
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th August, 1960.

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

Mr. BRYAN and Mr. DOWDING entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings held on the 2nd, 4th and 9th August, 1960, respectively, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*) There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from Mr. A. B. Way, Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank offering himself for re-appointment as Auditor of the Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1960, at a remuneration of £125 per annum.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from Mr. Lionel Giles, Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant of the House, applying for three months' leave from his duties as from tomorrow.

RE-APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR OF SUGAR
INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. A. B. Way be re-appointed as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1960, at a remuneration of \$125 per annum.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DEPUTY MARSHAL,
MESSENGER AND LIBRARY ATTENDANT.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. Lionel Giles be granted three months' leave of absence from his duties as Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant as from tomorrow's date.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. Arthur Giles be appointed to act as Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant during the absence on leave of the Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 11) Order, 1960.

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for four months ended 30th July, 1960.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by various Post offices, etc. to 31st May, 1960.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices, etc., to 30th June, 1960. 12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 11) Order, 1960".

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,147 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 13, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

Bill to amend the Stamp Act, 1916.

Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS a Statement has been laid in this Chamber on 9th August, 1960 by the Hon. Minister of Communications relative to transportation of Emigrants to the United Kingdom;

AND WHEREAS such Emigrants experience the utmost difficulty and hardship in obtaining for themselves the amount of money required to pay for their transportation to the United Kingdom at the current rates charged by British Overseas Airways Corporation, namely three hundred and sixty dollars one way per person;

BE IT RESOLVED that, in cases where Government is properly advised that any Airline offering rates of three hundred and thirty six dollars per head or any lesser sum than three hundred and sixty dollars cannot offer reasonably safe transportation to Great Britain with their available Aircraft, Government shall undertake to assist any would-be emigrant by paying the difference between seventy five pounds and the cost of passage by the said cheaper Airline, in view of the extremely impecunious condition of prospective emigrants to the United Kingdom in quest of employment.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Will the Minister make a statement, at an early date, on the Soil Conservation Scheme in the parish of Saint Andrew?

2. Will the Minister supply the following information for the benefit of the House:

- (a) the total expenditure of the Soil Conservation Scheme to date;
- (b) The number of acres reclaimed to date;
- (c) Average yield in tons per acre of canes produced on such land since reclamation;
- (d) Net yield (in Dollars) of reclaimed land cultivated, otherwise than under sugar cane; and
- (e) Number of acres yet to be reclaimed?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the Stamp Act, 1916, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, was read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I would like to move the Suspension of Standing Order No. 5 in order that certain Items on the Agenda may be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Items have to be named.

Hon. M. E. COX: I thought it was customary to ask leave before the motion is made.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is done comprehensively.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Items No. 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to postpone Items Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 and to take Item No. 5 as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is asking leave to postpone Items Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 and take Item No. 5 as the first Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

POOL BETTING DUTY ACT, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to impose duty on bets made by way of pool betting and to provide for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on the last occasion, I think I was preparatory to moving the second reading of this Bill pointing out the salient points. I think I had reached as far as Clause 6 which restricts the sending out of the island of money and valuable things in connection with bets made by way of pool betting. I made the point, Sir, that if this Bill becomes law, the Postmaster General will be authorised on the warrant of the Governor to open or cause to be opened any postal packet received for transmission by post to a destination outside the island which he suspects to contain any money or valuable thing attempted to be sent out of the island in contravention of this Section, and any such money or valuable thing therein shall be forfeited to the Crown.

Clause 7 provides amongst other things for the registration of persons carrying on any business which involves or may involve any sums becoming payable to them by way of pool betting, and Clause 8 sets out the duties of persons registered by the Comptroller in connection with the keeping of books connected with this business of pool betting.

12.35 p.m.
Clauses 9 and 10 deal with penalties in connection with contravention of the various sections. Clause 11 deals with the circumstances in which a Director, General Manager, Secretary or any other such officer of a body corporate may be personally liable for an offence committed by such body corporate. Clause 12 relates to the limitation of time for proceedings in respect of an offence under the Bill and Clause 13 gives authority to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make regulations for the better carrying out of the provisions of the Bill.

The last Clause - Clause 14 - stipulates the time in which the Act will come into operation and that will be by proclamation published in the *Official Gazette*.

As aforesaid, this is a new thing to Barbados. I do not want to repeat what I said on the last occasion but it has been discovered that by pool betting, Government is losing revenue and therefore, Government seeks to introduce controlling measures which would, if not altogether, to a great extent - and we hope it would altogether - control this thing.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the principle of this Bill which seeks among other things mainly to impose a duty on stakes collected by way of pool betting. I hardly feel that there is any hon. member - and I refer to members of the Opposition - who would fail to support

a Bill which seeks to introduce such a principle and which in fact would raise revenue for the island. Certainly, it should not meet with much opposition.

It is merely a Bill bringing in line what obtains in respect of the Barbados Turf Club and other betting agencies. In other words, for quite a long time, pool betting had not been subjected to any taxes whatsoever and that has been a means of exporting money from this colony and exporting revenue without paying any taxes of any nature whatsoever, whether by way of income tax, by way of levy or anything of the sort.

I feel that the principle as set out in this Bill is perfectly in order, but what is occupying my mind is whether in imposing the duty we are going too far. It should not be our aim to restrict it to the extent that pool betting would die a natural death because it is a means whereby many a humble person has been able to get a start in life and it should not be stamped out altogether. The duty or levy should not be made so excessive as to discourage it.

I am therefore wondering if the rate of 20% of the stake money paid would not be considered as really a bit excessive. The 20% is an enormous rate and I feel, although the Bill is quite good in principle, yet the rate is a bit excessive and it may be a means of discouraging pool betting. I beg to support the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I too support this Bill, but I will go on to say that Barbados is too poor a country to be able to afford the export of money at this rate on pool betting even though it has been, according to what the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, a means whereby some humble person has become rich and has got a start in life. Let me say that sometimes humble people get a start in life by a thing like this, but it does not mean that humble people should get the start by Government introducing legislation like this to help them.

A Government should be aware of certain things and not take things for granted. If hon. members of the Government are imbued with a spirit of gambling and, therefore, want to legalise all types of gambling, well then, a humble man may get a start in life by throwing dice. You say that you do not legalise that. If you legalise all types of gambling, then to those who throw dice, the losers will pay for what the winners have received. What this Bill on pool betting means is that the Government is legalising the export of money to other countries and that they are prepared to get a tax on it although it can be said that this community is very poor. When you let go out of the island \$10,000, even if \$2,000 comes back in to an individual, yet the community is poorer by \$8,000.

12.45 p.m.

Therefore you say you are going to tax the amount which you are going to give out; this is because people who cannot afford to lose money feel that they are going to gain by it. You are not expending sufficient on the social services because the amount of taxation which you will derive cannot pay for a single man in the Hospital for three months. See what it takes to keep a man in the Hospital for a day, multiply that by three months and see if it is the amount of money which you are going to get back. If you are legalising gambling, then you should have a lottery just as is done in South American places. I am not in favour of lotteries because, from my examination and observation of lotteries, the countries which engage in such things are not as well off as the countries which do not engage in them. I do not think that the twenty-one republics in South America can claim that they are better off than the United States of America or New Zealand where lottery is not permitted.

I do not think that any of the countries which are progressive countries like the Scandinavian countries of Sweden and Denmark - I do not think that those countries which allow lotteries are better off than these progressive countries; but in Latin American countries lotteries are carried on. People feel that their only chance in life is

winning a lottery. The hon. senior member for Christ Church takes an empirical attitude but not that of an ideal leader; however, the net result is that Barbados is going to be poorer because pool betting is nothing but a drain on the pockets of the poor which they cannot afford. Those who are in public life must be prepared to lead people, but not follow them down the path to destruction. You are accentuating in the minds of people by these degrees that this way of life is the only one to live and it is the only ray of hope to which they can look forward. I feel it is time that we get down to the fundamentals of putting people on the road to finding profitable employment whereby they have the right to work so as to provide for themselves and their families an existence, but not in the hope of winning anything. It is all right in the context that you are sharing in the spoils which you are getting or that you are getting your cut out of the gains; but if you are not in the pools you cannot get your cut. The Government is therefore getting their cut out of this kind of debauchery; they are exporting money out of the country at a rate which the community cannot afford, and it may be that people will be restricted from doing things which they ought to be doing.

I feel that I have to take a very strong view as a citizen in leading the people. We have enough gambling at the Barbados Turf Club already and if you look at the newspapers you will find that over \$220,000 was expended on the last meeting; you multiply that by four and you will find that in this country over \$1 million is invested in this manner. Have you seen the money which is made in Barbados other than by those who go in for races? There is no capital account attached to winning; a man may win \$10,000 and people have been wise enough to divert their incomes into horseracing; you are thereby better off in this country from the income point of view than those who have to work hard or those who have to utilise their brains, where the Income Tax Commissioner can hunt you down for the money. This is becoming a pastime for those who have enough money to find other means of investing it.

A part of this Bill is to support the Barbados Turf Club so that the Club will not be losing. I am not a person who would advertise that; I do not think that it leads anywhere. It is not the sort of thing which enhances the economic position of Barbados. If there had never been a race meeting in Barbados, the community would not be any poorer, because you have money being put into a pool. Those of us who take a realistic view of the matter will find that if you take \$10,000 in this country and distribute it among the community, you will not be making the community any richer. This is another type of taxation where you are taking away money from the majority of people and giving it to one or two people. I feel that pool betting is nothing to do with anything in Barbados; it is something which is conducted and it belongs to something outside Barbados. And far from encouraging it, it should be banned.

Barbados has nothing to gain by this pool betting; it is the type of debauchery which must be stopped. There is nothing profitable in this, and what you are doing is to encourage people to take chances when they cannot afford to take them. You have a man who is working for \$10.00 or \$12.00 a week; you say that somebody has won a prize and you are depressing the community by those who will sacrifice buying a shirt or doing something for themselves on the altar that they will be the next winners. We know that the community will be poorer as a result of this state of affairs. It is only the ignorant people who will think otherwise. If the national income in Barbados is x, this measure will make it x -. I am therefore against this measure.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, so long as bets made by way of betting are not illegal in this country, the Government is justified in attempting to secure for itself some profit from that pool betting; but as a result of this Bill being enacted into legislation, the Government should obtain useful information from the Comptroller of Customs and the Accountant General as to the amount of money which Barbadians are prepared to spend or are actually

spending on betting and gambling. With that information available to them after a year or two of its trial, it may well be wise for the Government seriously to consider whether an appreciable accretion to the national income could not be made by way of a Government state lottery. 12.55 p.m.

I think it is Malta which runs such a lottery; and if we accept the principle of approving of pool betting so much so that we take so much from the Public Treasury as a result of the activities of these pools, then I think it follows that we must realise how much is going out of the island, and there the hon. senior member for St. Peter is 100% correct in the vast amount of money which is going out of this island compared with what may come in for occasionally one solitary individual who has won a worthwhile prize.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the same may well apply to Insurance Companies and the vast amount of money which goes out of this island in premiums in the absence of a Comprehensive Government Insurance Scheme; but it seems that this Government in general approves of gambling. As you know, Sir, we have other things to consider. We will be considering sooner or later approving lotteries organised by the Transport Board, and you know, Sir, that the Turf Club's lottery in respect of every race meeting has Government's sanction. In as much as we have the Government of this island in principle accepting gambling as a pastime not to be banned, it would be as well in that case for Government to consider, with the information available to it as a result of the passing into Law of a Bill such as this, whether they should not institute a Government State lottery whereby money will come into Barbados from outside. People in this island will buy their tickets, and people from other islands will buy their tickets and the money will be deposited and no doubt most of it will remain in Barbados except in the case where someone from overseas happened to be the fortunate winner of the first or any of the other large prizes.

As was clear from the speech of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, my colleague, we are not opposing the second reading of this Bill, but we are pointing out that if the Government is accepting this principle and approving this matter of gambling, it is for them then to carry it to its logical conclusion, and with the information available to it as a result of the control which will be exercised and the information which will be obtained if this Bill comes into Law, consider the desirability of running its own state lotteries whereby the money will accrue to the Government of this island in its entirety or almost in its entirety as distinct from the little benefit which will obtain as a result of the duty which it is proposed to impose by this Bill on bets made by way of pool betting.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, pool betting in Barbados two or three years ago was at such a proportion that Government had to take notice of it. There were large sums of money going out of the island and the people in Barbados had fallen for it heavily. I do believe that that has worn off and pool betting today is not to the same extent as it was two years ago; but Government could not allow it to remain unnoticed, and I commend them for coming down with such a Bill not only to regularise it, by which they will know how much money is involved, but by taking their cut from pool betting.

There are some of us who would like to ban betting entirely; I am not one of those. Most of us like a bet. I am not a heavy better, and I am not a gambler at all; as a matter of fact, I have never yet filled out a pool form, because I do not know how to do it. It is in man to risk or want to risk some, if not of his savings, of somebody else's savings; but you are not going to stop it by enacting legislation, because they will find means of getting around it. I am not in favour of - rather, I am absolutely against a state lottery. Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I know that those countries which have state lotteries are the poorer for them for the very obvious reason that too many people are hoping to become rich overnight by placing their bets weekly with the hope of becoming a millionaire. I should never like to see that

introduced into Barbados. I am not one that would want to stop it 100% but I commend Government for taking their cut. Twenty percent is not too much; we pay 20% on much of the food we eat, 33% on motor cars, 20% on electrical goods and so on; but the important part about this Bill is that Government in future will know how much money is involved, both circling within the island and what is going out.

Mr. Speaker, in places like America and England, although they may not have Gambling Laws, there is considerable betting on horse racing, and I may add Australia. People in England gamble heavily on horse racing, but the Government takes its cut, and in America although there may be no Gambling Act, if you go to any race track and it is not three or four times a year as in Barbados - on every day of a week for eight or ten weeks during which time the season lasts you will find heavy gambling. They start at Saratoga and as the winter comes on find themselves in Florida and you will find the same people betting. They are professional gamblers, but Government takes a proportion of it. We have to be realistic about these things. I know that around the race season it is difficult for small shopkeepers to pay their bills, and the reason is not only that the shopkeepers indulge in betting, but many of their customers are unable to pay them at the end of the week because they have risked a couple of their dollars on the race ground. Fortunately for us it is only three or four times a year, and once it is kept within reason, it is a certain amount of liberty which you must permit the public in their habits. You cannot control it 100%, and I commend the Government for bringing it down; but the important point about it is that Government will or should know and the Statistical Department should be able to give them full information as to what money is remaining in the island and how much is going out. You can always know what is coming back.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down said "once it is kept within reason." Already in this debate we have seen how far some of the members around the Table expect reason to go. 1.05 p.m.

We started off so well with pools that we have in our hands a Bill whereby the Government intends to have lotteries by the Transport Board. Now, we have gone as far by a suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as having state lotteries and I can quite envisage that we will end up by having in Barbados gambling casinos.

I cannot see any reason whatsoever in gambling. There is no reason in it. I am fortunate, Sir, in having the experience of paying people on a Thursday or Friday their wages for the week and seeing them come back to me on a Saturday or Monday morning in a pitiful state telling me that they cannot give their families and their children anything to eat and have come to borrow money. It is in my opinion heartrending to see that this Government - and I may say that the Police of this island are almost doing the same thing as this Government intends to do, and that is to legalise gambling. I can see it no other way.

The response to pool betting in this island is going to come mainly from the man and the woman that cannot afford it. As to the few lucky ones who are going to get any benefit from pool betting, the chances are so few that I doubt any mathematician would be able to work out any permutations. If we in this island are going to support the decline of public morals rather than to ascertain that we help in every way to lift the people's morals, we are the ones that must definitely have the blame laid at our door. For many years there has been little gambling in this island, apart from the small amount of betting done in relation to the area that takes place on the racecourse, and which had been sufficient to serve the eager gamblers for big money. We have not yet experienced the fantastic situation which I have seen and have had first hand experience of as regards pool betting in England. I have seen people who are in receipt of a dole before they can do anything with their money, some of it must be taken out for the pools for that week. Now, Sir, imagine that. How degrading can it be, how far down can we get, that

before a man or a woman looks after the needs of his own immediate self and family, that money is being put by for gambling!

I can see it in no other light than that we are legalising gambling. This is only the start. This form of gambling has made a few people in England millionaires overnight - and I do not speak of the few who win a few pounds overnight, but the people who run these pools out of the suffering of the majority of poor people in England. I heard the Hon. Minister of Agriculture talking of having sometimes to do things for people in order to prevent them from taking advantage of themselves. This is a measure to which I feel we should definitely not give our full wholehearted support.

Then, Sir, I see from this Bill that the Government is contemplating the efficient running of a business by using gambling as a method for financing that business because there is a Clause which I see in it that pool betting duty shall not be payable on any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board. That, Sir, is another indication of the lowering of public morals.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is anticipating a Bill which is on the Order Paper and I do not think he should do so.

Mr. DOWDING: I have just read that from a section of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the one which is now before us?

Mr. DOWDING: Yes, Sir. That to me is an acknowledgement of your not knowing how to use your own business methods to make a business pay but must resort to what would be a gamble to support it; in this case, the Transport Board by a means of lottery.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is referring to another Bill. This Bill for pool betting which is before us does not mention anything about the Transport Board.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intitled an Act to impose a duty by bets made by way of pool betting and to provide for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith. That, Sir, is the Bill with which we are dealing. On page four, at the top of the page, paragraph (c) of Section 3, reads as follows:-

"Any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955, in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fares."

I wait for Your Honour to rule. The Hon. Premier says that I am out of order.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order. I thought the hon. member was dealing with the other Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. George is quite in order. You may proceed.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for your ruling and it is regrettable that some of us do not take the trouble to read our Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will make this observation. I think the wording of that section is wrong. Of course, if anything is wrong, it is the draftsman and not the Hon. Minister to take the blame.
1.15 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: If I may go on to extend my point, I would say that the gambling which is proposed by this Section is again a means of lowering public morals. When we are using lotteries to get in monies to run the Transport Board - well, in everything let us give up all reason, let us decide that we will have another little spot on this side of the Caribbean like Monaco and let us have everything they have. They are so highly educated to gambling that gamb-

ling is their living. My own experience of gambling in one of these places in this particular place of Monaco is that even the gambling is dishonest, if that is not paradoxical, and how far are we going with this matter? There is no reason given in this Bill for this state of things unless it is where the hon. introducer said that notice must be taken of it. If we are going to impose a duty which will cut gambling out of existence, then I say "yes", but we should not legalise gambling by putting a duty on it.

Mr. Speaker, I have had first-hand experience of gambling. As to the nature of the place I have mentioned, my money was on the right number, but it was taken away and given to somebody else; I got my money through deciding to have a fight and breaking up the place; otherwise I would not have got back my money. I got what I had lost plus, and I left. Mr. Speaker, is that what we want? I want to make it quite clear that I am not in agreement with legalising gambling to any extent. If this is an effort of the Government to stop gambling by imposing this duty in the first place, and the Government intends to follow it up, then that is all right. I have questions to ask about the local Gambling Act. It is pitiable to see people drawing their money and going and gambling with it. In every village there is the professional man, who, as soon as a worker gets his money, is out to take it from him. If we are going to stand by and allow these things to continue and then add pool gambling to the list of menaces which already exist, we are not, in my opinion, doing our duty and we are not keeping enough within reason. Within reason we should be trying to protect those who are gambling from this state of affairs.

I cannot agree with the idea that gambling is a necessity and a "must". I feel that this island has sufficient gambling in the few little things which go on up to now. I want those who are responsible in the Churches and those in the Legislature to show what gambling leads to; and if they were to do that, in my opinion, it would be of the greatest benefit in assisting in this matter rather than pulling things down. I do not take it as gambling in cases where people are going to help, if they want to take chances for a specific, charitable purpose. It is not with the idea of winning, if one goes into it with the idea of giving as much as he can in order that such charity, whether it be for the maimed, the deaf, blind or the halt, can get some alleviation. If we are going to legalise gambling to the point of State lotteries, what are we going to do with these deserving cases? Let me say that a number of cases in this island are supported strongly by such efforts; such cases need support but let us find out the people at the top of this Bill today. They do not need any support; they have already made themselves millionaires and multi-millionaires. Therefore I cannot agree with the principle of this Bill. I commend the Government, if they have taken this measure as a step to ban another type of gambling of this sort in this island.

I am wondering if this island is going to be made a place like one of those where poor people go around selling tickets and gambling - the policeman and all. I am wondering if the position is as is happening in England now. There is no place where you can go and do not find these forms being made out; it is all over the place. It is becoming a mania and I would be sorry to see this island led into this depth where you have a fanatic people, where there is no possibility whatsoever of people getting rich overnight out of this pool betting except for a million to one chance. I cannot accept the principle of gambling within reason at all; there is no reason in a man who is going to gamble. We should not encourage any gambling whatsoever which is for the out-and-out purpose of making money quickly. A lot of people think that life is just a matter of getting rich tomorrow morning; even those who have come along the hard way to save money, when they catch on to a little gambling, the next day they gamble away what they have earned on the previous day. In the majority of cases, it is a matter of easy come and easy go.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel myself that this is a Bill, well, I do not know what the Labour Party's line may be, but this cannot be, in the strongest sense, confined to the direct Party line. Unlike the last speaker, I

have not had the experience of gambling on the grand scale which he has had, but I have had my experience to a lesser degree. Therefore, I can say with the experience of the principles of gambling: "Yes, we should not encourage it."

1.25 p.m.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I say that with the fullest sense of responsibility, but you will observe when I am finished that my Party will also be divided on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, actually this Bill does not seek to legalise gambling as such, and that is what the hon. and gallant member who spoke last did not stress and seemed to have lost sight of. If this Bill sought to legalise gambling, I would be the first to oppose it not from any religious scruples, but because of the experience which I have had. It is like drinking or doing anything else to an excess, because we do some things and then realise it does not pay. I remember that I said that while I did not like to stay in the way of a lottery being run, I made it quite clear then that I could boast of being a person who had not bought a sweepstake ticket for horse racing in Barbados, because I just do not like it.

To deal principally with this Bill, Sir, I would just like to say what is the position with gambling locally. Gambling, so to speak, is legalised for the Turf Club in Barbados; then permission can be sought to run a lottery for any charitable purpose, and when we get to the question of the Transport Board's lottery later on, I will have a different outlook on that. In that Bill it is stated that what applies here in the collection of this money should not apply to the Transport Board's lottery, and when we come to that I will have my say. As I was saying, gambling is legalised for the Barbados Turf Club. From time immemorial and from the time I was able to read and write, I was taught that horse racing was the sport of the well-to-do and rich, especially since in looking over on the Government side I can see one member who indulges in the sport of Kings. We do not expect to ban Turf Club gambling, but people are sensible enough to know that if you keep race horses, you are able to evade income tax in many respects; all you have to do is to keep race horses because the winnings from race horses are not taxable and the feeding of them can always take up the winnings and so on; but I do not want to say more on that.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to join the sport of the rich and the Kings yet; so I say that in Barbados - and this may be an eye opener for some people - when something is found out you can say that you won this money by means of horse racing. The other method by which you can legalise betting is for charitable purposes which is very clear. Now as such, I like the hon. gallant member for St. George, would say that I am opposed to gambling if you came to legalise it, but this Bill does not seek to do that. The hon. senior member for St. Peter must bear in mind that this is something which he may as well face right now.

Let us ask the Government some questions. Have you taken steps to put a stoppage to this? Is it worthwhile taking steps to put a stoppage to it or is it worthwhile since it has gone so far that you cannot put any stoppage to it that you are now saying that you had better collect taxes by way of this? The Government should satisfy us with that. The Government of Barbados have said that they do not intend to legalise any lotteries in Barbados; they have proclaimed that from the house-top; therefore the Government should say that it has been drawn to their attention by the Police and by other Statistical Departments that gambling is being carried on in a circumscribed way in Barbados and they can do nothing to stop it; therefore rather than legalise it, the only thing to do is what the Americans do, that is, if you are a bandit or a gangster or by whatever means you win money, you have to pay by way of income tax. The Government is saying that they cannot get at people through income tax, so they are coming through a direct lottery tax. I would like to hear the Minister in charge on this.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of legalising gambling. I am in favour of the Bill in the sense that this

is not anything you are doing to help somebody. This is something in which you know people are collecting money and getting money out of it, and the general public seems to be going for it. You cannot stop it going on, much as the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. George would like to say that you should ban it by a stroke of the pen. If you outlaw these pools, they will get stronger because the fact that people know they cannot do it in that way would make them do it in such a way that you will then start to see money going out of the country. It would be just like prohibition in America. If you today outlaw throwing bone dice or playing rummy, as it is against the law, or black jack or playing thirty-ones - even saying "the baby wants shoes" as the member would say - it will still continue, and the only time you will collect money is when the Police arrests a person and he is charged and has to pay a fine for observing the Gambling Act in the breach.

What I am saying now, Mr. Speaker, is this; you have two things legalised for gambling in this country. You can do something for charitable purposes and have it legalised, and there is the Turf Club, neither of which the Government will outlaw; therefore I must be satisfied now beyond any doubt that the Government have investigated this and have found that it has gone so far that there would be no point in outlawing it and therefore all they can do is to collect taxes. I submit to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. George that this does not legalise gambling, but is only saying that Government can do nothing about it except to collect taxes.

1.35 p.m.

In other words, they are saying: "We get income tax from the Barbados Turf Club as an institution or we get entertainment tax or some other form of taxation from the Barbados Turf Club. We have, so to speak, legalised the Barbados Turf Club. Under the Gambling Act, with sweepstakes in aid of charity, the Government does not get anything out of those. This is something new - pool betting - and is running alongside the Barbados Turf Club. It is not for charity and therefore, you must find a means of getting something for yourself if you cannot outlaw it. We have taken every step to outlaw it and we cannot outlaw it; therefore, Sir, what else can we do but to collect a tax from it?"

Sir, what is beating me, and I hope the Hon. Premier will tell me, is what do we collect by way of similar taxation from the Barbados Turf Club and whatever else sweepstakes that are sold in this country. You say that this is a sport, but to whom and where does the profit of the Turf Club go? Do not let any of us fool ourselves that in running the business of the Barbados Turf Club it is only run for the fun and sport of it. It is run as a business for gain. Nevertheless, if Government is collecting a tax from the Barbados Turf Club, I see nothing wrong in Government collecting a tax from these pools.

If the Government were to come and say: "Let us outlaw this running of the pools", I would politely ask them the second question: "Do you stop Irish Sweepstakes, Jamaica Sweepstakes, Trinidad Sweepstakes and Calcutta Sweepstakes from selling here?" Sir, do you know that there are other neighbouring islands who have stopped the selling of Barbados Sweepstakes in their Colonies? Has the Government stopped sweepstakes from any other country coming into this island? All that these people from outside do is to get a Barbados Directory and send their sweepstakes to every name they find in that Directory and thousands of dollars go out of the island by way of those outside sweepstakes.

All through this Bill you see "Postmaster General" and all the powers that these people have. I think the Government should do just a little more than that. They should be able to tell us what amount goes out of Barbados by way of the pools. That is question one. As I have said, I am supporting the principle of the Bill that there should be a tax on the pools; but surely, if you are doing your work properly, you should be able to give the Opposition facts and figures. As I have said, in this country you have two methods of gambling: (1) the Barbados Turf Club and (2)

the selling of tickets for charity. The Government should be able to tell us that they have found that pool betting is taking away \$x,000 and therefore, in our opinion at a rate of 20% we can get in so much for the benefit of Barbados. I do not think that hon. members who were opposed to gambling and spoke against it just as I am opposed and any conscientious thinking person would also be opposed to our collecting tax on these pools.

I am supporting the principle of collecting tax on these pools provided the Government can assure me of the amount which goes out of the country as compared with the Irish, Jamaica, Calcutta and other Sweepstakes which come in here and for which we have not yet put on a tax. I am going as far as to say that Trinidad Sweepstake tickets are sold openly in Barbados and a lot of them are sold because the prizes are greater than what you get here. This is a matter upon which hon. members cannot speak too strictly on a Party line. We have not taxed the Trinidad, the Jamaican and the other Sweepstakes which are sold here, but we propose taxing the pools. I am saying: "Give us therefore, a comparison of the revenue earning capacity by your taxing the pools." Do not just bring in legislation and ask us to pass it without telling us what it means to us in dollars and cents. If you brought in a Bill tomorrow morning to ask us to pay a tax on sow pigs, you would obviously go to the Agricultural Department and get statistics and come in and say to us that during the last five years we have had so and so number of sow pigs in the island. It is not good enough to merely tell us that you are going to tax the pools. In principle I support the Bill, but I ask the Hon. Minister in charge to give me those facts which I have asked for, and also facts as regards the other sweepstakes which flood this market; that is to say, what you think you will get from those if you take them and what you propose to do as regards such other forms of illegal gambling which are also taking out of the country considerable quantities of money.

Sir, I am not going to say more at this juncture because I am looking forward to the Hon. Premier giving us some facts and figures about the entire matter.

Finally, I would say that you will observe that my Party feels that you cannot pin any member down to a deadline on this matter and that it is a matter of a man's conscience as to what he thinks about. Pool betting duty is something which I feel, first of all, you ought to satisfy us that you have done everything to outlaw the selling here and, secondly, not being able to outlaw it because it has reached such a stage, then you have put such a tax on it so as to dissuade people from betting. As a matter of fact, the tax of 20% seems to me that it has been put that high so as to dissuade people from betting on it and that it is an attempt to outlaw it. However, do not ask us to agree to this rate of 20% tax on pools without giving us some facts and figures and telling us whether you tried to outlaw it and whether you have compared it with the other two forms of legalised gambling as well as those other forms of gambling which come into our colony from which we collect absolutely no tax.

As a matter of fact, I think Your Honour knows that if you sell Barbados Sweepstakes in some of the other islands you can be locked up for it.

1.45 p.m.

I am hoping that the Premier will be able to give us the correct answers. I sit down by saying that I am in favour of the principle of the Bill but unless I am satisfied about the Government's action, I shall ask that the Bill be delayed or I shall have to vote against it. The Government must satisfy us by taking every possible step to do what I have suggested.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, as to pool betting, I think it is the greatest evil which has ever existed in Barbados. Any gambler is supposed to be possessed of a covetous desire, that is, to take what his fellow creature has by some means. When I sat here today and saw that the Government had brought down this Bill asking for 20% on this pool betting I am sorry that they did not ask for 50%. My idea is that the Government has to subsidise

those who win as well as those who lose, because every one is buying the same commodities. I feel that the Government is trying to protect those who have lost because as soon as a man loses he becomes a nuisance to the Government; he either has to go to Glendairy Prison or to some other public institution to get food. When I see that the Government is asking for this 20% I suggest that the Government is trying to help those who have lost. I know a man who worked and drew his money on a Saturday afternoon; he went and gambled with his friends and lost his money. His little boy asked him if he had lost his money; the boy said: "I bet you went with man Ellis" and the man replied "yes." His wife had some flying fish and she could not stew them because she could not even get salt; the fish had to be given to the pig.

Gambling is one of the worst things in the world; sometimes it causes you to lose your wife and sometimes it causes you to lose your life. Because sentence is not speedily executed, it is set in the hearts of men continually to do wickedness. It is gambling which has caused this world to be in such a dilapidated state today; it has caused many men to go to jail. When people lose their money after they have worked for it they cannot be satisfied. A gambler thinks only of getting the other man's money; he does not think of the other man's family. Yet I would say that gambling is not a compulsory matter; it is only a question of an illegal desire to live, and unbridled lust which causes us not to be satisfied. I trust that the time will come when the Government will put their whole pressure on gambling and ban it and then we will not have so many naked and starving people in this island. Many fathers go home without money because of gambling and if we could only stop that, many people in this island would get along a little better.

As to this Bill, I am not opposing it; it is not possible for me to do so. I am sorry that the Government is not asking for 50% instead of 20% so as to weaken the moral of the spirit of those who gamble; that would bring them down instead of lifting them up. When people win they feel good; but when they lose, murder and theft and all sorts of things stand in front of them because they have lost their money. By some means they have to try and get money because they have their families to be supported; sometimes they go on the wrong road and Glendairy takes them up. I hope we will try our best, as long as we have power, to ban gambling. I hope the Government will use all their efforts to try and get gambling out of existence; I myself will help to find a solution to get it out of existence.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely a bit of legislation which can confuse and divide the House like this one. It is confusing not because hon. members are not wearing their thinking caps, but because the subject is one which bears on gambling, and the people of this island are regarded as the biggest gamblers; because when one looks at the hon. members opposite, nothing less than gambling could persuade the people of this island to keep them in power. It seems to me that the people have made two big mistakes in recent years; one is that they took Sir Grantley Adams to be a fool and the other one is that they took the present Premier to be a genius. If that is not gambling, I do not know what it is. It appears that the Government cannot find anything left to do and it wants to stop money from going out of the country. That is a laudable object; but why did they amend the Usury Act in such a way that money went out before it could come back? Why do you form your policies in such a way that you allow big people to get away with big things and now you want to annoy the small people who, after all, are only using their own money? You allowed money to go out of the island, money which you said you wanted to keep in; you allowed it to go and come back in and people had to pay through their noses for it. Now you want to stop people who spend 25 cents or 50 cents or whatever it is on what I consider to be legitimate expenses though there are some people who do not think so.

1.55 p.m.

I am not saying of course in all circumstances that betting on pools could be justified, but this is what I notice in this

Island. The Government of this Island, Mr. Speaker, if the truth is to be told, cannot really congratulate itself on providing all the progress and the well being and welfare for the people. They as a Government cannot claim that money can be so much better spent than the fact that people now have a little flutter on the pools; and Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what may be the reason for concentrated and persistent gambling in other and bigger countries, one of the reasons - by no means the least important reason - in a community like ours must be the poverty of the people. It is ironical and somewhat paradoxical to say that, but we live in a community in which outlets for prosperity are closed, people cannot look forward to very much, and therefore they feel that if they can have a flutter by some luck or chance they will get something for nothing, and that would be all the better for them. That is why they gamble; they do not gamble because they are wicked or because they are more greedy than anybody else; they gamble because legitimate outlets for prosperity do not exist in this Island as in bigger places, and consequently people feel that if they have a flutter, whether it is an ordinary raffle for a turkey-cock or a pair of fowls, they are getting something for little outlay and that is a sentiment which is not necessarily wicked, and there is nothing wrong with it. But carried beyond a certain point it would of course be dangerous.

To say, Mr. Speaker, that Government is so alarmed now at the amount of money going out of the island that it must do this, I think, is not far short of being frivolous. I myself like most people would be in favour and am in favour of seeing every single cent we could get hold of in this Island spent and invested here. Of course, who would not be? You cannot have two minds about that, but what I say is that we have got to be careful in imposing unnecessary restrictions on people who are only indulging in a harmless pastime, however widespread it may be.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock.

On Resumption:

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that there are no answers ready yet to Oral Questions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: to resume debate on a Resolution re lack of Confidence in the Ministry of Communications.

On the last occasion when this item was being debated, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would briefly like to reiterate that I regard the motion as one which gives every member of the Chamber who desires to speak an opportunity to speak on this motion in relation to the Ministry as a whole. During your absence, Sir, I made reference, when the Deputy Speaker was occupying the Chair, to the fact that my strictures would come more within the province of Housing. I say that because owing to the Constitution of Barbados it is not a Ministry of Communications *per se*; it is a Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing, and it is most unlikely that there will be a vote of "no confidence" in the Minister of Communications, because he will still be Minister of Works and Housing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the hon. member that I hold an opposite view. The motion itself reads "Resolution

Re Lack of Confidence in the Minister of Communications." The Resolution itself reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House has NO CONFIDENCE in the Policy of the Ministry of Communications as to its Administration of -

(a) Public Passenger Transport, including its present attitude towards motor vans, known as 'pickups';

(b) Seawell Airport; and

(c) Generally."

I take it that "generally" means generally in relation to the Ministry of Communications. Again, as you know, the present Minister is the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing but at any time he may lose the Ministry of, say, Housing; he may be shifted to another Ministry. I think the motion should deal with him as Minister of Communications and you should not worry to go on to Housing. That is my view, and knowing how Cabinet shuffles and reshuffles can be done - I am not suggesting it, I am not hoping for it, I do not care anything about it - probably next week the Minister may be in charge of another Ministry.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will bow to your ruling. That is one of those very debatable things in our Constitution because they have not been very clearly defined. You have a Resolution which speaks about the Ministry of Communications, but you can take it differently and you can have a vote of 'no confidence' in the Minister. Surely, you can have a vote of 'no confidence' in a Minister and not in a Ministry, because the Ministry is what he represents and is what will still remain after he has left.

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely a Ministry can have no opposition.

Mr. WALCOTT: Of course, a Ministry can have no opposition unless we abolish it. The Premier is the person to say what type of Ministries they must be.

So far as the Communications aspect of this Ministry is concerned as to the running and the operation of the buses, I think it has been a public situation in which all the phases of it were not handled as well as they should be. Unfortunately for the present Minister of Communications, whether he likes it or not, he is in charge of it, but I think that it is the responsibility of the whole Government because the Government in its collective responsibility promotes the policy of the Transport Board. It is no use crying over spilt milk.

We all have our views about public transport. The Government has their experts advising them on it. I do not know what was the detailed advice, but what appears to me as a layman to be wrong - and this is what would be wrong with any undertaking - is that the people who run an undertaking must be people concerned with the running of the undertaking and who know something about it. I feel this way about it. Nationalised or social services ought to be run by people who have one faith and understanding and one approach for such a service because they are for the benefit of the community as a whole. Where social services are run by private people, they are there to see how the service is run, and the view is held that people seeing after their own business run it better than if that business is impersonal.

I think any supporter of the Government will see this view, and there is no denying the fact that the Government had at one stage of its operation of these buses a bunch of dunderheads, people who were grossly incompetent of running transport, and this is no sneer on a man who is running a small business. I, myself, have never been in big business but I do my thinking in a big way. If you have people who are running small business and you put them to run big business but they still are thinking in a small businesslike way, you cannot expect that their running of big business would be a success.

I know that there were members on this Transport Board who in their attitude of running this business thought that they should disguise at night and hide themselves behind poles and in the bus stand to see if a bus conductor was going to pinch a fare. Some got behind an electric pole and acted as a spy. It seems to me as if something is wrong with the thinking of people. I believe those members of the Board who acted in that way did not inspire confidence. I am of the opinion that there was not enough thought given to staffing the organisation, but that they were using people as they came along. I believe that at one stage of the Board's operation there was too much unnecessary political interference and in a small community like this, I think it will be well for the Minister to take this thought in view that there is too much the idea that, if you run a business department, the people who work there should be supporters of the Government as against somebody who is not a supporter of the Government, and, therefore, if you get people who are not supporters of the Government working in that business, they are not going to do the job for the Government to as high a degree of efficiency as those who are supporters of the Government. I say that because all taxpayers are citizens of the community, and as such they are entitled to work in any nationalised service provided that they are competent. There should not be this folly of your not employing people to do a job of work because they do not like the Labour Party or because they are friends of the Opposition. I feel that has been one of the difficulties in your running the transport service.

Sir, I do not believe enough evidence has been revealed to show that the present people are going to do much better or are doing better from what has been seen, because enough has not been stated. What I do feel is that with the right approach and discipline, the Transport Board should be able to run its service more competently than that run by private people. For example, I have been watching the buses that have been owned by private people, and, in many instances, it seems that the buses owned by private people seem to be in better shape and general condition than the buses owned by the Transport Board.

One of the fundamental dangers against the buses being kept in good condition is the question of our roads. I do not know what the Minister would say about it. In Barbados where you have not appreciably widened the roads and the streets to accommodate this new type of traffic, I think that you are really expecting too much from a driver to manipulate these buses in such a way as to be perfect at all times. There are very few roads in Barbados of which you can think where two Leyland buses can pass each other at a normal speed of fifteen or twenty miles an hour without one of them slowing down. I regard that speed as the rate at which these buses should be driven. I have seen some of these drivers crazy enough to drive these buses at greater speeds than what I have just said; and although I represent these workers in the Trade Union, I often tell them that any man who is caught driving a bus of that size at some of the speeds at which I see them driven when they are coming around curves and corners — well that type of employment is not meant for them. That driver should go and fish or go out in a fishing boat where he can sail a boat at any speed.

Sir, you can very well see if such a driver comes in contact with a small car what will be the result. That is the sort of thing which you want to inculcate in the minds of drivers of these large vehicles. I will also tell you something. Sometimes the passengers of these large buses go in for it. We have a community with some people who seem very pleased with people who go in for fast driving. The Transport Board should endeavour to curtail fast driving and promote safe driving. Safe driving makes the vehicles last longer and lowers the maintenance cost.

Sir, there is no point at this stage to talk of our having too large a bus on the streets because the experts have advised the Government on that; but I say that a few of these buses are too big and in my view too costly. I

would like you to take a financial analysis of that situation. If that size of bus means a capitalisation of this business at this rate, you have to ask yourself: "Is the community prepared to pay for that type of service?" In other walks of life, we have to condition the services that we use by our income, and if we cannot afford to use a Rolls Royce car and have to use an ordinary mass-produced car because it comes within our budget, we must look at the transport service and its getting these size of buses at that cost in the same light.

2.45 p.m.

If we cannot afford to use Rolls Royce cars and we have to use the ordinary mass-produced cars, then we must buy them. There is no point in buying for the community something for which the community cannot pay; I mean in the context that it is too expensive for the community to bear the total cost of it. That is where I feel that buses of a more durable kind than those which existed in the past should be obtained, but more in keeping with the economy of the people who have to use these buses. There is no point in saying that you should have to increase bus fares over your dead body and then you buy buses which, on the fare which a man has to pay, you cannot afford to purchase. The hon. junior member for St. John says that he does not like the Senatorial investigation because it prys into people's affairs.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I have been one of the very strong protagonists on the floor of this House that we should have some such form of machinery in this island. I am sure that the hon. member must have misunderstood me. I may have said that I deplore the limits to which the Senatorial Investigating Committees have gone, but I do not think the hon. member has got me right at all. I was one of those protagonists who feel that we should have some such investigating Committee; you will find that there is a Resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper asking for the establishment of a Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is not my intention to misquote the hon. member. I put forward that method as a distinct one, but the hon. member did not agree with it and he made that statement. I do not think that the Government has acted fairly with this Chamber in saying precisely and in terms of figures when these buses were taken over, what were the circumstances which led the Government to return buses to certain concessionaires. On what basis were these concessionaires given buses and concessions? What is the amount of money outstanding, and under what terms and conditions? If that information is given, you will have a sort of broad public glare. But what do you find? A concession has been given to a person; the next thing you find is that a concession is given to a person who was a candidate of the Labour Party which is the Government in power; a concession has been given to another person who is a strong supporter of the Government in power. I can call names; I mean people like Mr. Coward; he was given the concession for the Boston route. I do not know if it was ever given away. Mr. Coward has a route which runs to Bathsheba but on one occasion the Government used to run that route. Mr. Coward was a candidate of the Labour Party in the last Local Government Election.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The appropriate Minister is not here, but I would like to say that surely when Mr. Coward was given this route, as far as I know, he was not a member of the Labour Party or a candidate of the Labour Party. These buses were sold or handed over to Mr. Coward in 1956 and it is only in 1958 that the gentleman became a candidate of the Labour Party for the Local Government Election. I remember that before then, he was running with the Opposition, that D.L.P. thing (Laughter).

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I can make reference to the Labour Party as the B.L.P. thing. The hon. member has said precisely what I said; the concession was given to a man who was a candidate of the Labour Party. I did not say that the concession was given to him when he was a candidate; you do not ask me to be a prophet or to be

more than human to say that if I give you something today, tomorrow I would associate myself with you; but that must show some connection or relationship. I mentioned that to show what the public would gather from it. The hon. member must understand that, as a politician, as persons in the community or as a Government, you have to be practical. If, in these circumstances, you find such acts taking place, it is nothing unusual to say: "Let us know". It would look as if you are favouring some people.

The Hon. Minister, who rose on a point of order, will pardon me if I say this; he, as Minister of Trade, had the unfortunate situation of taking over these buses at the beginning as a policy of the whole Government. Therefore, without any memorandum prepared on the matter, the hon. member had to try his best. Let us take it in that way; I do not believe that, on sober reflection, the hon. member would take over anything in the same circumstances again. (*Laughter*). The hon. member is very famous for reading speeches. I remember his speech in here at the time. I agree with him that the buses were taken over, and in the circumstances in which they were taken over, I was one of those people who had no misgiving that if the present concessionaires could not run the buses or had no intention of running them, then the Government had no other alternative but to take them over.

2.55 p.m.

I gave the Government 100% support in taking over the buses; but as I said earlier, the Government in taking over any enterprise has to be ruthless enough to take over the best people too and see that the best people run the services.

As I said earlier, and I repeat, my view at the time was and still is that the Government should have set up a big public corporation and place some of those people who wanted to invest money in this public corporation to run it as a big transport corporation and to utilise the abilities of such persons in the interest of a public corporation. That did not find favour with the Government, I believe, because it came from me; but even at this stage, I feel that there are occasions in which you have to make a brutal analysis of a financial situation, and it is in the public's interest to do the best thing if you have to do it. I doubt very much whether the Minister could come to this House now after the unpleasant situation with these buses and get public support to take over the others. What I can say with all due respect to private concessionaires is that the people who work in a general way for the Transport Board are in a better position than the people who worked for private industry at any time prior to the taking over, and that is a phase which I cannot ignore and which the public should not ignore.

Mr. Speaker, in this island we have to be very strict and firm because my view is that some people have the habit of nodding at dishonesty as if, as I heard earlier today in another debate, it is human nature. I feel it is human nature to be honest too, and I have no sympathy for people who are going to be bold faced and brazen enough as to want to do acts of dishonesty and want people to nod. My idea is that you should place such people before the Courts and let the Court decide as to their honesty. No business, no matter who runs it or how efficient the people are, can run efficiently and successfully if the people who are working in it are not going to give 100% of their interest. It would take more than human beings to make it succeed, and we should aim at that as a matter of public policy.

Now I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Government made many bites at this issue of transport; they have made so many bites that it is debilitating, and as the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has said, the pickups are taking up the matter very powerfully.

Now unfortunately — and I hope not to belong to that school — if private enterprise is doing something that is in the interest of the community, you have to be fair. If it is in the interest of the community and if you are having buses, you cannot have pickups at the expense of the people who are investing money to put them there, because you

have given out concessions and therefore these people must comply with the Law; they cannot run off the route, but in the same breath you say that another man does not require the things which you give to the concessionaires. A man may buy a motor car for \$50 or \$60 and pick up people and drop them at their doorstep, so the people might say that he is offering a better service, because he is giving a door to door drop while the ordinary concessionaire is taking him to a bus pole.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be fair and practical about this. It was never intended that the regular buses should carry a person from door to door, and there is no place in the world where that happens. If you have reached the situation as I said last week — and this is where I believe the danger has come — where this type of goods vehicles and passenger transport are necessary, say to the public that you need this type of transport because people coming from the parish of St. Joseph will want to bring their breadfruits to town, and you must transport these people. I know, Sir, that some women would not allow their breadfruits to come on one sort of vehicle while they are on another, no matter what you say. They are going to say that if their breadfruits are coming to town, they must go with them. A breadfruit will roll and you never know, when it starts to roll, where it will stop. More than one breadfruit will roll out of a tray or basket, and if a breadfruit begins to roll at the top of Horse Hill and the person is coming to town, if you get the right incline it would roll to Belleplaine; so there is no point in asking people to travel unless you give them the necessary protection.

Mr. Speaker, the buses that we have now are designed for European countries; they were not built for the tropics, and unfortunately in the tropics we have not evolved our own designs to suit ourselves and have to copy what the people from outside have; but you can very well see that the Leyland or Mercedes Benz bus with the windows at the sides were meant for cold countries so that you could be kept warm, because in cold countries they only have at the most nine or ten weeks of a summer like this. You can very well see that during the other 40 or 42 weeks they can live on a bus like that and be very comfortable. We have to be very practical in the Twentieth Century. These buses are for European communities because in Europe nobody travels with a tray of breadfruits. When people travel with goods in any of these countries, they go by a different sort of vehicle.

3.05 p.m.

These are passenger vehicles, and the most that you carry in them is your own luggage; but, as I have said on a former occasion, you can look through the back of a bus which is travelling to the country and see all the breadfruit and banana trays and in the far distance in front something peeping out like a woman's face. I say that it is God's mercy that we do not have any more serious accidents here. Unfortunately for Barbados we wait until there is a disaster before we act on certain things which we know should be done. You will remember on one occasion that there was a bridge in St. James which used to cause people to lean on a side when they were driving around it, and on one occasion, people sitting on a lorry were driven around it. The next thing which we heard was that thirty of them were killed by the lorry after it toppled over the bridge into the gully below and then the authorities decided to do something about that bridge. But then, plenty of people were dead already. You acted after the people met their death through it. The Hon. Minister must see that the roads are suitable enough and wide enough for these vehicles. I do not know what is Government's policy in so far as the widening of the roads of Barbados is concerned. However, if you go in for this type of transport, you must go in for wider roads. It is suicidal to have these roads with this type of traffic on them. It is not unusual to see an accident between two vehicles, and the two drivers get out of their vehicles, fold their hands and wait until a policeman comes and in so doing create a traffic block. That is the sort of mentality you get here and with these buses on the streets they will add to the problem. I am glad to learn that the number of accidents

here this year is lower than it was last year, but what I have just referred to is one of the dangers in our system of transport.

I feel that if the Transport Board can induce its servants to pursue a proper approach to work and also train them along such lines, it would be a good thing. I am satisfied in my mind that the task of making transport in Barbados worthy of being a public service lies with the Government. I would like to say that there is no excuse in this place of not having a public transport service because everything converges into one city. We are not like London and the Americas where there are many branches of the service outside of the main cities. There is no branch of the service here in Christ Church, in St. Peter, in St. Joseph or in St. Andrew. The whole network of the bus service of this island is a service from the outer parts into Bridgetown; therefore, in normal circumstances it would be the job of one large company. I am no expert on these matters, but I hope some day the Trade Union Act would be so changed that the Trade Union would be able to take over a bus service like this, pay the bus drivers and conductors as good or better than they are paid now and make it a profitable service. We would have no shareholders to draw dividends; the public would be the shareholders.

I say this: if the Government fails in this public enterprise, the Government is failing the community in a very important aspect of the philosophy which the Government holds, because this Government is professedly a Socialist Government. It is true that I do not take them very seriously; the tenets of socialism are not practised by the Government because they seem to be afraid of their own professions and manifestations. This Government is too afraid of Socialism at the very first time it has a golden opportunity of taking over the transport service of this colony. Transport is one of the things in which any Government can safely say that this should be a public service. Even the diehard Conservatives in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America who do not profess to be Socialists run the transport service. The Minister of Labour is recruiting workers to work in a nationalised service run by the Conservative Government 5,000 miles away from this colony; yet in this country in which you are running a service of a similar nature, the Government is making it appear to all and sundry that it is incapable of running a service such as this. Your own workers coming from a Government which is Socialist are finding employment in a country under a Conservative Government which is running the transport service which was taken over by that Government from a Socialist Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that the Labour Party in 1945 had the greatest battle in their taking over public transport, and you will note that the one thing which the Conservative Government which is now in power has not done is to denationalise public transport; therefore, it is a sad reflection for me, a Socialist, to find that a Government of my profession cannot show to the world not only that we can run a Government and run a service like transport, but that we can do it and do it better than anything done before. But what has happened? We get bold criticisms that the Government is doing it worse than what the private people did with it before.

What is serious about that is that it is going to stultify the chances of men and women in a small community like this who are willing to branch out to remove some of the economic problems in this island. This is going to be a stumbling block because people are going to say that the people with a Conservative outlook, the people who ran this island for over 300 years, were more outstanding in what they were doing than what the Socialists are doing now. It is going to be a stumbling block to other things which the Government should take over. This Government has to be lukewarm now about taking over Light and Power, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know to your own shame and embarrassment that just as the statement has been made about 'over our dead bodies bus fares would be increased', a similar statement was made at that time that within six months we would be taking over the Electric Company.

The chances now of taking over the Electric Company after this upset of the running of transport are very remote. They are as remote as the first satellite which was sent up by the Russians. Those are the sort of analyses which must be made in a given situation such as this and I take this opportunity to let the Government see that you must have a right-about-turn about these things.

3.15 p.m.

If the Minister can see the wisdom in reconstructing every aspect of Communications that would lead to greater efficiency, it is his business to do so. I feel that the Minister's policy with regard to Communications should be linked with that which is in relation to transport. If the Minister can see that the whole network of buses should be under public ownership, he must make a careful analysis of that and let the public know. If there is going to be a merger between what is known as the Transport Board and what is known as the private concessionaires, we have to do that; it is for those reasons that I take the liberty of entering this debate, because those are the things which struck me very forcibly.

I am sorry that Your Honour has ruled that I cannot speak on the question of Housing because my strictures would be very heavy on the Minister in relation to Housing; but Your Honour has said that this motion is directed to a specific aspect of the Ministry of Communications and therefore I do not intend to go away from that.

My last point is in relation to the Airport. As to Seawell, the Minister will have to answer the questions raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on those points about transport. I do feel that a very serious thing which is now coming out in the open, is this question of the Minister's Statement *vis-a-vis* the travelling of the public out of Barbados and the type of communication which has been offered. As to the Hon. Minister's Statement in relation to the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Philip about people who were refused transportation, from what I have seen in the newspapers, I do not think that we can ignore the sort of replies which have been going on from one thing to the other. It would seem that in respect of the Minister's policy on Communications, he must have satisfied himself that the maximum transportation could be provided for Barbadians emigrating at maximum speed and at the lowest possible cost. The Minister's Statement, I take it, was made with all avenues investigated, and I hope the Minister will be quite prepared to back up his Statement in reply to the allegations made and now to the new statements made by the agent.

I am aware that in doing business some people will go to the length of saying or doing anything in order to get business. I realise that. Emigrants seem to be a very happy hunting ground on which, all over the world, people make money; they seem to be innocent dupes, but the implications was that some enterprising young people, not part and parcel of the hierarchy, the economic hierarchy of Barbados, were quite willing to embark on a field which was new. I would say *en passant* that I have my own experience in Barbados that anyone who is entering into the business circle finds it very difficult to pierce the economic Iron Curtain of the monopoly which exists here. It has no bounds of application; it must be like the place where you cannot enter if you do not come by the straight and narrow path, if you do not come *via* the road by which some people feel you should come. That is the proof that some businessmen, because they are out to make a profit, can be extremely unscrupulous and will do anything to get business; they will say anything to get business. Emigrants are innocent people looking for work and some are innocent dupes in this whole situation. The Minister's Statement, as an answer made on the floor of this House to the statement in the press, is something which should be properly ventilated by the Minister. It should not be just a matter of a Statement made by the Minister; there has been constituted what is an affront and it has been said by one of the agents that the Statement is a straightforward lie. It is one of those paradoxical statements; you do not associate lying with straightforwardness; it is just like telling somebody that he is a straightforward crook. That is the sort of paradox which you get, but that was the position.

Anyone who is prepared to make such a bold statement in print — to paraphrase that would be difficult, but in essence the statement was saying that the Minister was a straightforward liar; that what you are saying could not be true. We cannot ignore that, although we do not debate newspaper articles; we have heard what the Minister says so as to clarify the situation which exists in the minds of the public. To an emigrant, in the context of \$360, \$24 would seem simple; but to an emigrant, with no dollars, who is borrowing \$336, the other \$24 is a formidable amount. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you must have had the experience of people coming to you and asking you to sign documents for them, and sometimes you find yourself in the unfortunate position where you cannot mortgage what you do not have. If the amount of \$336 represents the total amount which the Government is willing to lend, it makes a lot of difference to the person who is going abroad, because it would relieve him of the indignity of having to ask people to lend him money. 3.25 p.m.

I think the Minister will have to make a clear, unequivocal and unambiguous reply in support of his Statement in view of what has taken place.

Finally, Sir, with respect to the allegations that have been made about people and how people are treated at Seawell, I would say that I do not know who happens to be on any particular list, but as I said earlier, I am not given to this sort of feeling about protocol treatment; but I feel that members of the Legislature — and this is not putting ourselves higher than the people have put us — should be given some different treatment. If I may put it this way, we happen to be in this Assembly as the first citizens of the community, because we happen to be the elected members of an elected Parliament, and any dignity that is to be given to the community is given through the representatives of the large majority of people. I do not look upon any privilege granted to members of the Assembly as something out of place, because you cannot give it to the community. If you are giving it to the representatives of the people, then I do not see anything wrong with that; but I would say that there has been a gradual diminution of the privilege and dignity of members of the House since the introduction of Ministerial Government and by people in large measures who have come into this Chamber *via* the route of the democratic processes.

To give an example to a lesser extent of what I mean, Mr. Speaker. Unless a policeman knows you — and I am very co-operative with the policemen — you will find great difficulty in coming into the precincts of this Assembly yard — which in my view should always be the unfettered right of hon. members — and parking without any difficulty. It may not be the fault of the Minister of Communications. Coming to the Assembly to meetings or even on State occasions, I am sure that some members have found great difficulty to enter the Chamber, although they are elected, as if they were intruders. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if you were not sheltered in some instances, you too would find difficulty in coming to the Chamber to which you were elected, and it always seems strange to me that in big countries no member of Parliament finds any difficulty in getting into Westminster. The policemen usher him in with all the dignity one expects. I am of the view that if there is to be any indignity to members going to Seawell, I think the Minister should be able to make a statement as to what is Government's policy in the treatment of members of the House meeting friends or having the privilege of entering Seawell Airport which members of this Assembly should have.

Mr. Speaker, those are the sort of questions that I think the Minister should be prepared to answer, and I do hope he will take this opportunity of letting us know, because although strictures have been made on the Minister as has been done by the Hon. Mover, they are not personal strictures; they are strictures that one makes because we are interested in good government; and if this debate has done nothing more, it has drawn to the public's attention certain things that should be made clear. If the Minister is as public-spirited as he should be, then he should also

take this opportunity to remove any doubts, if there are any, and to remove some of the serious allegations which have been made, and I think that those things should be answered in the public's interest.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be lengthy on this matter for two reasons. Firstly, I cannot remember the number of occasions on which this matter has been discussed in this House, but I have spoken and given a background on numerous occasions as well as other hon. members. Secondly, I cannot agree with the motion as it is put forward. In my humble opinion, not disrespecting Your Honour in any way, this would have to be a motion against the Government and not against the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just at this stage say this? I suppose the hon. member is looking forward to a possible result or the possibility of some results. In that I am not interested. Any motion — or rather, as I said — almost every motion thinkable may emanate from a member of this House and be debated by this Chamber. As far as the correctness of verbiage is concerned with the idea of producing a possible result, I cannot be interested.

Mr. DOWDING: I thank Your Honour for clarifying the matter, but before I go on any further, I must know what results are going to be in that the implications are going to be (a) or (b). In other words, I want to make it quite clear that I cannot vote against the Minister, if I cast my vote. I am not going to put my vote to the motion because of the fact that I feel it should be a motion against the Government and not the Minister, and that is the main reason why I got to my feet to explain that I am not against the motion in its subject matter, but against the method of censure on the Minister alone. You cannot think little and be big, and if one goes back to the beginning of this, little thinking, which was purely a political necessity or thought to be a political necessity at the time was the main cause for taking over of the buses by the Government; but since then, Sir, it has shown in at least hundreds of thousands of dollars that this situation is not the little thing which a matter of votes can compensate the political Party which is in power at any time for. The 'dead body' has now become so dead, and we have been flogging it for so long, that it is only now a matter of time for the electorate to decide this situation for themselves. 3.35 p.m.

The start was a wrong one and, unfortunately, today in many parts of the world Governments do not realise that, after an election is over, they are there as a Government and are responsible for all concerned — the minority, the majority, A, B or C and everybody else that are under the Government. They play politics after an election is over and it is unfortunate, Sir, that throughout the world you get this tendency to the same sort of thing as occurred with the Transport Board.

What are the facts of the case? The facts of the case are that the then Prime Minister said that bus fares would not be raised over his dead body and in reality bus fares have been raised and he is still alive. You get two facts. The then Prime Minister is not dead and bus fares are raised; therefore, you can very well see what the statement amounted to. That is not a statement which should come from anyone who has strategy or tactics. The effect of that was to start this thing off, and after that to have a continuance of political favours by placing persons in jobs purely as a political expediency. That is happening every day and I hope that it will be brought to the full light of the people. That is one of the main reasons why the Transport Board is still the talk of the House of Assembly at every possible opportunity that arises. Therefore, Sir, I feel that it is really useless to continue to point out to the Government the shortcomings of the method, which is not a method at all, but a system which they have evolved, purely the result of no knowledge as to how to operate such a transport organisation. The fact that they have to go out of this island to bring people here to tell them how to run a bus from one point to another makes it obvious to me that they were incapable of taking over the job which they took over purely and simply for political expediency.

Sir, we in this island have mechanics quite capable of dealing with diesel motors, and people quite capable of finding out the distance from one point to another and working out the necessary computations to put it on a sound business footing; but the Government in the light of pure political expediency insisted (a) in taking over what they knew nothing about and (b) putting people who knew nothing about it in the business. As a matter of fact, if they themselves had come in for a vote of censure - that is to say, the members of the Board - I would only be too happy to speak in favour of this vote of censure because they are the ones who should be fired, and fired quickly. After all these years, those members of the Board cannot get this service in order and they still have to bring people from outside to tell them how to run it when they are good "Bajan" people here who are capable of running it. It only means that those people who are the overriding authority are themselves incapable and therefore, they must make it appear to the public that a scapegoat is between; and they import Managers and all that happens is that the Managers come and go, and that is because these members of the Board do not allow the Managers to manage the business as it should be managed. No politician has a right to interfere with a man after he has been put in charge of something. You tell the Head of the Department whom to hire and whom to fire, how many buses to run and what hours they should be run. That is not the duty of a politician and that is the reason for all this mix-up. It is because of the fact that you employ a man who does not know what he has to do, and again it is the fault of the employer because in the first case he should know what type of man he wants, what references he has, what his qualifications are, and then he should get the right man for the job; but if we continue as we are, these Managers will come and they will go because they can get no sense out of this chaotic 'dead body.' This chaotic situation is costing the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars and the time of hon. members of this House and probably hundreds of hours wasted. It is no wonder that this simple problem is now being talked of for six or seven days running that this House has met.

This is a problem which could be settled immediately if you were realistic to the facts and let the public know of the facts. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, decide whether you should nationalise the whole thing and say that the fare policy should be so-and-so. In this island you will never be able to have a whole lot of concessionaires who are working under their own conditions in relation to a Government-operated situation. That is an impossible mix-up and will always fail. You should either go out and tell the public that you are going to nationalise one hundred percent or hand it back to whosoever will take it. Do not jump to the conclusion that all who were in it would take it back. When you hand it back, hand it back to people who would be capable of stopping this large amount of the taxpayers' money from going through the gasoline tanks out into 'X' tanks or going through the wheels and tyres when the wheels and tyres are going back out through all the ways and means that are open to the situation right now. I do not like to speak these generalities without giving some facts. I remember on one occasion that a bus came from Harrison College with a full tank of gasoline, and when it got to Rickett Street the tank was empty. That, Sir, is a fact because the driver of the bus came to me and reported the matter. Therefore, you will see that there are people who would know how that tank got empty in that distance. It does not take an Englishman or a man from overseas to come here and tell us how gasoline gets out of tanks. It gets out two ways, either through the engine or through the backdoor. If these matters are not faced with reality and the Government take some decision on them, one way or the other, the taxpayers' money will continue to go out through the backdoor.

It is so simple to me that I fail to see why it cannot be done. (1) Nationalise the whole issue. If that is the way the Government feels, let the Government go ahead. Or, (2) now that they are in it and they have a downfall, lift up the trap, get out and pass it back to people who are more than capable of running buses even in competition with the Government and giving proper services and who are not spending these hundreds and thousands of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied in the manner of the Transport Board's operation whatsoever. I cannot absolve the Minister of Communications one hundred percent from blame but I cannot support this Resolution of "no confidence" as an issue for naming him and him alone, because it started a long time ago when another Government was in power and continued with the Government in power now. It has been one fiasco from the beginning with a chaotic Board on it and it will always continue in that condition until a definite situation is arrived at and the Government is willing, one way or another, either to live to its issue to nationalise or hand it back to those willing to take it back.

On the matter of the Airport, I would like to say that I saw a statement in the newspaper of a straightforward lie attached to the Statement made by the Hon. Minister of Communications of this House. I felt, Sir, that it was a matter which should have been the first issue dealt with here today. I was a bit late but I do not think that any issue was made out of it; but it also strikes me as a case where the Hon. Minister will have to make a very clear and distinct statement to hon. members of this House on it. (A VOICE: To the Judge.)

3.45 p.m.

I do not agree that it should be made to the Judge at all; I feel that it is a matter of attacking the privileges of this House for such a thing to be published in a newspaper concerning a member of the House. I thought that the matter would have been an issue here today. I think that this House, when it comes to an attack upon any of its members, regardless of his political affiliation or otherwise, should maintain its dignity; unless the dignity of this House is maintained one hundred percent, and hon. members join together unanimously in the case of what I feel is a privilege of this House, then we are heading for letting down the people of this island to a point where there would be a complete and an utter lack of confidence in this House.

I am surprised that this matter has not been taken up as a matter of privilege. I want it to be quite clearly understood - in fact, at this juncture I would ask Your Honour's opinion on this matter as a matter of privilege. For a member of this House to be classified as a straightforward liar in a newspaper heading, is, in my opinion, a matter for you.

MR. SPEAKER: I think hon. members ought to know by now, and indeed the whole public of Barbados should know, my attitude towards the Press of Barbados. I have not yet done the Press the honour of reading the article. If hon. members think that a point of privilege is involved, those who have read this article are in duty bound to bring it to the attention of the Committee of Privileges of this House. Such a Committee has now been established and it may function at any time. I repeat: I have not yet read the article.

MR. DOWDING: I thank Your Honour for those words and I hope that those who are directly concerned have listened quite carefully indeed to Your Honour's words. I do feel that the Minister would have to give this Honourable House a clear indication of his refutation of the statement made or frankly the public should in future look upon this House not as an honourable, but a dishonourable House. If we are going to get here and make straightforward lies, then we are dishonourable; and if a newspaper is allowed to classify a Statement as a straightforward lie, I feel that this is one of the most important factors of privilege and it should be gone into most carefully. On the actual issue which is before us, I do feel from what I have observed in the newspapers, that there has been a type of war between certain factions over the affairs of the people who are leaving the island. That does not, in any way, stop the competition and quite rightly so; anyone who can provide a cheaper and a reasonably good and safe transportation at a cheaper price than that offered by others, should be taken into consideration. I myself have no particular interest personally in this matter, but I think it is time that a little more competition was given

to B.O.A.C. and B.W.J.A. I have seen with my own eyes and I have found out that for forty-two passengers to get their luggage off a plane it took thirty-two minutes. A lot of people blame the Customs, but they do not know that the fault lies with the people who are responsible for getting luggage off the plane. When I saw an article about people being held up at the Customs I said: "Let us find out who is responsible for holding up the situation." I myself have gone to the office of B.W.J.A. in order to report this matter. There was one single person attending at the counter with seven people there and another one was sitting down behind the counter behind a closed door reading a newspaper. I am not in favour of that organisation; if they have the monopoly, they must get the emigrants from here and I say: let us investigate and get the facts from the Minister. I agree that there are certain International regulations which will have to be adhered to. 3.55 p.m.

If it is a fact that another Airline can offer our people as good transportation at \$336 instead of \$360 – and it was more before; but we have seen it drop from \$400 to \$360 and now down to \$336 – it is our job to ascertain that those concerned get the best at the cheapest possible price. So, Sir, I would like to hear from the Minister what is his final answer. I understood sotto voce that it would be a matter for the Court, and although the Court is extremely important, this, Sir, is the highest body in the land if we ourselves maintain it as such; but if we allow the dignity to fall, well then, we, Sir, are to blame.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I could not be more forcible on this motion as it stands because I am not in favour of the method of censuring the Minister; I am in favour of censuring the Government as a whole for this debacle of transport. The other things are only minor issues which have come in and I am very glad that we are not discussing Housing. Those are really not the facts we are after, but I cannot support the motion for censure from that point of view only. I agree wholeheartedly that the whole transportation situation has been chaotic and remains chaotic up to now from the time Government took it over.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I heard one or two hon. members saying that we should nationalise the bus service as a whole, but I would not like to see that because if they only took a few and they cost this country so much, what do you think would happen if they took all?

Now, Sir, with regard to the Transport system of this country, I would not say that the particular Minister in charge now is altogether responsible for the chaotic condition there. When we took over these buses, we started wrong; the shoe was on the wrong foot, and it seems to me that at this rate it will always remain on that foot. You will remember, Sir, when we were passing the Transport Bill that I said that one member from this House and one from the Other Place should be on the Board. I had a reason for saying so because I felt that the member from this House would be responsible to this House for the good running of that Board and transport on the whole, and I said that that particular member would become as a watchdog. I was told that we were to keep politicians off that Board. The politician was kept off, but still politicians remain. *(Cheers from the Opposition.)*

I did not know at the time when we were taking over transport whether the Director of Highways and Transport was questioned, asked or knew about transport, but he was supposed to be the king-pin of the Board, and as far as I could see, that gentleman knew nothing at all about bus transport. He might have been a very good engineer and knew about roads, building bridges and things of that sort, but he knew nothing about the actual running of a Transport Board. That, I felt, was the first mistake we made by putting it into the hands of that particular gentleman to be the big boss. Well, they appointed a Board and the personnel of the Board at that time, in my opinion, knew nothing at all of transport either. We have to be very careful of whom we appoint to Boards, because we should make sure that the member or members whom we are appointing know something of the duties they are going to take upon themselves. The first set of personnel knew nothing about it. It may have been, in my opinion, the desire of the person responsi-

ble for the appointments to bury the Transport Board early, because the first thing that was done was to appoint an undertaker as one of the members, and he was one who knew nothing about transport. I do not care whom you appointed so long as they knew something about transportation.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, one of the members dressed in an old short pants and went knocking about the place at night trying to see if a bus was pulling out full. That was not that particular gentleman's duty, because if he knew his duty he would not have to do that. If he knew that things were going so bad that he would have to go about at night to peep and dodge, he had the thing in his hands because he was a member of that Board. He had to break up his night's rest to do a thing of that nature which nobody would expect him to do; the thing was going bad and he did not know what to do to remedy it; so he started wrong.

I know of another gentleman who got into his motor-car and made a long journey down to St. Lucy and up to St. Particks. All that used to be done, but that was not really running the Board or administering transport. So the Hon. Minister for whom the junior member for St. Lucy is singing the song that "he will have to go" is not the one who must go. Rather, I will have to sing the song "he has to stay", because he took up transport in the condition in which it is now, because I have not seen any improvement from the time we started. 4.05 p.m.

We were told that it would be a question of the old buses being removed and a fleet of young ones coming up. There would be as many young ones as would offset the expenditure for buses on the old ones, but I am still waiting to see that Resolution when it is ready because I still expect that one will be brought down to help pull the Transport out of the mire.

We imported a man down here and I thought by importing this man everything would be going well by now but instead of everything going well, he has gone well. I do not know the reason for that. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the particular gentleman did not want to take orders from a politician. I do not know if that is true. However, that does not look good either.

I am going to blame the Board for all of this Transport business because, as I have said, I do not think that the Board is really giving the Minister in charge a true position of this thing. I believe that the Board is just like a man who is doing business which every day is sinking money and he still expects by borrowing some money from a friend that the business will rise. The next week he will have to borrow again; yet he still has hope that he will get it again on its feet. I feel that is what is happening up Roebuck Street. Those people should tell the Minister the truth. They should say that they have done their best and when you have done your best you can do no more.

You state that you have new buses. In some quarters, it is felt that the conductors are touching up the bag. I do not think so because if the conductors were touching up the bag, things would not be so far gone and they would be millionaires by now. You cannot focus your eyes on the conductor alone when there are other avenues for the money to pass through. The hon. senior member for St. George said that the gasoline was going through the back door. I did not know that a gasoline tank had a back door but I read in the newspaper recently where a policeman has been charged before a Police Magistrate for going through a door and taking gasoline out of a bus. Surely you would not think that a policeman would have done such a thing.

Now, this bus question is a serious matter and I do not feel that it would be fair to call on me who has to contribute to the upkeep of my motor car to contribute to the upkeep of the buses too. I know that these buses can run at a profit; but if you put people who do not know how to administer on the Board and you put them there only because they may be friends of yours, you will never get this business administered profitably. I can well remember about

two or three years ago that the Board wanted a member and a particular member of the Board called on me and said to me: "Smithy, we want a member on that Board, can you suggest someone to me?" Every name that I called to him he rejected. Every one whom I knew would be of help to the Board was rejected by that chap; and when he did make the appointment, or whoever else it was who made the appointment, a Mr. Ramsay was appointed. I would say that Mr. Ramsay was a good gentleman but not for the Transport. (*Laughter*)

4.15 p.m.

You cannot be looking for Reverends to do a real rough and tumble job; one has even to curse sometimes when cursing may cause the job to get along. How on earth can you be doing these things? Members of the Transport Board should comprise of one Auditor or Accountant, a good first-class mechanic who knows when a bus is repaired from when it is half done, and another one who knows about the running of the buses, even if you have to look for one of the present concessionaires. I would put one there so as to get his experience, because this is a matter which you are going into and you want help with it. This is a big problem; you want a man who would be in a position to tell you that Route 1 is paying and Route 2 is not paying. You would only have to put the conductor of Route 2 on Route 1 and you will be able to find out where your fault lies. You would have to do that and every day of the week you will have to put conductors and drivers in various places and keep a strict account and you will find out what is happening on the routes.

Then you will have to find out things in the workshop; there are many avenues whence this money can be taken out. If you take a good part out of a machine and put in a new part, when the part which you have taken out could work for a length of time, that is money which is thrown away; therefore, you can lose quite a lot of your money in the workshop. It is not only the conductors who are making a little pick; the conductors employed by the private concessionaires are touching off some of the money too; but they cannot give it a blow. (*Laughter*) Again you may have a top-heavy office; you may have six people doing a job which two people could do. I am throwing out the suggestion to the Minister who may not be thinking along these lines, and he may be able to ask questions. You may have people butting their heads against each other.

The private concessionaires have to do their checking; a person who is working with the Transport Board will leave off after a certain time, but not so in the case of the private concessionaires. I have heard that a private concessionaire bought one of the old buses; I am not sure about this because I did not have the chance of checking; I did not know I would have been speaking in this debate today, but that bus is going like oil. When the bus was to be turned over to the Federal Bus Company, everything was taken out and with all that was done, the Federal man still made a good job of it and he is still making a good job of it. The Federal man tells me that at night he goes out with this flit gun and flits the seats of the buses so as to make sure that anything does not bite a passenger. He is doing all of that so as to make a success of it. (Mr. BARROW: Who is the Federal man?) I cannot remember his name but the buses are marked "Federal". (*Laughter*)

People say that women cannot do any business, but we have a woman in St. Andrew and another one in Collymore Rock making a success of their buses; they are getting down some of the same buses which are keeping a lot of noise — just like the Government's buses — but they are running. Some members are still telling this Government that they should nationalise everything. The hon. senior member for St. Peter says that the Government gave their supporters buses and that they have given to Mr. Coward this and that. I did not say anything at the moment but when the bus route was given out, Mr. Coward was nowhere near the Barbados Labour Party. The buses were given back to Mr. Birch too, and if it were not for the fact that other people were too much ashamed to do as Mr. Birch did, they would have got their buses back too. (Mr. BARROW: What did Mr. Birch do?) I do not know, but I know that he has got the buses up there and they are working like oil. (*Laughter*)

The Government imported an Englishman and he failed; he had to save himself. Another one has come out, but what will he do? He will try his best too, but unless he sits down and thinks for himself and instructs the Board what to do, and if the Board does not do what he says, he will have to leave too. No ordinary manager is going to succeed up there; any intelligent person can see where the trouble lies. The time has passed for people to be making sport when it is time to be doing business. This particular Transport Board was formed in spite and sport, not in business because if it were going along as a business should go along, we would not be so far out to sea. But advice was needed; when the Transport Board was situated at Fairchild Street, I was told that one of the men who had the say applied for the job as manager. He was an employee of the Department of Highways and Transport already and he helped to do things. He applied for the job as manager, as I say, and he was told by the Director at the time "No". The Director refused to give him the job but still the Director left him at the helm. What could you expect of the gentleman? I know what I would do. (*Laughter*). You tell me that I am not good enough for a job, you do not give it to me, but I still have to be at the wheel. I know that a member of the Board applied for the job; he did not get it nor did he have any more advice to give. (*Laughter*). But I doubt if he could give any advice. All of these things are responsible for the chaotic condition of the Transport Board today. There are some hon. members who are saying that we should nationalise all the buses; I say "No". We will have to get around this matter. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy says that the Minister must go; I am saying that he has to stay because I do not think I could prove him responsible for anything; as far as this bus business is concerned, I cannot say that the Minister is responsible for the chaotic conditions up there. I believe things must have got a little better since the Minister was in harness. I am not a member of the Board; the Board must not have a politician, but it must have politicians. (*Laughter*) I would not feel happy for the Minister to go. I would like to see people get their transport service as cheaply as possible and, until the Minister is quite satisfied that all is well with these buses which he now has, he cannot take over all of them. I do not think it is possible to see any profit; you will not see the profit derived from these buses as if it were a private concern. But I would like to see the Transport Service pay its way and the buses run themselves.

4.25 p.m.

I would like to see the Transport Board pay its way, and until the Minister can satisfy me that the buses are running themselves, that is the only way that I could encourage him in any way to take the remainder; but if it is not paying its way, do not attempt it.

Now I feel that the Transport system of this country is running for the benefit of the public. If the Government wants to get away from some of the administrative responsibility in which they find themselves, they should make it into a Company, let all the people who use it, those who drive the buses and others buy shares in the Company, and all the Government would have to do is to see that at least one-third of the members of the Board are appointed by the Government. In that case every person driving in the buses could become a shareholder and everybody who uses them, those who sell gasoline and oil would also become shareholders, and you should then put people on the Board who know about running a business and get away from some of the responsibility of the administration. I am sure that it would run properly and you would be surprised to know how many even of the other concessionaires may buy shares in it; they might want to buy all and run them at the convenience of the public and it would not cost this Government one cent more. We have got to think of some way to get out of it, because merely talking is not sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those persons who were highly in favour of taking over the buses, but I thought that by taking them over we might have got the material we wanted to run them; but that was not so, and I maintain that that is responsible for the chaotic conditions of the Board today. We started off wrong, all in a hurry, and all the fellows at the top were the wrong type and knew nothing about trans-

port. They tried their best and the others underneath tried their best too. Everybody tried his best, but the worst turned out.

Now we come to the pickups. The pickups, Sir, are doing a good job. I can speak for the whole island, but I am speaking now for the parish which I have the honour to represent.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, the House will now revert to Government Business.

STATEMENT MADE IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY BY THE MINISTER OF TRADE, INDUSTRY AND LABOUR

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before we revert to Government Business, I wish to make a Statement today on the subject of the granting of loans to persons in the United Kingdom to assist in the purchase of houses for the accommodation of Barbadian workers who have emigrated to that country.

"At the meeting of the Honourable House on the 2nd August when the supplementary resolution for \$1,150 to augment Head 31 Item 26 - Barbadian Immigrants Liaison Service - was being debated, certain Honourable Members made statements to the effect that there was no legislative authority for the granting of such loans."

Indeed, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter said and I quote:

"I am going to explode now. You said that you made loans to landlords and you named some person. Why has not this Legislature heard about it? Who is Mr. Eytley? Who is Mr. Leslie? How have they come to have loans from the Barbados Government, and this Legislature for the first time today is hearing about it? Look at this hocus-pocus which they are playing with the people's money! That is why I hope to see that somebody go to jail for this sort of thing. If these lawyers about here were to get down to their business, they would see that somebody goes to jail. Has this money come from us? Who is Mr. Eytley? How comes it that Mr. Leslie is entitled to a loan? Why is it that Mr. Leslie can get a loan and people in Barbados cannot get a loan? Why is it that money is loaned in Great Britain? Why is it that we are knowing about this for the first time today?"

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy said that he was surprised to learn that loans were being made and though he wanted information he was a bit mild in his criticism, if I can call it a criticism. The hon. senior member for St. Philip referred to what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said as

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I thought I would allow the hon. member to finish his Statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have not finished.

Mr. WALCOTT: I realised he was not finished and that is why I rose on a point of order, because if the Minister is alleging to make a Statement, he did not have to pause in parenthesis to say what the Statement is. We cannot debate anything in the Statement and that is why I rose to know if what the hon. member is saying is part of the Statement, and whether Your Honour is acquainted with the fact that the Statement made by the Hon. Minister is supposed to be a speech made in a current debate which has not yet been published.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling will be given when he is finished.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is exactly what is embodied in the Statement, Sir:

"This is not correct. I will draw to the attention of hon. members Message No. 2 of 1956 from the then Governor, Sir Robert Arundell, laid in this House on 7th February, 1956, and in the Other Place on the same date.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Why is he rising on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have to hear.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Statement we expected to hear on an occasion like this is not the sort of Statement being made by him today. All the Minister is doing

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I must object to the nastiness which can only emanate from a corrupt, nasty mind like his.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must warn the hon. Minister that the hon. senior member for St. Philip rose on a point of order which I am in duty bound to hear, whether or not it is a point of order. I have to make myself sure that it is one, but only after having heard it. No hon. member in the world can judge a point of order until he hears it, no matter how much genius he thinks he is. The Hon. Minister rose in a burst of expression and certainly lost control of himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: Indeed, I didn't.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is just a matter of opinion, but it is my considered opinion that the Minister rose in a burst of expression and lost control of himself. Again I am going to listen to what the hon. senior member for St. Philip purports to be a point of order. If it is not a point of order, I will tell the hon. member that it is not a point of order. Let me hear the hon. member through.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to have somebody nurtured in a cesspit ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member will take his seat. I am going to address the House again. Let me warn hon. members who are engaged in these so-called point of orders that they are not going to get around them with me by just firing after each other and thinking that they are making points of order. I will just use the authority which this House has given me to deal with all such hon. members. It is hon. members who are getting out of hand who have given me this authority. I have not given myself the authority; the House has conferred it on me. It is just an accident that it happens to be me. If it is not I, it must be somebody else. The hon. senior member for St. Philip does not hope to retaliate with any outbursts of anger and expect to be heard on a point of order; but he will be heard if it is a genuine point of order, but just a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have two points of order to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will make one at a time and you must take your seat after the first.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The first point of order is this. The Hon. Minister rose just now and said something about a nasty mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have also told the Minister what I think about that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point is this. I do not know what he said that in reference to at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member just make his point of order and leave that out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Nobody knows exactly why he said those scandalous, libellous remarks. I heard him use the word "filth".

Mr. SPEAKER: But that is not a point of order now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The other point of order is this. What we expect from Ministers on the floor of the House are not Statements like that which the Hon. Minister is making today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member allow the Hon. Minister to get to the end of that Statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point of order is that when he is finished, we cannot debate it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member get to point number three, if he has another to make?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Was Your Honour shown this proposed Statement beforehand?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, before it was read, but not the content.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, can I continue? I repeat.

"I draw to the attention of Honourable members Message No. 2 of 1956 from the then Governor, Sir Robert Arundell, laid in this House on 7th February, 1956, and in the Other Place on the same date. I shall now read the Message:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that plans exist for the recruitment of Barbadians on a considerable scale by road and rail transport undertakings in the United Kingdom. In some cases, however, the employing undertaking is unwilling to proceed with recruitment unless satisfactory arrangements are made for the accommodation of the workers.

2. There are individuals in the United Kingdom who would be able and willing to make accommodation available for Barbadian workers, provided that they receive certain assistance from this Government.

3. In view of the potential importance of this recruitment, the Liaison Officer, Barbadian Immigrants' Welfare and Liaison Service, has been authorised to enter into agreements with such persons, on the basis either of loans by this Government to be utilised for the provision and equipment of accommodation, or of guarantees by this Government of a certain minimum gross income from charges for board and lodging. In every case the interests of Barbadian emigrants and of this Government will be fully safeguarded by provisions in the agreements relating to such matters as the availability, standard and cost of the accommodation, the repayment of any security for loans and so on. The cost will be charged to Head XXXI, Labour Department, Item 18, Emigration."

This shows, without any doubt whatever, that the Government has acted in this matter with the full knowledge and concurrence of the Legislature.

I shall read for the benefit of the House, the stipulations laid down in so far as Government is concerned in connection with those loans, and as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy asked, a statement showing the amount, figures and so on.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is taking advantage of a situation that does not exist. A Statement to be made in this House should not be a Statement dealing with a debate in which the Hon.

Minister had the opportunity of replying. The Hon. Minister had the opportunity to reply to hon. members when we were in Committee of Supply, and if he failed to reply then, he is now using this House as a means when that debate has ended. He is now bringing in a Statement on something which has taken place and which is finished already. Since the hon. member had the opportunity to reply, he is only now using the House as a means. What he is reading now cannot be any Statement. That is the point of order which I rose to point out.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just tell the hon. member that I have to make a ruling at the end of the Statement. You anticipate too much and that is why hon. members get themselves into difficulty.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Apart from Your Honour's ruling which we are not anticipating, we are rather apprehensive about this endeavour on the part of the Ministers to utilise this way to reply to debates when they should give the information during the debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, for the information of Hon. members, I am continuing to read the Statement -

"For the information of honourable members, I should like to state the conditions which are attached to the granting of the loans:-

"The credit standing of the borrower must be fully investigated.

2. The accommodation and board to be provided must be of a satisfactory standard.

3. A reasonable proportion of the accommodation must be available for Barbadian workers, regard being had to the terms of the agreement and in particular to the amount lent in relation to the value of the property.

4. Reasonable safeguards to be included against summary ejection of workers.

5. Charges for board and/or lodging to be subject to the approval of the Liaison Officer.

6. Loans to be used solely for the provision and equipment of accommodation, and wherever possible to be issued by payment of bills etc., and not in cash.

7. The borrower to put up at least 25% of the capital outlay, unless this condition is waived by the Minister.

8. The security taken must be fully adequate to protect the Government. In the case of a loan exceeding £1,000 for the purchase of a freehold property, the security should invariably take the form of a mortgage, unless the Minister directs otherwise.

9. Interest to be charged at a reasonable rate, regard being had to prevailing conditions.
4.45 p.m.

"10. Repayment to be at reasonable rate. The maximum period for the repayment of a loan not exceeding £1,000 should normally not be more than three years. The maximum period or repayment is not to exceed 10 years in any case. The rate of repayment may, subject to the above maxima, be related to the extent to which accommodation is occupied."

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is contrary to "May's" Parliamentary practice.

Hon. M. E. COX: On the last occasion when this question was being debated, the hon. senior member for St.

Lucy said he wanted particulars about these loans and I promised this House then that I would bring in the particulars.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is in order to do that.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Statement continues:-

"11. Loans should be restricted to the minimum amount necessary to achieve the particular object in view. In any event no loan is to exceed £4,500, and the aggregate amount lent from the inception of the scheme up to 31st March, 1959, is not to exceed £20,000 without the permission of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

12. A guarantee of minimum gross income from board and/or lodging charges, or of minimum percentage occupancy by Barbadian workers may be given only in conjunction with a loan not exceeding £1,000. Such guarantee should be based on a reasonable percentage occupancy of the premises, not normally exceeding 90%. The period of such guarantees should not normally exceed one year with suitable provision for renewal. Where a percentage occupancy is guaranteed, or a minimum gross income based thereon, the proportion of the accommodation to be reserved for Barbadian workers (paragraph 3 above) should not be less than that percentage. The use of guarantee arrangements should be restricted to the minimum.

13. Agreements on the above lines are to be drawn up by reputable solicitors, the legal costs being payable by the borrower.

14. The order of desirability of possible arrangements is -

- (a) larger loan (i.e. exceeding £1,000, with mortgage);
- (b) smaller loan;
- (c) smaller loan, with guarantee.

15. A return of loans made, with amounts lent, amounts repaid, and amounts (if any) overdue, is to be made to this Government quarterly."

4. Details of the loans so far made are as follows:

Name of Loanee	Amount of Loan	Date of Loan	Date Repayable
R. F. Hyman	\$960 £200	5th August 1956	Loan repaid
E. Eytle	\$7,920 £(1,650) at 5%	7th October 1958	7th October, 1968 no part of principal repaid. Interest paid to date

This shows that without any doubt whatever that the Government has acted in this matter with the full knowledge and concurrence of the Legislature. I should also like to state that when this Message was laid on the Table of the House the hon. senior member for St. Peter and all the other hon. members with the exception of the hon. junior member for St. John were present in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister purported to quote from the debate which took place in this Chamber last Tuesday, or rather Tuesday, 2nd August, but I do not see in this Statement which he has handed to me the quotations from the speech of a member which he purported to quote.

Hon. M. E. COX: I shall pass that on to Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as the Hon. Minister has given information relative to the legislative sanction to the loans of which hon. members enquired on a former occasion, and recently, the Minister is quite in order. Hon. mem-

bers need not worry because they know that although they cannot debate the Statement, there is every opportunity given them by way of a subsequent Resolution to debate the subject matter of the Statement. As a matter of fact, at the last meeting of the House the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gave notice of a Resolution to debate - as a matter of fact earlier in the day of this day's sitting the hon. member gave notice of a Resolution to deal with a Statement which was made on the last occasion. Therefore, I do not see that hon. members should be worried at all.

As far as quoting what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, that will be struck out and it is absolutely out of order; it is against the Standing Regulations of the Debates Committee. The hon. member made use of this speech which was made on the last occasion and that speech has not yet been printed; so what the hon. member has quoted cannot be regarded by me as official and correct. This part will not appear in any way in connection with the Statement; it is a private matter which should not have been quoted at all. I subsequently received a report of the speech and it will not be dealt with in the Official Statement given by the Minister.

Hon. M. E. COX: With great respect, may I be told the rule from which Your Honour made your ruling.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: You cannot tell me what to say in here. As long as I say, with great respect.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Do I understand the hon. member to say that you cannot tell him what to say in here? All remarks are addressed to the Chair and I do not know if you do not intend to call the hon. member to order. And while I am on my feet, in view of the fact that the hon. member admitted that I was not present in the House when this procedure took place, and I regard that the Government cannot create a charge on the Treasury, I give notice of my intention to give notice - I have to put it in that way - to debate the Statement made by the Hon. Minister.
5.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking a question of me?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I was under the impression for a long time as a member of this House that a member was not allowed to read from the debates in the present Session. That is to say, Sir, as I understand it, if it were a printed copy of the debate which took place with that speech and I was reading from that debate, I would be out of order to read from that debate. With great respect to Your Honour, I was not reading from the debates of this House at all; I was reading from a note which I had in my file which was passed on to you, and that is not really the debates of this House. I have always understood that you could not read from the Official Debates of the House in the particular Session when that speech or the debate was made or occurred, but I repeat I was not reading from the debates of the House as such; but surely I think hon. members ought to be given an opportunity when statements are made against the Government to write down the statement and to refer to it.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member know that I am in charge of this House?

Mr. BARROW: I appreciate that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member really on a point of order?

Mr. BARROW: I understood that the Hon. Minister was asking Your Honour a question, but he appears to be asking a question and giving a ruling at the same time. I know he is reducing the House to a contemptuous state.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have much more patience than the honourable member.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that all along I understood that you could not quote from the Official Debate of a speech which was made in that Session. In other words, I could not quote from the debate of this House because the speech was made during this Session, but if the speech was made before this Session, then I could quote from the Official Debate. I repeat, however, that what I read was not from the Official documents of this House, and as I said, it is in a member's interest to write out what another member says in order to reply either in the House immediately or to come with a Statement refuting the charges made against the Government. No member can expect to lay charges against us which are unfounded and then

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish hon. members would really try to emulate me in patience.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Everybody cannot suffer fools gladly.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not hear that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said I wish hon. members would really try to emulate me in patience. The hon. member said that he is of the opinion that an hon. member may not quote from a speech made by another hon. member during the present Session. The hon. member is quite right, but what has he done? He has purported to tell this House that the hon. member said something and has had it written down here in direct English, not reported speech.

Now the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is the property of this House; it has not yet been printed. The Hon. Leader of the House says that he is reading from notes, and if the hon. member purports to come in here on a subsequent occasion and quote from what he describes as notes the direct and actual words which the member is supposed to have said, I will tell the hon. member here and now that I will not allow it. But what is worse, whose fabrication is it? This might be an entire fabrication as far as I am concerned if it is not an official debate; I care to call it a mere fabrication; so it is not worth anything; I cannot entertain it, I will not entertain it. The only thing I will entertain is when I see a Report of the hon. member's speech in the official Hansard of this House. This is nothing, not even notes, and I do not recognise notes in Parliament.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with dignity and great respect to this House, this is a reflection on the servants of the House as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to attempt to say that until I have investigated. I never rush to make those statements, and I cannot very well afford to do so. I cannot anticipate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if I may have your indulgence, the copies of the Rules are not printed yet, but sub-Clause 11 of Rule 26 states that no member is to allude to any debate of the same Session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by indulgence of the House, for personal explanation. I think Your Honour has the Rules, and I would like to say that what is unfortunate about this whole unhappy episode is that the hon. member purported not only to read what is alleged I did say, but purported to read it as part of the Statement which he was making to the House, and it is only at Your Honour's discovery that it was not a part of the Statement, that it was intended to be a malicious concoction by the Minister to have it included in the debates of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going too far. I think that covers the matter completely and entirely and we should now resume normal business.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, just to explain myself, I said it was a reflection on the servants of the House, but I did not mean that they have done wrong.

I am asking that Your Honour investigate the matter and let the House know the result of this, because dignity of this House will be undermined completely unless whoever is concerned is free from any reflection. I am not saying that the servants are wrong, but a reflection has been cast.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, the hon. member rose just now and referred to the Statement and said that it was a malicious concoction, and.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not seem to understand the English language quite clearly. (Hon. M. E. COX: Not as good as you.) You do not have to make an apology for that; it is not my fault. I rose on a point of order,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member gets quickly out of hand, but he should pay attention to the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I said, Mr. Speaker, was that the hon. member was reading the speech to be part of the subject matter of the Statement which he was supposed to be making.
5.05 p.m.

I did not lose my composure because Your Honour realised it would be out of order. It was on the instance of Your Honour reading the Statement that it was found out that part of what the Hon. Minister read was not part of the Statement; he read it in such a way as to make it appear that it was part of the Statement, when in truth and in fact it was part of a speech I made on a former occasion. We say that his putting it in a Statement which we cannot debate is entirely out of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position quite clear. I am sorry that the hon. member who sat down did not understand what the question is about. I said that in order to tell this House what happened in 1956 when the Hon. Minister of Communications was in charge of this portfolio, I would have to refer first to the statement in which the hon. member said that somebody should go to jail, and that this was something which this House had no knowledge of. I said now that I am going to show that the House had knowledge of it and I proceeded to show to the House that authority was given on the 2nd February, 1956, when the Hon. Minister of Communications was responsible for this portfolio and brought this statement before the House and made that statement and laid it on the Table of the House. I had to show that the Government was more or less slandered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a point of order?

Hon. M. E. COX: I had to make that statement in order to explain to this House what had transpired before the authority we said we had got, against what the hon. member said, that we had no authority and that we should go to jail. I wanted to explain the facts to the House. The hon. member is saying that I am trying to concoct something. That shows that he is hiding again.

THE POOL BETTING DUTY BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: At the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was addressing the House.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I had left off at the point which I was emphasising that however laudable this particular bit of legislation may be, yet there are certain circumstances surrounding it to which you should give great consideration and apart from which it cannot be truly judged. Everybody sympathises with the view that if money is going out of this colony - -

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

I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that everybody sympathises with the view that if there is an excessive drain of money from this island and when this outflow is not going into productive channels, we ought to be concerned about it, and if it appears to be excessive, to stop

it. The only difference is that if we have no information from the Hon. Premier as to the amounts which have gone out in pool investments over the last two years, we have no means to know if they are excessive or moderate and I am astonished to see that in introducing a Bill of this nature, the Hon. Premier did not avail himself or arm himself with that information. I am convinced that if he were able to give the House that information, the House would be able to judge and say whether this outflow was excessive or moderate and whether from what was accruing to the sum it would be wise to curtail it in any way or whether it would be wise to ignore it.

When we consider this question of pool betting in its broader aspect and address our minds to what should be done about it, I think that there are one or two things which need to be said. I, myself, am not a pool wagerer and therefore, anything I say in favour of it can be taken to be detached and dispassionate. What I feel about it is this; that all betting, that all gambling of any sort when it gets out of control is wrong because it encourages greed, and any attempt, for instance, to get more than what you have put down, to get something for nothing, is greed and is therefore wrong. But then there are degrees of greediness; and since we are all human and therefore are all prone to some sin or the other, I do not think it is much the best thing for a Legislature to concern itself in too censorious a sense on the matter. Unless I see figures, I must suspend judgment on whether this thing is excessive. We cannot say because 2,000 people spend twenty cents that the result is excessive. What would make it excessive would be if we had individual persons who are spending more and more each week - and that would have to be proved - or whether a substantial number of them were spending substantial sums. It is only on that basis that you will then begin to concern yourself about pool betting.

Another aspect of the matter is this. I think that there is a sort of creeping paralysis for what I call "thou shalt not" legislation growing in this colony. I notice within recent weeks that all that this Government is concerning itself with is dealing with legislation which is of a prohibitive nature. We are shackling the people with a spate of legislation of "Thou shalt not". They are dealing with all negative legislation and do not seem to tell the people what they can do. All that we are doing is preventing people from doing this and that.

I do not think it is the duty of any Government to be too frequent in bringing down legislation of this sort. A question of personal freedom is involved. I agree that no man should be allowed to spend his money in buying dangerous drugs or buying slaves; but a certain amount of freedom must be left for individuals to do what they wish to do with their own money, and you cannot say that a man, merely because he takes a chance and invests some small part of his weekly earnings in this way is doing something which is necessarily wrong. To me it is going a bit too far although I sympathise with you in your desire to prevent excessive amounts of money going out of the island.

The only convincing argument which they set up was the one with which we are all concerned - that is, the money going out of the country; but the other arguments for imposing these charges really do not satisfy us. They seem not to be cogent. Furthermore, in a week or two we shall have to deal with two other Bills which concern gambling as such. This does not, and that is why I think the strictures which were made and the censorious statements were completely irrelevant. The two Bills which follow this will give hon. members ample scope to bring out their dour attitude to condemn people for gambling if they have a mind to do so.

5.15 p.m.

I feel that the Government of Barbados has not provided enough opportunities for the people of Barbados to be fully and gainfully employed. The people are suffering; and since they do not want to steal, they quite properly, in my opinion, lay aside in every week or in every other week, a little of what they have and invest it. Big people can do all sorts of investing and they do not satisfy the requirements of the

law; but now the small man is investing and you are trying to prohibit him. I would like to know what are the amounts which you hope to get in from the 20% on the amount of the stake money paid in relation to pool betting. I notice also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a proposal, which is not a healthy one, in this sort of legislation for the authority to be given to the Postmaster General under the warrant from the Governor to open postal packets if he suspects that money is going out which has not been taxed. This is what the relevant section says; subsection (3) of Clause 6 states:-

"The Postmaster General may on a warrant in writing under the hand of the Governor open or cause to be opened any postal packet received for transmission by post to a destination outside the Island which he suspects to contain any money or valuable thing attempted to be sent out of the Island in contravention of this section and any such money or valuable thing found therein shall be forfeited to the Crown."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what other hon. members feel about this matter, but I feel that in this section alone you are committing an unwarrantable invasion on the liberty of the subject. Nowhere in the Queen's domain would you find this sort of power given, except in carefully defined and specified cases affecting the Crown. You do not want people to have any sort of contact with the Enemy and that is a case of the Emergency Powers; where are we going to draw the line? The Postmaster General is given power to open mail if he suspects that money is going out of the island; he is given power to open mail which he has no right to do, and you do not specify the terms and conditions under which he may do this. I am not in favour of this proposal and I am counselling my Party to fight this Section tooth and nail because it is contrary to the public interest that the Crown should have this power to open mail.

If you start here, you do not know where to draw the line. I doubt that in a Bill which is for the purpose of receiving some sort of revenue from pool betting you should inject a Section like this that you can open mail on suspicion that a person may be sending money out of the island. Mr. Deputy Speaker, just to show you how silly this whole Bill is in its conception, if I were a person who used to bet in pools and this Bill was passed, I would find a simple way of getting around it. You say that you should open my letters if I put money in them to go to Vernon's Pools; all I would do is to pass on my letters to the Purser of any boat in Carlisle Bay and see if you could stop me. I know that that has not yet occurred to the hon. member's mind, but the Crown Law Officer will tell him after we have mentioned it here. People will be justified in getting around the law as it stands because it would be oppressive and contrary to their liberties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make the position of the D.L.P. clear. We sympathise with the idea that money which goes out of the island, which is not going out for a productive purpose, should not go out. If that is the view of the Government, then the two parties stand on all fours. Where we part company is beyond that point. The points of divergence are these; we do not feel that you should advance nearer to a Police State by taking away people's liberties merely because you want to get a few cents from pool betting. Secondly, if the people are sending out more money that you feel they should send out, the fault is that of the Government because you do not open any new prospects before them. There is nothing to which to look forward and there is something worse than that; if people want to get money and they do not want to go to jail for it, the only way to get it is by trying the pools because they see no means of advancing under the present regime.

It would be very hard on people if the conditions created by the Government forced them to spend their money in pools and then the Government took up the matter in this way; we feel that there is no place in Barbados for authority to be given to a servant of the Crown to tamper with people's mails. There is a sort of binding contract between the people and the Crown that mails are inviolate except in times of war, grave national emergency or if a person

trafficking with the enemy is suspected. Apart from these circumstances, there may be cases where dangerous drugs may be suspected of being carried in mails and any Government should arm itself with power to protect the health of the community, if it finds that dangerous drugs are being smuggled in or out of the country in that way.
5.25 p.m.

Now when you except war, national emergency, treason and trafficking in dangerous drugs, all of which would be occasions for opening mail if they were suspected and separate them, there is no occasion for tampering with mail, and I think that it is this particular sub-section of this Bill which shows how wicked in concept this whole thing is and which should serve notice to the people that under the guise of wanting to stop them from investigating their money abroad, the Government is really plotting to take away their liberties.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there really is not much to answer. A few members started off their arguments based on high moral principle, but as you know, Sir, that is a thing that varies from person to person; sometimes it is elastic and sometimes chameleonlike, and just to show you what I mean, I think the argument - I am sorry he is not here - of the hon. senior member for St. George deserves special mention. By the way, Sir, I want to correct the impression that this Bill has anything at all to do with gambling. The hon. senior member for St. George was not opposed to the Bill in principle, but he started off by saying how poor people go and gamble out their money when they are paid on Saturdays and on Mondays have to come back to him and beg him to lend them money in order to feed their families; but at the same time he went on to say that he was somewhere in Europe and went indulging in gambling. He thought he was being robbed and he had to offer to fight in order to get back his money. That is the principle of gambling. When a person thinks he is losing unfairly, he wants to fight. That is my observation; so in that he does not differ from people whom he says he has to help, because as we all know there is a spirit innate in every human being to get something for nothing, and one of these ways I suppose is gambling or taking chances.

Another member referred to raffles and outright gambling, but they too also stem from the fact that somebody wants something more than what he is putting in. I would not waste any more time on that, but will answer one or two points made by members of the Opposition. I will take the last hon. member who spoke first. He resorted as you must have heard to specious arguments in most of what he said, and said that this Bill like most recent Bills which have been brought by Government says "thou shalt not do." This Bill does not say "thou shalt not do"; but what it says is that if you do, Government must share in it. If you in any way attempt pool betting, Government asks for a share. It does not tell you not to buy sweepstake tickets, but if you do buy sweepstake tickets, Government wants four cents of the money spent in that ticket.

Again the hon. member was very loud in asking if the Government can show how much money was sent out of the country. How will the Government know how much money is sent out of the country? Government is now trying to control it, and in a year's time you can ask that question; but as it stands now, Government has no control. We get all sorts of reports, but Government is not in a position to say whether five cents, \$5 or \$500 go out of the Island. I want to remind hon. members that Barbados is not the only colony in the West Indies today which is watching and taking legislative action in controlling this pool betting. British Guiana just a matter of weeks ago passed a Pool Betting Act; so an Act is now on their Statute Book. Trinidad in consultation with Barbados, British Guiana and, I think, with England too is getting advice on legislation controlling pool betting with the intention of very soon putting an Act of this nature on the Statute Book.

There is no way, Sir, of Government finding out how much money is going out of the Island now by way of pool

betting. When this Act is passed it will give us that much control and we will be in a position to tell anybody at any time how much money is being sent out of the Island by way of pool betting. That also answers the point made by the hon. senior member for the City. The hon. senior member for the City who is not here now did ask for information concerning revenue derived from the Turf Club tickets. I have figures here, Sir, with the revenue accruing to the Government from the sale of sweepstake tickets since 1941 in five year periods - 1941 to 1945, 1946 to 1950, 1951 to 1955 and 1956 onwards.

5.35 p.m.

These figures show that within the last five years there has been a considerable reduction in the revenue accruing to the Government from the sale of sweepstake tickets.

The hon. member also asked about the position as regards race tickets from other places coming into the colony and being sold here and asked if there is a law against it. Certainly not. There is no law against it. Your Honour will forgive me if I refer hon. members to the next Bill - A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Gaming Act of 1891 - and at Section 2 (b) of that Bill you will see that Government is now taking steps to control the sale of sweepstake tickets from other islands coming into Barbados for sale. Hon. members will see that that step is now taken by the Government. We are told that there is legislation in the other islands against the sale of sweepstake tickets from Barbados and other neighbouring islands and this Government likewise is taking opportunity now to control the sale of tickets from those colonies coming into Barbados.

Those are the main points to be answered with one point made by the last hon. member who sat down relative to the opening of persons' letters. That hon. member is not here now, but he knows as well as the world that very often Government has to take such a step as advised in this Bill so as to prevent revenue leaving the island illegally. When they have to investigate they have to do so via the mails. You have been to some places and you know that is so when they suspect certain defalcations that may be taking place via the Post Office. How would you detect this if some authority is not given by the Head of the Administration? It cannot be lightly done by anybody else. It is done by the Head of the Administration because he is in charge of the Civil Servants and he can require the Postmaster or the postal authorities in other places to take the necessary action along these lines. There is no further point of major importance for me to answer. I think I have covered all the points.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I just want to call attention to Section 3, sub-section (3), paragraph (b), which reads as follows:-

"Pool betting duty shall not be payable on -

(b) any sum paid in respect of the taking of a ticket or a chance in any lottery or other game, method or device instituted for a charitable object and for which a licence has been obtained in accordance with the provisions of section two of the Gambling Act, 1917; or,

(c) any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955, in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fares."

Does that mean, Mr. Chairman, that the Transport Board will be authorised to conduct a lottery?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order. I really did not hear what the hon. senior member for St. Philip said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I quoted paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (3) of Clause 3 which bears reference to the Transport Board, the implication being that the Transport Board will be in some way connected with a lottery arising out of the sale of tickets. The question I asked was whether or not the Transport Board has been authorised to conduct a lottery.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to deal with this matter subsequently. You are putting the cart before the horse. If you pass this Bill now, the passing of the other Bill is automatic. There is another Bill which is going to make it legal to run a lottery by the Transport Board; but since the Government proposes to proceed with this in this manner, we must, therefore, deal with this Section on that aspect and if hon. members do not agree with a lottery being run by the Transport Board, they can vote against this Section.

Why I am against it is this. How on earth can the Hon. Minister justify it? He says that he does not know what it is about betting. I do not think that is a wise thing for him to say because he is a member of the Government and he should know. If he does not know how much is going out of the island, why should we pass it? You must know; you must be able to say that the net result would bring you in such-and-such an amount because you may be putting up machinery which would not work. I agree that if other places have done it, you should fall in line. This is money which people are exporting; and if you are satisfied that pool betting is not the best thing to do, therefore, ban the pools and let all the money go to the local sweepstakes. If pool betting is obnoxious, say that it is and cut it out. I do not see how the Government is going to justify the running of a lottery by the Transport Board when you have other aspects of transport in Barbados.

5.45 p.m.

The transport service is a public service; what is the use of putting in a Bill that the Transport Board can give a man a ticket on which he can draw a prize? You cannot tell a private owner that he must give a prize, because that private owner would ask you: "What do you mean? A man is driving in a bus and I must give him a prize?" We are copying something out of the Conservative book; but if you want Barbadians to make loans towards the development of their country, it is a worthy cause. With \$5 in Government bonds at some time or another you can make an appeal and it does not matter if a man buys a ten thousand dollar share; it all depends on the amount of allotments you issue. I think it would be a better thing for Barbados to give a prize, not in the sense that you are gambling; do not tell me that you are legalising gambling. A man pays five cents to get into a bus and taking into consideration the type of administrative machinery which you have to set up, what will be the prize you will give? Is not this making a mockery of things? We want the Government to be a Government with initiative, not a Government with gambling. I do not know what is the evidence on the turnstiles. This Sub-clause (3) of Clause 3 reads as follows:-

"(3) Pool betting duty shall not be payable on -

- (a) any sum paid to the Barbados Turf Club in respect of the sale or issue of any ticket on which a duty is imposed under the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941; or
- (b) any sum paid in respect of the taking of a ticket or a chance in any lottery or other game, method or device instituted for a charitable object and for which a licence has been obtained in accordance with the provisions of section two of the Gambling Act, 1917; or

- (c) any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955 in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fares.

This Clause is complementary to the one with which you propose to deal, the amendment to the Gaming Act, 1891. There is no point in legalising a lottery of the Transport Board. I will go further and say this; you have had many headaches at the Transport Board and you are going to create another sort of headache by running a lottery. A lottery is a headache when things are going good; and when things are not going good, a lottery is a headache compounded. The reason why a man will take his ticket is because he expects to get a prize and you have to impose a lot of scrutiny if it is from the point of view of collecting fares.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member but he, like myself, is actually speculating on the intentions of the Government with respect to the Transport Board and any proposed lottery. So far as I have been able to understand....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should rise on a point of order so as to put something right. I think he will have the opportunity to speak again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All I am doing is eliciting information which we require by reminding the hon. member that the Government has, so far, made no pronouncement on this question of a lottery to be run by the Transport Board. Rather than speculating, we ask for precisely what are their views in this respect.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have no such information. Order No. 7 on the Order Paper is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917, and paragraph 2 of the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill states this:-

"Clause 4 of the Bill exempts from the operation of the Act bets made by way of pool betting, sweepstakes organised and controlled by the Barbados Turf Club or any overseas Turf Club and lotteries conducted by the Transport Board in connection with bus tickets issued by the Board. This last provision seeks to offer an incentive to the travelling public to call for their fare tickets and so indirectly to increase the receipts of the Board."

This last provision has nothing to do with this Bill, but these other Bills must be read in conjunction with this Bill which is before us now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To which Bill is the hon. member referring?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to Order No. 7 on the Order Paper which is a Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917. Order 5 deals with pool betting but the particular Clause makes reference to bets or lotteries run by the Transport Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would not like the hon. member to attempt to deal with Order No. 7; let the hon. member deal with the item with which we are now dealing. We have sufficient scope in subparagraph (c) of Subclause (3) which deals with lotteries run by the Transport Board. I am afraid therefore that I cannot allow the hon. member to bring in Order No. 7 when dealing with this Order which is now before us. The hon. member has made passing reference to that Order, but I am afraid that I cannot allow him to deal with the Order. I ask him to refer to Clause 3 of the Bill with which we are now dealing.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the Order Paper you will see mention made of the Gaming Act, 1891 and the Gambling Act, 1917. There is no point in telling me that you cannot allow me to deal with it, because your own commonsense will show that if the Bill which we

are now amending has a Clause in it introducing something new into the Gaming and Gambling Acts, I have the right to refer to the Gambling Act and what it purports to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which I allowed you to do.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have and you read the Objects and Reasons.

Mr. WALCOTT: You allowed the hon. member to rise on a point of order to query Government's position. If a man said that he was going to kill me at 7 o'clock, you would not expect me not to take any precaution but to wait until 7 o'clock to see if I am dead. I am pointing out that my objection is the reason which Government gave for doing it; the Government states their reason for doing this in the Objects and Reasons, and Order No. 7 to which I am now referring exempts from the Gaming Act bets made by way of pool betting, and lotteries conducted by the Transport Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have told you already that there is sufficient scope in the Bill with which we are dealing in which you can make your point in connection with the Transport Board.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can read any Objects and Reasons to any Bill. You cannot tell me that I cannot read the Objects and Reasons of the Bill; it is not a Clause. I can read the Objects and Reasons of any Bill dealing with the Gaming Act of 1891. There is nothing on earth to say that I cannot read the Objects and Reasons of any Bill on gambling or gaming whether it is in Timbuctoo or Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You read that out here and I looked back in the Bill to see, and I said that you will not be allowed to deal with that in the Bill. I suggest that there is sufficient scope to deal with any matters in connection with the Transport Board and that you should wait until you get to Item No. 7 to deal with the points in the Objects and Reasons.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can make reference to any Objects and Reasons dealing with the Transport Board. I am not dealing with any Clause, I am talking about the Objects and Reasons, and I can quote any. I do not have to read Clauses 1, 2 and 3; the Objects and Reasons is not a Clause; it is argument, statement and reason. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of commonsense. The Government put a Clause in the Bill to say that this condition shall not apply to the Transport Board in respect of a lottery organised by the Transport Board. How can you suggest I have no right to say what they say is the reason? You have no right to say that I cannot say what is their reason. Am I not in order to read the reason which the Government has put forward?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Have I not allowed you to read it?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, sir; you have not. This is what is printed: "This last provision seeks to offer an incentive to the travelling public to call for their fare tickets and so indirectly to increase the receipts of the Board". That is why the Government says they are including this Clause because they intend to introduce a lottery at the Transport Board in order to induce people to call for their tickets, so that when they call for tickets it would increase bus fares, and that is why I am dealing with this.

If you wanted to be strict, Mr. Chairman, you should say that the Government should not have introduced this Bill to be passed before the other Bill, because in essence you are asking the Legislature or the House to sanction a Clause in a Bill or to sanction something that has not yet come before it; this is working on the hypothesis that we have already passed the Bill dealing with the Transport Board. The one dealing with the Turf Club is all right because you have a Turf Club Act on the Statute Book, but when you pass this now it means that you are asking us to give approval to something that you have not yet dealt with.

I find, Mr. Chairman, that there is not much difference between us. This Clause says that these provisions shall not apply to any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955, in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fare. You must see, therefore, that this Clause as it reads is based on the assumption that there is such an authority by the Board to run a lottery, because this says it shall not apply to the Board running a lottery. You have not passed that yet, but you are asking us to pass this; so if you pass this and I do not make any comment on the matter, this would be redundant and you could not have it in here. This Bill says that none of the provisions of this Act shall apply to any lottery run by the Turf Club or any lottery organised or controlled by the Transport Board. You do not make reference to the Barbados Workers' Union, the Barbados Labour Party or the Democratic Labour Party or even the St. Michael's Almshouse because they do not run lotteries, but you have referred to the Transport Board; so they want to run a lottery from the point of view of having a ticket. What this really means is that when a man gets into a Government bus he gets a ticket as an inducement to something which you are offering for riding on that bus; therefore it is more profitable to ride on the Government bus than on some other bus because you may get \$100 as a prize which you would not get from riding on another bus.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister came here and said that the Board had a deficit; so you mean to tell me that we are such gamblers that we are going to gamble with a deficit?

6.05 p.m.

You put this in the lottery business and you lose money on the lottery. That is why I say to the hon. member when you pass this Bill you are passing a Bill authorising lotteries for the Transport Board and the passing of the other one would be automatic because the reasons are already stated. The reason is that they are running lotteries from the point of view of their issuing more tickets. I say that you should embark on something of a more positive nature, such as people making loans to the Government on a debenture basis. Your assumption is that the conductors are not carrying in all the fares; if the conductors are not carrying in all the fares, then have other means of dealing with the situation. I understand that you have turnstiles in some buses and that they are working well. Turnstiles do not need tickets and the hon. member knows that very well. Even as they are worked by stages in London, you go and buy a ticket if you are travelling by underground and there is a man to collect the ticket when you get out at the other end. We have to introduce ways and means to build up a core of honest people; and to my way of thinking, that is not beyond the capabilities of the Board or the Government. You have to recruit men and women in your transport service of the type and integrity who will not look upon petty theft as a way of life, and to do that you have to pay them adequate wages in order that when they lose their job for theft, they will feel that they lose something. If we have to go down to all these means to get people to be honest, the next thing you will have to do is to put a register on people's hands and do things in other respects in order to get honesty among the people.

Sir, I hope by now you will very well understand that the Bill to institute a lottery by the Transport Board is covered in another Bill. It is covered up in this Bill which deals with pool betting.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am asking for a more direct statement from the Government with reference to this issue. The insertion of this subsection before us is a rather oblique way by the Government of hinting that at some time or the other the Transport Board may be legally entitled to conduct a lottery. The oblique reference is not good enough. Arising out of the insertion of this subsection, there should be a direct statement from the Government as to the reason for its insertion; that is to say, if the Government proposes to run a lottery on the Transport Board for one reason or the other, it should not be left to the Committee to infer from the insertion of this subsection that this is a proposal of the Government. After

all, the Transport Board is not their private concern; it is a public Board and what they intend to do with it and the means along which certain aspects of policy are to be conducted are matters of public concern. This is an indirect manner of referring to what may well develop to be an important aspect of the operation of the Board and it is certainly not good enough for members of this Committee to have knowledge of it in this indirect manner. It is therefore not asking too much to ask the introducer of the Bill before much further debate to enlighten the Committee as to the real reason of this subsection in the Bill before us.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I regard this method as being a very unscientific way of attempting to establish a lottery system in the Transport Board. As far as I know, and I believe most hon. members feel the same way, there is not now any provision made for a lottery in the Transport Board Act. This is the first occasion that a Bill having any reference to a lottery being conducted by the Transport Board has been introduced in this House and, as I have said, this is a very unscientific way, to say the least of attempting to establish it. We have no legislation dealing with it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do admit that these three Bills are badly set down on the Order Paper and I probably should have done the other one first. If hon. members will prefer it that way, we can report progress and ask for leave to sit again and come back to this when we have dealt with the other one. These Bills were arranged in this order by my Secretary and I was not aware of it.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Premier is adopting the wise course in that this Bill is in some indirect way attempting to set up this lottery and, therefore, he should have proceeded with the other Bill first. But what I would also like to draw to your attention is that even the wording of this Clause which says: "Any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955, in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fares," is not a means of authorising the Transport Board to create a lottery and I hope the other Bill deals with it in the proper way and does not expect people to read in things which are not contained in it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 6

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

THE GAMING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Gaming Act, 1891. 6.15 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very short Bill. As is pointed out in the "Objects and Reasons", the object of this Bill is to exempt from the operation of the Gaming Act, 1891, bets made by way of pool betting, sweepstakes organised and controlled by the Barbados Turf Club or any overseas Turf Club and lotteries conducted by the Transport Board in connection with bus tickets issued by the Board. As hon. members will see, reference is made to sweepstakes organised and controlled by the Barbados Turf Club or any overseas Turf Club. At the moment there is no law in Barbados whereby sweepstake tickets from other places com-

ing into Barbados may not be sold; on the contrary, there is legislation in other places which prevents Barbados tickets from being sold in those territories; and for the first time something along that line will be attempted by Barbados. The wording of the operative section is very simple. It says this:-

"17. None of the provisions of this Act shall apply to-

(a) any bet made by way of pool betting; or

(b) any lottery or sweepstake organised and controlled by the Barbados Turf Club or any Turf Club outside the Island approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee at or in connection with any race meeting held under the auspices of such Club;"

In short, the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have to approve in connection with any Turf Club outside the Island selling their tickets in Barbados. With regard to the Transport Board, hon. members have asked for a definite expression of policy of the Government in connection with these sweepstake tickets run by the Board. We live in Barbados and we know what happens when the tickets are sold to passengers in buses. The passengers do not keep their tickets; in fact, they do not call for them. They are asked to call for them when they pay their fare and, in some cases, we have heard reports of attempts to quarrel, to put it mildly, with the inspectors who board the buses and ask passengers to present their tickets. We do not want to undertake any further legislation compelling passengers to produce their tickets on pain of a fine or anything like that; the proposal here is the method which has been adopted by the Board.

We want to set up this legislation. The Government is going to run this business; if and when it is run, it will be run by the Transport Board. The Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing will give any additional information to what I have given if hon. members so require; but what I have said is, in a nutshell, what is proposed. It is considered as being one way in which to induce passengers to keep their tickets and produce them when called upon to do so. There is nothing more than I can add, Sir, to what I have already said; I repeat that the Bill is a short one. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must admit that from the reasons given by the hon. introducer of the Bill, the Bill appears to be farcical. People are prone, as he says, not to keep their tickets after they have been given to them by the conductors, and this Bill is to bribe them to keep their tickets. In a lottery of any sort, the chances of success are almost one in a million and generally the people who travel by these buses will know that their chances of winning a lottery are very slim. A bird in the hand is worth a million in the bush. If there is any collusion between passengers and conductors, this Bill cannot stop it. The way to go about this matter is already laid down in the regulations controlling the operation of buses in the island. The same system was operated under the old tramway system. If you are called upon to produce your ticket and you cannot produce it, you are made to pay the fare again. It is as simple as that. If you cannot produce your ticket because you allowed the conductor to put the fare in his bag without giving you a ticket, you pay the fare again. The easiest solution of the matter is to abolish the ticket system altogether. If you go on any of the major transport systems operating in the big cities of the world, you will find that there are no tickets. You deposit your fare in the turnstile and you take your seat. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Then you are in favour of the turnstile system.) By all means. The only objection is that it may be putting the conductors out of work.

While the Official Opposition recognises the importance of maintaining every possible avenue for providing employment for people in the island, yet in a matter of this sort where the public has to pay so heavily for sub-

sidising the transport system to a certain extent because the Government claims, money which is paid by the passengers does not find its way into the coffers of the Transport Board, certainly we are willing to agree to the adoption of the turnstile system generally. There is nothing wrong with that.

6.25 p.m.

You can find work for conductors in the system somewhere else, but it certainly seems to me far easier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, than to run a lottery. How are you going to run a lottery? What prizes are you going to pay? The Transport Board is sinking money now; are you going to pay out money from the money they are collecting and lose more money? You are not increasing the fares, and I take it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the passenger will pay his ordinary fare now, he will get a ticket which he will keep, then there will be a drawing organised some time later in the month and the prize for the ticket would come from the normal bus fares paid by the travelling public to the Transport Board; therefore you are going to sink more money because you have got to find prizes out of the money being paid into the buses.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Ministers were going to pay the prizes, it would be all well and good. Maybe the Minister for Transport intends to give these special prizes—maybe called "Mapp prizes"—every month to the travelling public; but do not tell me that he intends further to dip his hands into the Public Treasury to find prizes of appreciable sizes, large enough to bribe the travelling public into retaining tickets at the end of a journey. I cannot see that the proposals have much to commend them at all, in comparison with the easier solution of inserting turnstiles in all the buses. The Hon. Premier has not vouchsafed us the information as to where these prizes are coming from. They are either cash prizes or you will ride free for a certain period if you win a prize; but either way it costs us money. The prize may be an old bus which the Transport Board does not want any more. But what amazes me is that the Government should be thinking of resorting to a lottery for a purpose like this when less than three months ago they refused the Southern District Council permission to operate a lottery for a most important purpose.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Southern District Council cannot afford to pay its way now. The rate of taxation is so high that the Government has had to put its hand in its coffers as in the case of the Northern District Council and subsidise the taxpayers by an annual subvention. Now the Council has no headquarters; it has nowhere to conduct its legal business and nowhere even for its offices to go into every day. It is renting part of the old Foundation School and paying rent for it every month, and the Council has asked for permission to run a lottery to provide itself a headquarters and has been refused permission. The Gaming Act of 1891 under reference here empowers permission to be granted for the holding of a lottery for charitable purposes. The present St. Michael's Cathedral was rebuilt by a lottery after the old Cathedral was destroyed in the late 19th Century. Could there be anything more charitable, Mr. Deputy Speaker, than providing headquarters for a Municipality? As a matter of fact, the definition of "charitable purposes" in matters of this sort includes the provision of municipal buildings; and yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, permission was refused the Southern District Council to run this lottery. But a Minister for the Government comes up with this preposterous scheme which he believes will induce the travelling public to retain the tickets they get for five cents and so on at the end of their journey.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Regulations are there stuck up in every bus saying that you are supposed to call for your ticket and retain it, because if you do not and you cannot produce it at the end of your journey if called upon to do so, it may mean paying your fare again. All you have to do then is to impose the Regulations; but certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not let us have the example of the Minister coming in here the next time he produces a statement disclosing the losses incurred by the Transport Board and in this statement saying "financial losses for

the operation of the Board, \$1 million; money spent on providing prizes \$1/4 million; total losses \$1 1/4 million." That is where we are going to end up. It is a marvellous thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and worthy of its proponent. The only question we want to ask is where are the prizes to come from.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really cannot agree with the inference to be drawn from the introduction of the Bill that the Transport Board will be better off in any way after the passage of this piece of legislation than it was before, and in all fairness, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with an alternative like the introduction of turnstiles, what on earth could be the reason for not adopting them?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thought that earlier today and in many debates in this Chamber I had tried to see if I could show the Government that with a little vision and commonsense the Transport Board and transport need not be in a deplorable condition.

6.35 p.m.

What have you heard the Premier say today? The Hon. Premier says that this suggestion comes from the Board. Do not take the Board to be oracles. That may be a good suggestion from their point of view. Their minds are more or less thinking about what is the best thing to do; but I would like to tell the Hon. Premier that people who do not exercise their minds and brains even on private affairs cannot exercise their minds properly on some important aspect of public affairs. This now seems to be the easiest way to them to bring them out of the mire, but the Hon. Premier and the other Hon. Ministers need not accept this from them.

I will say this to the Hon. Minister. A Minister must be dealing with things of such weight and type that he cannot word a thing as how paragraph (b) of subsection 3, of Clause 3 is worded. People fool themselves that certain people will not do things and they make excuses for people. I will say this to members of this Committee. I am a member of the Football Association; so too, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we issue tickets in some instances to people. There are cases where we issue tickets in the same manner as you issue bus tickets. The people come and purchase the tickets beforehand, and when they have to enter they have to show the ticket; and when you call on them for the tickets, they are there to be presented. Do not tell me that a man sitting in a bus cannot keep the tickets issued him. They buy tickets and they hold them until they present them. That is the way it is done in other countries. It is a rigid system in which you are not entering unless you have a ticket and the person who sells tickets must be responsible to you for the number of tickets sold. When you are running a business like a Government Business, from the top must come the spirit that you are running a business in the interest of the public and, therefore, there must be no collusion, no hocus-pocus. Right at the top we must have honest people dealing with it.

The Hon. Premier says that this is more or less an incentive to get people to hold tickets, but as the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said, you have Inspectors and they must do their duty. This is pandering to the public. You get on a bus and an Inspector comes to you and you cannot show him the ticket. Well if you cannot show him the ticket, pay again. You get people who say that you give him a breadfruit, a box of cigarettes or something like that and he tells you, "I will give you a free ride." That is why I say that you will spend all this money and get no results, and that is why I say that the people who are running this business are a penny wise and a pound foolish. We are still in the habit of paying low wages. An Inspector is a man who is put in charge of a route. If you have an Inspector, he cannot be a man who looks as if he would borrow money from a Conductor. Until we get down to the idea that you must pay these people money, you will get no further. They say that they have no money in the business other than what we collect on the buses; and if the bankers were having the same problem in the banking business, then they would have to turn out the whole Police Force to look for losses in the banks.

Sir, it is purely a matter that we have to exercise our brains, and our brains are put in our heads for use. I cannot see how the Hon. Minister can seriously come to this Chamber and say that he has been convinced that to get more busfares in, you must run a lottery when it has been stated that other people run buses too. I will say this. I represent workers. If you intend to raise the standard of people, pay them proper wages and give them good conditions of employment. You must accept a game of trial and error until you get the right people. You must dismiss people who are not honest. The idea of a lottery will not help. It may have its temporary blessings. You go to a lady in a bus and ask her to let you see her ticket and she does not show you. Those same people go to the United Kingdom and act differently. Whenever they get in a train, they hold the ticket and show it. The Inspector has never come to me in a bus in London for a ticket, but when you are travelling on a train, you have to keep your ticket and when you get out you have to show it to the Conductor. When are you going to train people to know that when they are running on a business vehicle, they must keep their ticket and show it when called upon? If you are riding on a bus where they issue tickets, then you have to present your ticket when called upon to present it. You have to train your Conductors, your Inspectors and your Drivers. Do not only train them for the United Kingdom. What is unhappy about all this matter is that we are training people for export but not for local consumption. The trouble is that you train them to go to England to work efficiently and the people over there say what nice people they are. They are the same people whom we have trained that will say over here "throw in the old lady's hat", "let me get it here", "fair enough", "move", "stand still", "easy" and all those kinds of colloquial phrases which you hear when you get on a bus. You also hear them addressing passengers like this, "Woman in the red hat", "woman in the corner". This is the kind of rough and ready treatment, the rough and ready attitude that you get here and you have to make your Conductors and your Inspectors learn to treat the passengers with respect. When you travel, you have that courtesy. If you go outside, you will find that when an Inspector and a Conductor meet, they exchange greetings. One would say to the other "how is the weather treating you?" Of course, it is true to say that they have long traditions behind them and a different type of civilisation and, therefore, that type of behaviour is bred over a number of years. But we are not so lacking in our breeding. The reason why I say that is to show that you can say that things are lacking about here. I want to tell hon. members this. If you want to see local people treating you with courtesy, come to the Barbados Workers' Union and see how the staff there will treat you. They will treat you with respect. There is too much of this rough and ready treatment here and people are excusing others for it. You get it even in traffic on the streets; watch how bus drivers drive the buses!

6.45 p.m.

On many instances I drive and see that you allow bad behaviour to go on. Why can't you ask a lady for a ticket when she gets on the bus? I know that some of the bus conductors have shown resentment to people who ask them for their tickets. When complaints come to me I have told bus conductors: "I would fire you for what you have done. I will ask a man to give you a chance on the bus if you are right." I have had no trouble with such people after that. I do not waste my time asking for a chance for a man who says that somebody puts something in his pocket.

You do not want any lottery; what you want is a proper investigation in order to find out if you are getting what you want. The people who are not prepared to give you that co-operation must be fired. You give a man an opportunity and the Union is there to represent him; otherwise you can go to the Labour Department about matters. What you need, with the staff which you have up there, is a Personnel Officer; you want somebody to train people to say: "You are an inspector, you are a bus driver, you are a conductor; this is your living and you must help the organisation to be run properly." It is better for the Government not to accept these things from the Board; a lottery run by the Transport Board is a waste of time. Nobody would be against the other things; I would ban pool betting and all

of this foolishness; we can get joy without these things because we have the sea all around us. I would delete Clause 6 of this Bill and let us pass this Bill without having anything to do with running any lottery. Let the Transport Board be run as an institution and cut out this idea of running lotteries. You are likely to find that if cash prizes are in these lotteries, somebody will have something to say against it. The employees of the Board are organised people and you can talk to them or you can talk to their Organisation.

I can speak with authority and I say that the Union has given the Transport Board the maximum co-operation in all of the Board's activities. I am satisfied that since the Union has had to do with the Transport Board there has been a completely different outlook. Mr. Deputy Speaker, only as a comparison I would say this; some years ago Barbados had the lead on the waterfront and today Trinidad is sending up people to see how we run the Port even with the lighters. They want to see how we are running it. Things must come from the top right down to the bottom if everybody is pulling his weight. I repeat; do not carry on any lottery; make an approach for good work and improved conditions and teach the employees good manners, good behaviour and proper public relations. These things cannot come by guess; they will come by having some person there trained to do these things; you want a trained personnel management man and you will do a wonderful job up there.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not quite clear that what is proposed is the proper way of providing this system in respect of the Transport Board. As to whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, I will probably deal with that later; but the whole question is whether there is a scientific way of introducing a lottery system for the Board. At present under the Act, the Transport Board has not got such powers. The whole question is if what is proposed here would be a means of giving the Board power to run lotteries. What I feel is this; if you are imposing new powers on the Board and entrusting them with the power to run lotteries, there must be some scientific or legal way of doing it. This is more or less admitting that a lottery may be run by the Transport Board. This sub-section reads as follows: "Pool betting duty shall not be payable on any sum paid in respect of any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955, in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fares."

Tickets are not issued by the Transport Board for the purpose of running lotteries as such; they are issued by way of acknowledgement of the receipt of fares given by passengers. What is occupying my mind is whether there will be some extra fare paid by the passengers or if it is going to be the ordinary fare. Unless some extra money is collected, from what source will this prize money be paid?

6.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to point out to the hon. member that under Section 9 (2) (d) of the 1955 Transport Board Act, the Board can do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board. They can give a prize to the holder of tickets or a ticket if in their opinion that is facilitating the proper carrying on of the business of the Board;

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

but under the Gaming Act that would be interpreted to be a lottery, and the whole object of this Act is to exempt this particular exercise from the provisions of the Gaming Act.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Minister who has stated that the Transport Board has power to run a lottery in that it has power to do whatever

is necessary to facilitate such matters. The Act reads "subject to the provisions of this Act, the Board shall have power to carry goods and passengers by road within the Island, to provide, maintain and operate a passenger road transport service....."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member would give way on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform him that I read sub-Clause (2) (d).

Mr. TALMA: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that point later on. The Minister says that the Board at present has power to do whatever it thinks fit to facilitate the work of the Board. The Clause reads "to do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board." That Clause, Sir, is the general sort of Clause you find in all Bills, but one would not expect that to mean a lottery system.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

In Resumption:

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

THE GAMING (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension the hon. senior member for Christ Church was addressing the House.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I had reached the stage where I was dealing with the question of whether or not the Transport Board has power to run lotteries. Now the Minister pointed out that under the Transport Board Act, Section 2, subclause (d) the Board has such power, and he read subclause (d) which reads as follows: "to do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board." In reality, Sir, on the face of it that looks like a general sort of supplementary power which the Board has to do other things to facilitate the work, but in reality this is the sort of general Clause you find in all Bills, and in a strict legal interpretation it is what is known as *ejusdem generis*; it is a Clause which although it refers in a general way to the Board having power to do other things to facilitate the work of the Board, yet it refers specifically to the powers already set out prior to that. I am saying that a power such as to run a lottery will have to be specifically and expressly stated, because you cannot read into that the power to carry on a lottery. A lottery on the face of it is an illegal transaction and you cannot vest such power in the Transport Board in this indirect way. It has to be a specific power setting out in express terms the power to carry on a lottery.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member need not be labour that point. He is obviously right.

Mr. TALMA: I am glad that Your Honour notices that. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that power has to be given to the Board to carry on a lottery, and to attempt to vest power of this nature to run a lottery which on the face of it is an illegal business, it cannot be done in this way. It is not only unscientific; it is illegal in the final analysis for the Board to run a lottery in that it has not got power to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go back to the amendment to the Gaming Act, Clause 2 reads as follows:-

"Section 17 of the Principal Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor - none of the provisions of this Act shall apply to - (c) any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board established under the Transport Board Act, 1955, in connection with tickets issued by such Board on payment of fares."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the wisest course which should be adopted would be to postpone further consideration of this Bill because the Transport Board has not got power to run lotteries, and this is an indirect way of attempting to do that because any lottery undertaken by the Transport Board will be illegal, and anyone who thinks that he can introduce legality or expect the Transport Board to run a lawful lottery by including a Clause like this in the Gaming Act is wrong. I am surprised to see that legislation comes down like this.
7.50 p.m.

I am hoping Sir, that the Hon. Premier will consider what I have said and have this matter postponed in that this is an indirect, illegal way of doing things. This is not the proper way to vest power of running lotteries in the Transport Board. The Board has not got such power and this is not the way of doing it. You will have to amend the Transport Board Act, and vest that power directly and expressly in the Transport Board. You will have to amend the Transport Board Act and then come down with this consequential amendment to the Gaming Act of 1891, and unless you do it in that way, you are doing it in the wrong way.

As far as the pros and cons of lotteries are concerned, I am not really competent to say whether a lottery will cause the Transport Board to receive more bus fares; but at the same time, I will say that if the Transport Board is going to pay out money in prizes or money's worth by way of prizes, whether it is actual money or money's worth, if they can afford to do that, they cannot tell us that they are running their business at a loss. Therefore, it means that you will either have to increase bus fares or you will have to issue another ticket to include what you want to get in by way of the lottery; that is to say, those who intend to enter this lottery will have to pay something in addition to the regular bus fare so that the Transport Board will have extra money to pay out in prizes.

I will move the postponement of further consideration of this Bill in accordance with the Rules so as to enable the Government to have the Transport Board Act of 1955 amended to vest power in the Transport Board to conduct these lotteries prior to coming down with this Bill to amend the Gaming Act.

Sir, I am asking leave at this stage to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed. I hope that the Hon. Premier will not regard this as superseding his power.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that motion for the postponement. We have been dealing with so much gambling that it makes it difficult for us to understand if we are not converting this House into a gambling den. Really, Sir, what I have to say is just what the hon. member who has just set down has said, and that is, first of all, that this is not a criticism of the hon. member who is in charge of the Bill. One wonders if members of the Government should not take some of these gentlemen to task and ask them at times why they leave themselves open to so much criticism.

One of the things which I would like to point out, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, is that there is no power under the Transport Board Regulations or Act at present which gives them the power to run lotteries and that is why we ask you to postpone this Bill and put the Act right first. They are asking to have something done which they feel conscientiously can be done in this way; but in the absence of any authority giving the power to the Transport Board to run a lottery, how can you amend this Act to say that the Transport Board can run such a lottery? As I read this Bill now, I am thinking of the Transport Board Act which gives the Board no power for them to run a lottery. Would the Hon. Premier tell us how are you going to find the money for paying the prizes? I understand that the Hon. Minister quoted a section of the Transport Act which he said gives the power to the Transport Board for doing certain things and that this would be included if they want to do it; but as it stands, it is not the law of the island. Therefore, I too am wondering if it is scientific as people would have us to believe.

What I am also wondering is how are we going to get the money. What is the idea behind this coming here? You have your Transport Board as run by the Government, so to speak, without any competition, with the exception of the pick-ups — and I hope that the Government would get wise and allow them to remain on the roads because I think that members of the Government have found out that it is too dangerous a step to stop them. If they have any doubt they can just look up the speech of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in 1948 in this respect. I think they should be able to tell us on this side of the Table for what reason the Transport Board wants to run a lottery on tickets as received by the people who ride on the Government buses. I cannot agree that that would be any incentive.

However, Sir, I do not want to waste time. I cannot support this Bill on those grounds. I believe hon. members would agree with me if I say that as long as members of the Government are advised by their Legal Draughtsman that what they are doing is the right thing, what the hon. senior member for Christ Church has suggested will not weigh with them; but I notice, Sir, that by your approach, it must weigh with them because there is no such power vested in the Transport Board. If there is no such power vested in them, are you not going to come in with something to amend the Act and say that this should be done? If I may use the legal phraseology, I must say that it is unscientific, the way you are doing it. It does not seem to be the correct thing to do; therefore, I have much pleasure to second the motion for postponement, and I hope the Hon. Minister will see the wisdom for the postponement. If he does not and you pass this, it will go to the Other Place and then the Attorney General is going to say that the Clerk of the House should have seen this error and drawn it to his attention before the House passed it as it is.

8.00 p.m.

I wonder if it is convenient for Your Honour at this stage to intervene in a matter of this sort. It looks ridiculous for legislation to be passed in this House, and then not only the Other Place but the public as well seem to think that the Opposition must be a bunch of dunderheads, or that we have not paid sufficient attention to a matter, when in truth and in fact, the Opposition has paid attention to it. After all, you have the Clerk of this House who is a legal man. This Section states that under the Act you can run these lotteries and there is absolutely no power given to the Board to do so; therefore I must second the motion which has been made by the honourable member. This is unscientific draughtsmanship and you should not pass it because of your numbers and then be laughed at. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that you deal with matters of this sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will tell the honourable member that there is absolutely no reflection either on me or on the Clerk of this House as far as the drafting of this Bill is concerned. We will have nothing at all to do with it, anyhow. The Government has had its opportunity of being advised and the Government may accept the postponement if it thinks that the matter needs to be gone into; but there is no responsibility resting on my shoulders or on the shoulders of the Clerk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour for what you have said, but I did not mean to infer that there was any responsibility resting on your shoulders; the Clerk can advise you and so can all members on this side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that hon. members know the feelings of the Clerk on this matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down seems to confuse the post of Clerk of this Chamber with that of Standing Counsel to Your Honour. I hope that arrangements will be made for Your Honour to be equipped with Standing Counsel to yourself. As to this Bill which is now before us, there are two aspects of it on which I would like to speak. One aspect is in respect of the intervention of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas when the hon. senior member for

Christ Church was speaking. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas referred to that part of the Transport Board Act where it says that the Board is empowered "To do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board." The hon. member gave the impression that he had been advised that the Sub-Clause was so wide that it would include doing anything including the establishment and carrying on of a lottery. With that opinion, if it was an opinion given to the hon. member by a lawyer, or if it was the opinion of the hon. member who has had no inconsiderable experience in the Courts — whoever gave that opinion — I must profoundly disagree with it. That Sub-Clause is to be taken in relation to the other Clauses of the Bill. Sub-section 2 of Section 9 of the Act says this:—

"(2) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the powers conferred by subsection (1) of this section include power — (a) to construct, manufacture, purchase, maintain and repair anything required for the purpose of any of the activities of the Board specified in that subsection; (b) to do anything for the purpose of advancing the skill of persons employed by the Board or the efficiency of the equipment of the Board or of the manner in which the equipment is operated; (c) to buy land, or take land on lease or under any form of tenancy; and (d) to do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board;"

There is what is known to lawyers as the *ejusdem generis* rule. I know that you are well acquainted with that phrase. When a Clause such as this is considered in the light of the *ejusdem generis* rule, it is considered to limit the phrase "To do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board" to such things as would normally come within the compass and scope of the everyday activities of the Transport Board in connection with the actual running of the buses. In my view, this matter of running a lottery would not be regarded by a competent Court to come within the scope of this phrase, "To do all other things" but that the phrase, "To do all other things" is a phrase which is subject to the *ejusdem generis* rule. It would be interesting if the Government were to pursue and press this matter to finality this evening and it were to be decided in the Court. I would have no doubt that the point of view which I am presenting would be the interpretation by an experienced Court as to the meaning of that phrase and its interpretation of the *ejusdem generis* rule.

8.10 p.m.

That is why I am supporting the motion for further consideration of this Bill to be postponed, and then if the matter is again submitted by the Cabinet for the further opinion of its legal advisers and they adhere to their opinion, then the Cabinet will be absolved from responsibility in respect of the legal advice it receives, good or bad, and when the matter is threshed out in Court they would see what is the opinion of either the High Court here or the Federal Supreme Court or the Privy Council as to the interpretation of this phrase and to the limited interpretation which is entitled to be put on the phrase despite its apparent wide implication "to do all other things". So much for the legal aspect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from another point of view, if you are proposing to alter a law, the onus is on the proposer to justify the proposed change. Now the Objects and Reasons advise us that the object of this Bill is to exempt from the operation of the Gaming Act, 1891, amongst other things, lotteries conducted by the Transport Board in connection with bus tickets issued by the Board. It is my premise that the onus is on the proposer — he who is disposed to change the existing state of affairs and to change the *status quo* — to satisfy us of the necessity for so doing, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not sufficient to persuade us on this side to support the changes when all that we are told in respect of these lotteries is that we all live in Barbados and that the matter of actual details of these lotteries will be

left entirely to the Transport Board. Even if that is so, we would expect to be told, and we feel we are entitled to be told, how these lotteries are proposed to be conducted and what is the source from which the prizes are to be drawn.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the reason which is adduced without necessarily agreeing with it. People who today do not insist on getting a ticket will insist on getting one in order that they might participate in the lottery however often it is conducted; whether it is a weekly, monthly, quarterly or annual lottery has not been divulged, but unless the prizes awarded in this lottery are reasonably attractive, I still do not see it beginning to achieve the purpose for which it is proposed to be inaugurated. If the prizes are going to be \$5 first prize and ten shillings second prize, I do not see many people putting themselves to any great amount of trouble not only to retain their tickets for the entire journey, but until the end of the week or month or whenever it is the lottery will be deemed to be concluded and they will set about to decide on the prize winners. To be really attractive the prizes will have to be sums such as at least \$100 first prize, \$50 second prize and things of that kind which in my view are likely to induce the majority of people to keep their tickets. One or two people will keep their tickets at all events even if the prizes were one day's pass for the next day, but if it is to attract the majority of people, the prizes must be along the lines of sums which I have suggested; first prize \$100, second prize \$50 or \$75, third prize \$50 or \$25 as the case may be. The hon. senior member for St. Philip is entirely justified in querying what would be the source of the prizes awarded, because it may well be that when the Transport Board's next deficit is presented to us, we may see an additional amount added to cover the cost of these prizes.

In this matter, Mr. Speaker, you must be fair to all routes; you must not have it run on the Silver Sands route or the Christ Church routes to accommodate the hon. member for St. Thomas and not have one on the St. Lucy and St. Peter routes. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if you are having a lottery in respect of each route and you are having at least a decent price in respect of these lotteries, and if you are having these lotteries regularly, I can well understand the fears of the hon. senior member for St. Philip as to what may be the cost of these undertakings added to the general cost of running the public passenger transport system of this island. I am therefore submitting, Mr. Speaker, that the onus is on the proponents of this particular legislation with which we are concerned to satisfy us as to some details — I would not even say details, because it may well be that details are a matter for the actual Board — but an outline of the general principles on which the Cabinet understands or the Minister of Communications understands it is proposed by the Transport Board to run this lottery. We are entitled to such information just as we are entitled to enquire if the Government can tell us of any precedent. I do not feel that we are necessarily bound by precedent because there has to be a first to everything, but there may be a precedent in which Transport Boards or public passenger transport concerns have run lotteries in order to reduce deficits. If there are such cases, I think it is only fair and reasonable for the Government to tell us because we are not aware and such information would be useful. If they tell us for instance that this is the case in Camchatka, Korea or Tortola, we could have our own information and check up on the running of Transport systems in these colonies and satisfy ourselves that the necessity which arose there is similar to the necessity which arose here and that lotteries had been run in these places where they have been established and whether they have worked satisfactorily so as to justify us copying the precedent in this island.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what is the reaction of the new Manager of this Board to the proposal of the lottery. Has it been put to him? Does it find favour or disfavour or is his attitude neutral towards it? Those are the three important things in which I feel Government should take the House into its confidence in

order to satisfy us that we will be justified in assisting the passage of this legislation into law. Firstly, as I have enquired, what will be the general outline of the principles on which the Government understands the Transport Board will conduct this lottery; secondly, the source and the magnitude of the prizes and the number of prizes; and thirdly, the attitude of the new Manager of this concern towards this proposal, because I take it that these proposals were studied and accepted by Government before the arrival and taking up of office of the present Manager.

Dependant on that, Mr. Speaker, will be our attitude towards the support of this second reading of the Bill; but in any event I am supporting the motion moved by my friend and colleague, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, that further consideration be postponed for the legal reason which he gave and with which I am in accord.
8.20 p.m.

There is one other point, Mr. Speaker, and that is in respect of the alternative which has been mentioned by another colleague, my friend the hon. senior member for St. Philip. He suggested that turnstiles might not be as bad as a lottery because if you must run a business by a lottery, it means that you are not running the business successfully at all; you are running it on a gamble. We might as well let the Ministry understand this. We will sanction this provided, and only provided, we have an absolute binding guarantee that there will be no consequent unemployment following the introduction of these turnstiles because if the result is to put in 50 turnstiles and turn 100 conductors out of work, well then, Mr. Speaker, what is the answer for finding work for that deserving section of the community who may be turned out of work?

I understand that the proposal is to maintain the conductors in office in order to make change and to be responsible for the general good behaviour and conduct on the buses; but, in view of their lessened responsibility, that Government is proposing that the Transport Board intend while retaining the present number of conductors to employ them at a greatly reduced rate. That is a matter which I leave in good assurance to the good offices of the hon. senior member for St. Peter that any intention to maintain the same number of conductors at a greatly reduced rate of pay will be handled by the Workers Union, and I do not have to remind the General Secretary, my friend the hon. senior member for St. Peter, of the effectiveness of the Union, and in cases of dire necessity, of the vital importance and benefit of the strike weapon. We have seen what happened with the oil companies in Trinidad as a result of the strike weapon, and if the Transport Board were to try while maintaining a certain number of employees to cut their wages in half on the ground that they have so much work less to do, then it is time for the representatives of the Union to which these workers belong to take that situation in hand and deal with it effectively.

Those are my reasons for supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, so far as the legal point raised by hon. members opposite with regard to the power of the Board to conduct lotteries, I am not in a position to pronounce upon that with any authority.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that this particular Clause comes under the rule which means "of the same nature or class", but reading the section as I did in relation to this matter, it appears to cover it by the words "to do all other things which in the opinion of the Board are necessary to facilitate the proper carrying on of the business of the Board." (A VOICE: Not lotteries.) All of these are means to an end. You issue tickets to ensure that the fare is collected and this is just a further avenue for the same purpose. Again, I repeat that it is difficult to be dogmatic in our interpretation of the law and I leave it to the Hon. Premier to decide what to do.

At the same time, even if hon. members opposite are right and the Transport Act would have to be amended, it still remains that you will have to amend this Act anyhow; so I take it that what hon. members are saying is that it is a matter of which comes first. (A VOICE: We are not in favour of it.) Well then, you will vote against the amendment to the Transport Act and you will vote against this.

I cannot find out what is the purpose of postponing this if it is necessary to amend the Transport Act because you will have to go over all this again. (A VOICE: That is only a technicality.) That is only a way of postponing voting against it. So far as I am concerned, and speaking for the Government also, we are in favour of it and if we have to come down with a Bill to amend the Transport Act, we will still have to come back down with a Bill to amend this Act, and whoever is in favour of it will vote for it and whoever is not in favour of it will vote against it. This section against the Transport Board has occupied a lot of attention and I hope I have answered the points put up against this particular amendment.

Now, Sir, as regards this matter about inducing or getting people to take a ticket or call for tickets when they get on buses, it has been a very serious one and has occupied the attention of the Transport Board for a considerable time. They have done everything in their power to improve collection. The hon. senior member for St. Peter says: "enforce the law and put them off." It is easier said than done. The hon. senior member knows well enough that that is so and it is one of the points which I have stressed in my policy Statement in this House. Unless you have a certain amount of cooperation it is always very difficult to work these things. You cannot put off a whole bus load of people if they do not want to get off. You get the situation where the other passengers remonstrate with the conductor and quarrel if he is strong and firm and does his duty and goes ahead and calls for the ticket.

8.30 p.m.

Up to yesterday morning a man who was travelling on one of the Speighstown buses said that he had paid his twenty cents and a ticket was given to him upside down. It was a ten-cent ticket. I asked him if he had drawn it to the attention of the conductor and he replied that when you speak to the conductors, the passengers keep a lot of noise. They will not co-operate. I do not think you will run any fool-proof system except the turnstile system. Hon. members have said that the turnstile system is a good system. They used to have a turnstile system in Puerto Rico but they left off that system because at the end of the day the driver used to stay a very long time with the turnstile and that was something which the Union did not like. They then went to the slot system and the rule was that if a passenger did not have the right change to drop into the slot, then he must hand the money to the driver who, in turn, would hand back the change to the passenger. It was the passenger who had to drop in the coin in the slot. Very often it would happen that the driver would not hand back the change to the passenger but would say: "Don't you worry, I will drop in the fare for you." And sometimes the fare did not get into the slot. I have been to Puerto Rico subsequently and I found that they went back to the turnstile system.

You cannot use the turnstile system on two or three different fare stages; that is why we could only use the system on certain routes like Station Hill and Deacons Road. I should like to say that there has been an increase in our collections since we have started the turnstile system. If we could operate the turnstile system throughout the island, we would do so, but we cannot do that; we can only do that on single fare routes of five cents, ten cents or twenty-five cents. It must be one fare in order to get the money into the slot.

We have come back to this bugbear which has given the Board headaches for a long time, that is, getting the public to co-operate in obtaining their tickets. I admit that, on the face of it, it is shady to allow or promote a gamble. While it is true that it is an unorthodox method, it is not of the same nature as the Government conducting a public lottery where you sell tickets. In this case, the public is

riding on a bus and people are given tickets and they keep their tickets because a particular one may win a prize. Is it not so that the British Government used a lottery in raising money through bonds? That was to induce people to buy bonds. It is not the same thing as inducing poor people to buy tickets; it is not the same thing as adding to the already heavy burden of people by drawing money from them in raffling this, that and the other and in sweepstakes. This is an unorthodox way of inducing people to keep their tickets because they may get a prize. I can vouch for the fact that since the Union has entered into the picture, so far as the Transport Board is concerned, the Union has educated us one hundred per cent in discipline and so on; but this is more an inducement to the public to co-operate and call for their tickets.

Some time ago we conducted a survey; we had people to ride in buses for a week, we saw what the collections were like and we compared them with the actual takings going into the Board. I should like to say that there is no corruption at the top because there would have to be conspiracy all around. However, we had a check made and we were losing anything between twenty and forty per cent of the takings. I myself, on principle, do not like lotteries; I do not say that I would not buy a sweepstake ticket, but gambling becomes very stupid when you cannot afford to do it; but if you can do it within your means, then it does not matter. At the same time I think that there is a point reached where we should stop.

I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we should not do, or we should not become, like the South American Republic; but when the Transport Board could show me what we stood to gain if we could induce people to call for their tickets, I decided that I would allow the Board to institute this innovation. I would not put any hindrance in their way.

8.40 p.m.

I may tell hon. members that - and I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter mentioned it the other day - for actually two months we had a working profit. I wonder if he knows the reason for that. In one of those months the Board collected the highest sum since its inception, and part of that was due to the fact that we are getting more co-operation from the Union and more discipline from the workers; but part of it was due to the fact that school children were convinced that a certain firm which was advertising on the back of tickets would offer some prize, and more money flowed in during that month from school buses and from all types of buses than ever flowed in before. That is human nature. They all insisted on getting their tickets and kept them because of the rumour to the effect that they would get something from this particular firm.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, where the rumour started; the Board was not responsible for the rumour, but it is because the firm I believe was associated with sharing out various things on Rediffusion programmes and that kind of thing - and on these programmes there were some very nice prizes shared out at the time - and they felt that if they kept their tickets they would also be in line for a prize.

I do not think, Sir, that I can say much more. I will only tell the House that I think that with nationalised concerns we should give them a chance to operate their businesses at the maximum efficiency and in the way they think fit. I do not think we should hamper them so far as the Legislature is concerned in any way unless it interferes with the public good. If we feel it interferes with the public good, then we could step in; but this is a case where I am content to sink my personal feelings, because as I said already I do not think it offends any morality, and I do not think it can be compared with public lotteries that we have read about. There is a prize for holding on to your ticket and I am personally willing to give the Board an opportunity to operate a lottery.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to answer any of the points made by hon. members at this stage. While the point relating to the authenticity or the legitimacy of the Board to engage in a lottery was under

discussion, I tried to get in touch with the Acting Attorney General to put the matter before him and ask his advice, but he was not at home, and therefore I have only got one side. I am quite willing under the circumstances to postpone this Bill and to accept the motion for postponement from the other side until that point has been cleared up.

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 7 to amend the Gambling Act also contains reference to the Transport Board, and I think as a consequence that that Order ought to be postponed too, and we will go on to Order No. 9.

PEASANTS LOAN BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Peasants Loan Bank Act, 1936.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order makes provision for the paying of a pension to certain employees of the Peasants Loan Bank. Under the first Act, that is, the 1947 Act, past service with the Bank prior to the coming into force of such order would not have ranked as pensionable service. As it is considered that such service should also be taken into account for the purpose of determining the amount that may be awarded as pension to such servants, this Bill seeks to amend the Peasants Loan Bank Act, 1936 so as to enable such past service to rank as pensionable service.

Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to enable monetary contributions to be made by the Bank in aid of the pensions of all the personnel of the Bank who may become entitled to a pension payable by Government.

In short, Sir, as I think we all know, the employees of the Peasants Loan Bank are not now pensionable by Government; so this Bill which now stands before us which seeks to amend the Act of 1936 is a way of getting around that by calling on the Bank to make provision by annual payments to the Treasury.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not against these Bills, but I am making an appeal to the Hon. Premier that Orders Nos. 9, 10 and 11 should be the subject of study before we pass them. Now it looks all right to give these people pensions, but you have to study these Bills in relation to the Public Employees Act.

Now the Government Savings Bank, the Peasants Loan Bank and the Post Office, Mr. Speaker, are all Departments which perform a service to the community. This is a Bill, Mr. Speaker, which affects the Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER: They need not listen.

Mr. WALCOTT: If what we say is not of any interest to the Government that is proposing it, it is very strange indeed.
8.50 p.m.

The Post Office is a service department; but the employees of the Post Office are not required to pay back into the Treasury 25% of the salaries paid out in order to pay the pensions of their Government servants. The people whom we appointed to the Peasants Loan Bank are appointed by the same Public Service Commission. They come through the same sort of treatment. The present Manager of the Peasants Loan Bank was a Civil Servant and he was seconded to that Department. He has always been a Government servant.

What I am pointing out to the Hon. Premier is that I require information. If I say this, the Hon. Premier will understand what I mean. The Housing Authority has got money from the Labour Welfare Fund. Part of the money allocated to the Housing Authority comes from money accrued to the Labour Welfare Fund. The Housing Authority also gets

money from general and other means such as from the Civil Servants. All this is known as the Housing Authority; but when a man is employed by the Housing Authority, you cannot sub-divide him and say that he is working for the Civil Service, the Housing Authority and General Loans. It is an Authority.

You say that 25% of the total salaries paid out must be paid back into the Treasury. The Peasants Loan Bank gets its funds from the Government. Mr. Speaker, you have been a Civil Servant yourself. We have been maintaining these pensions in the light of the 1947 Pension Act and I think the Hon. Premier should take this opportunity to analyse it. That Act makes provision for Widows and Orphans. I feel that it would be grossly unfair to call on a whole-time employee and take back 25% of his salary. Twenty-five percent is a substantially high proportion. What you pay to the National Insurance in Great Britain is not as high as that. If you are taking back 25% of the salaries paid out to the Peasants Loan Bank and the Housing Authority, you are taking back one-quarter of the amount and I feel further examination would have to be gone into that so as to reveal how much that money is and if it is wise to pay it back into the Treasury or wiser to have a Superannuation Fund and to apply it on its own and then to utilise the money for any of the schemes. I see from this percentage and from the salaries which are paid out by the Housing Authority that there is going to be a considerable amount of money going back into the Treasury from the Housing Authority; and I want it to be examined, not in an arbitrary manner, but to see that the pensions of the total of Civil Servants—let us say that there are 5,000 people who are eligible to pension and the computation equals 25 percent, then you say that this should be equal to 25 percent. It is my opinion that if any firm or business had to provide pensions for its employees on a basis of 25 percent of the gross amount of salaries paid out, that percentage would be considered as a very considerable one and very few would do it. I do not feel that money should be just taken up like that. The Peasants Loan Bank is not different from the Post Office and we do not ask the Post Office out of its revenue to take out 25 percent of the salaries paid out to make up for pensions. We do not ask the Agricultural Department to take out 25 percent; the Peasants Loan Bank is as much a Department of the Government as the Post Office and the Agricultural Department.

When it comes to the Housing Department, I would like the Hon. Premier to understand that the Housing Authority is going to be an employment force for many years to come; and with so many carpenters, masons, and clerks at the Housing Authority, I can see a substantial amount of money will be taken out by this 25 percent method. I am interested in it because the workers at the Housing Authority are members of the Union, and normally if it were a scheme embarked upon by anybody other than the Government, the Union would have had some conversation about it with the employers as regards the details. I would like to make that point clear. If we can have the opportunity to discuss the details of the quantum that has to be deducted in these instances, it will do no harm, and I would like to hear from the Financial Secretary more of the details of this because I have a point of view which I think is a more mature point of view than the one which the Government has. The whole idea of it is that the 1947 Pension Act under which this is administered is not beyond modification in the light of modern trends. I am sure that in 1959 the National Insurance Act of Great Britain is greatly modified and is a more up-to-date measure than it was in 1946. I would like to be able to bring to the authorities what I know about the National Insurance Act in Great Britain which covers a wider area and a wider number of people than before; and as the Housing Authority would cover casual workers and would cover people other than what the 1947 Pension Act says, and as the bulk of the money in the Housing Authority will be coming from the Labour Welfare Fund, I feel that at least I should have an opportunity of discussing these important details with the Government before this legislation is enacted in view of the fact that I represent a powerful interest in workers for this Authority. We are not against the 1947 Pension Act as such, but we do not feel that the 1947 Pension Act is the last word; we would prefer before you take out the 25 percent to let us discuss details with

you and be satisfied that 25 percent does not represent a higher proportion than is needed. That is my appeal to the Hon. Premier.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the principle of the Bill and like the hon. member who has just sat down, I feel very happy to see that full consideration is being given to the services rendered by the Officers of the Peasants Loan Bank and that their posts are now being made pensionable and being put on a proper footing.

9.00 p.m.

Like the hon. member who has just sat down, I feel that there is a lot of weight in what he has said about the question of quantum; but in so far as the proportion of one quarter of the total sum of the salaries, which is the amount to be set aside for the payment of the pension, in so far as that amount is concerned, I say that the Government has a Financial Secretary, an Accountant General, an Auditor General and a Peasants' Loan Bank Board. I take it that the Board of the Peasants' Loan Bank plus all of these officers, plus all of these financial experts, must have gone into this question. When you consider that the staff of the Peasants' Loan Bank is a small staff - I agree in part with what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, but I am going more specifically into the issue which is before us. When you consider that the staff of the Peasants' Loan Bank is a small one, quite in contrast to the staff of the Housing Authority, I can see the reason for expecting one quarter of the total salaries to be paid in.

In going into the whole matter you will see that the staff is a small one and if there is anything less than one quarter of the total sum of the salaries, which is the amount to be set aside for the payment of the pensions, you may not be able to make provision for pensions and gratuities, many of which may soon fall due. I am entirely in agreement with the principle of this Bill; I feel that provision will have to be made for granting pensions and gratuities for services rendered prior to this Pension Act and that no officer who has served will stand to lose as a result of the Pension Act of 1947.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this is just a word in passing. We are not objecting to the second reading of this Bill, but it has just occurred to me that since a pension is being paid to the staff of the Peasants' Loan Bank with a view to providing pensionable offices for certain servants, it is indeed a pity that in considering this amendment to the Peasants' Loan Bank Act of 1936, the Government did not also consider making some amendment to provide for remuneration for members of the Board. That is in keeping with the general trend today in respect of membership of Boards where some reasonable sum is provided for the payment of Directors for their attendance at meetings of various Boards as is the case with other Boards which are set up by Statute. Instead of doing things in a piecemeal fashion, one would have thought that the Government would have given some attention to the question of the remuneration of members of the Board. In these days people do not serve only in the hope of getting an O.B.E.; there is time and money expended in attending these meetings; and I suggest that the Government should give early attention to a further amendment of this Act so as to provide for adequate remuneration for members of the Board who attend these meetings. There would be no objection to such an amendment from this side of the House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I would like to say that the employees concerned are quite satisfied with these arrangements. They have been met by the Government and all of these things have been put to them and they have agreed to them. However, there may be some force in what the hon. member has said; that would need some further consideration and I do not think that we should postpone the consideration of this Bill at this stage with a view to considering all the points which the hon. member has raised. I will promise the hon. member that at some future date his remarks will be brought to the attention of the officers concerned and consideration will be given to the matter.

With regard to the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy relative to the payment of members of the Board, I am informed that there is a new Act being drafted, that the hon. member's point is under consideration and the proposal will be incorporated in the new Act.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

9.10 p.m.

Clause 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called; it read as follows:

3. Section six of the principal Act is hereby amended by deleting subsection (3A) thereof and by substituting therefor the following new subsection to be numbered "(3A)" -

"(3A) The Bank shall in respect of the financial year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-nine and every financial year thereafter on the demand of the Accountant General pay out of its funds into the Public Treasury of the Island in aid of the pensions of its officers or servants a sum equal to one quarter of the total sum of the salaries paid by the Bank in each financial year to officers or servants of the Bank serving in that year or any part thereof in any post specified in an order made under subsection (1) of section 5 A of this Act and to employees of the Bank serving in each year or any part thereof to whom the provisions of the Public Employees Pension Act, 1937 apply".

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on this I take the liberty to explain in greater detail what I said before. Now what I meant by the proposal I put forward is not that the persons are dissatisfied, because there is nothing in this to make the persons concerned dissatisfied, because it is non-contributory; the employees are not contributing, so they cannot be dissatisfied.

Those of us who have been in this House long enough would know that the Peasants Loan Bank operates on a grant given by the Legislature each year. What I cannot understand is that if you are giving the Peasants Loan Bank \$10,000 or \$20,000 a year as a grant without which they cannot operate, how you can ask them to give back 25% of the salaries you say they must pay? The salaries that the Peasants Loan Bank pays are the salaries that have been constructed by the Government. The Peasants Loan Bank cannot pay its employees salaries which the Government does not approve. The salary of the Manager of the Bank has been created by the Government, and all the appointments are made by the Public Service Commission. As another example, the teachers at secondary schools get grants, but the teachers have a right as such to draw a pension under the 1947 Pensions Act though the schools get a grant. The schools do not have to pay back a percentage to the Government in order for the teachers to get a pension; so all I am saying is that it is a question of unnecessary bookkeeping, because the schools do not have to pay back money to get pensions for teachers.

If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is looking for something, let me make this quite clear to him. Let him look at the Alexandra School and the Lodge School and see what is done. In the Estimates you give a grant to second-

ary schools; secondary school teachers are entitled to a pension under the 1947 Pensions Act, but they do not have to turn around and give the Government 25% in order to get a pension. They have a right to draw a pension as a condition of employment. If the Peasants Loan Bank is part of the Government's machinery in dealing with peasant loans, to say that they should pay back 25% of the salaries is nonsense, because you are already giving them money without which they cannot operate. There is a revolving fund and you give them money to make loans; the amount of interest from peasant loans goes back to the Treasury and the Accountant General. The Peasants Loan Bank cannot operate as a business. They cannot say they pay this money out this year and it comes back to them and therefore they can operate the Bank. The Accountant General has to account for every cent they get, and it is just like fishing loans or any other revolving fund.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that in making them pay you back 25% towards their pensions, you are only making a figurative amount which is to be paid back to you when in truth and in fact it is money you are paying them, because you have to grant them the money. The Peasants Loan Bank cannot operate in 1961 unless the Government decides they are going to give them a grant in 1961; and when it comes to Housing loans, I say it is more complicated even than with the teachers, because you do not ask teachers to pay back any money. I am not a school-master; but when it comes to the schools, what you do is to find out how much comes in through fees and how much through books, and then Government makes up the amount to run the school and provides them with a pension. They are not State schools in the sense that they are elementary schools, but they get the same conditions as elementary school teachers though they are run on a different basis. It is therefore a matter, Sir, of making yourself quite clear as to what the situation is in analysing the 1947 Pensions Act in relation to an organisation like the Housing Authority which is going to be a completely different cup of tea.

All you need to have done with the Peasants Loan Bank, Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion was to make the employees eligible for pension *per se*. The question of taking back money would not arise because the Peasants Loan Bank cannot operate money without your knowledge.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I see that Clause 3 which is proposed to be substituted in place of the old section 3 reads as follows:

"Section six of the principal Act is hereby amended by deleting subsection (3A) thereof and by substituting therefor the following new subsection to be numbered '(3A)' -

'(3A) The Bank shall in respect of the financial year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-nine and every financial year thereafter"

I was just wondering if that is correct. Is that the financial year of the Bank? Does the financial year of the Bank run from January to December, the calendar year, or is it like the Government's financial year April to March? I am just bringing it to the attention of the Committee because I think it should be 1959-60 or 1960-61. (Hon. M. E. COX: It is the same as our financial year.) I do not think it is right because the financial year is not referred to in other Bills that way.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

9.20 p.m.

HOUSING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Housing Act, 1955.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Bill is somewhat similar to the other Bill which we have just passed from the point of view of effecting a pension for employees. In this case, it relates to the Housing Board.

This Bill seeks to amend the Housing Act, 1955 so as to enable certain posts in the service of the Housing Authority to be declared by order of the Governor pensionable posts thereby entitling the holders thereof to pensionable rights similar to those granted to persons employed in a civil capacity under the Government of the Island.

As some employees of the Housing Authority were formerly in the employment of the Housing Board established under the Bridgetown Housing Act, 1936, or of the Labour Welfare (Housing Loans) Organisation the Bill seeks to provide that in certain cases service with that Board or Organisation may be taken into account in determining the qualifying or pensionable service of such employees.

By Clause three, the Bill makes provision for monetary contributions by the Housing Authority in aid of the pensions of its officers and servants.

Here again, it is a question of the Authority making monetary contributions.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am definitely going to oppose this Bill. I gave reasons just now and the reasons which I am going to give now are going to be even more forcible because, as I have said, the Peasants Loan Bank is in a much different position from the Housing Authority. The Housing Authority uses Labour Welfare money and that money does not belong to the Government. The Labour Welfare Fund provides the greatest amount of money that is earmarked to the Housing Authority.

I could not sit here as one of the representatives of the workers and allow legislation to be passed like this. Now, nobody has specified it, but 25 percent of the money paid to workers is to be taken out and put back into the Treasury. This money is coming from out of the Labour Welfare Fund and the Government is now making no contribution to these people; a contribution is made to them with money from the Labour Welfare Fund. In other countries, the Labour Welfare Fund is not used for people to whom this Government is now making contributions. Money from the Labour Welfare Fund is taken out to buy housing areas and the workers do not get it back; they do not even get the rent from these housing areas. What is going to be the situation? You are now having a Bill and saying that certain of these people would be made pensionable. A man who is building a house for the Government and working in the Public Works Department gets a pension out of the Civil Service, but a man working at the Housing Authority does not get such a pension; you say that it must come out of funds which go towards the employment of him. You say 25 percent of the funds which are paid out as salaries must be taken out and paid back into the Treasury so as to determine whether he should get a pension. Bear in mind, he is working in the Government Service in the same way as the man who is building a house or a school who is working in the Public Works Department. We know that there is a shortage now, and people cannot get the maximum loan which they want from the Housing Authority, and that is the point which I made just now. These people are workers who are in the Union and we cannot sit here and allow you to do this without asking you who are the people to whom you are giving this pension. I am not going to sit here and see that you are giving certain people a pension and say that those people are the only people who should be given a pension. The Barbados Workers Union has an interest

in this because this Authority employs workers who belong to the Union and we said that we were not going to have it done in this way. We protested against that.

What is going to be the qualification to say that a man is a wholetime man? A man may be working for the Housing Authority for ten years but he is employed on a week to week basis. What is the definition of a whole-time employee? As I have said, this is now taking money from the Housing Authority which is different from the Peasants Loan Bank which spends only money from the Government. All the money that is spent by the Housing Authority is not Government's money; part of it is money from the Labour Welfare Fund. It is not money which comes down from the Legislature and is budgeted for, and I think in fairness, if you are passing something to give workers a pension - and I speak on behalf of those workers - certainly I want to be consulted on these arrangements.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a little misunderstanding about the purpose of this Bill and I think that much of the remarks made by the hon. member who has just sat down would only have arisen out of the proposals for the last. Now, Sir, the hon. member made a comment - I think he made it on the last occasion - in which he conveyed the idea that these workers are not paid 25 per cent of their salary.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that the Government was getting back or taking back 25 per cent of the salaries paid out which was money which the Government was advancing to the Peasants Loan Bank; but I say in this Department, the Housing Authority, the difference is that the workers are not making the contribution; that is to say, in this instance, it is a different thing from the Peasants Loan Bank in that 25 percent from the Housing Authority is money that is not money that comes from the Government Treasury in the same way as it comes from the Peasants Loan Bank, because part of it comes from the Labour Welfare Fund.
9.30 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member would read the Section carefully he would see that it says that the Authority shall, in respect of the financial year 1959, and every financial year thereafter, on the demand of the Accountant General pay out of its funds into the Public Treasury of this island in aid of the pensions of its officers or servants, a sum equal to one quarter of the total sum of the salaries paid by the Authority in each such financial year, and so on. I take it that, suppose out of the total grant which the Government makes to the Authority, let us say, half a million goes to salaries; the Authority, when this Bill is passed and becomes law, will take one quarter of that and put it aside towards this purpose. I put it to the hon. member that what, in effect, would happen would be that the Authority would very well come back to the Government and say: "Give us \$125,000." In effect, the Treasury will be bearing this payment. Instead of putting all of these officers in a Schedule to the Act, as we did in the case of the Secondary School Teachers, this is another way of advancing the money to the Authority.

When they are framing their Estimates, they have to take out this amount and they will ask for a further amount so as not to deplete their annual grant. We will be refunding the Authority from year to year. I do not think you will find that the Labour Welfare Fund will be losing anything.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Minister for the reply which he has given; but what I would like to point out further is that in this Clause you are granting people pensions. You are talking about Civil Servants and this is an Authority or a Board here. In the Trade Union we do not understand anybody fishing us around. Mr. Lashley is made a Civil Servant; when the Minister says that this is money which the Treasury pays out, I want him to understand that you do not pay this money out of the Treasury. The Hon. Minister must get that clear. The fact that the Governor-in-Executive Committee administers the money which is paid into the Labour Welfare Fund, does not mean that these funds are Government funds. If you say that, what would you say about the Sugar Rehabilitation Fund?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I have not denied that these funds will not constitute the total revenue which is put at the disposal of this Board. What I am saying is that in the final analysis the amount is being set aside for this purpose will be coming from the Government and no funds will be depleted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I could not agree with the Hon. Minister there. If you have one million dollars in the Labour Welfare Fund to give to the Board and you have 25%, you cannot come and give them one million dollars plus 25%. Under the Act, the Government can give to the Labour Welfare Fund more money than that Fund has collected; the Authority may pay out money from the Labour Welfare Fund (Hon. M. E. COX: Oh, No, No.) The bulk of the money comes from this Fund. You have three sources for money; it may be you have four. I want to say that the carpenters whom you are employing at the Housing Authority are not going to build the houses for the Civil Servants. I am dealing with the Authority in connection with which you are employing workmen which has nothing to do with the loan aspect of the matter.

What I say, Mr. Chairman, is this; this is a complicated matter. It is not a straightforward matter. The Peasants' Loan Bank only had eight people, but this is something where you have carpenters, masons, clerks, inspectors and all of them are employed by the Authority which is responsible for all the employees who are there; but the Authority does not get all of the money (ASIDES). I have to represent these people; who are the certain people here? There is no Schedule and why should I sit here and agree that only whole-time people must be entitled to this pension when there is nothing clear to show who these people are? A carpenter may not be a whole-time man. Who are these other people who are building these houses for you up and down the country?

This Bill in section 2 9(1) says this:-

"The Governor may by order declare any post in the service of the Authority to be a pensionable post and such order shall, subject to the approval of both House of the Legislature, have effect as if it were an order made under the authority of subsection (1) of section two of the Pensions Act, 1947."

9.40 p.m.

The hon. member said he had these financial discussions with the Auditor General and the Financial Secretary. Financial discussions are not a mystery to me because the Financial Secretary of Barbados or the Auditor General are not mystery people; so there is not anything they will discuss that nobody can understand. What I know is that our point of view is not in this Bill, to know who is going to get a pension by this. I am not going to sit down and agree that you should give certain people a pension when we do not know who the people are and who are going to be left out. We want to know whom the Board has in mind. Who are the people the Board is thinking of? Where do we stand? How are we going to know if we pass this Bill? Are we going to take 25% of their money and say it is money from the Treasury?

Part of this fund, Mr. Chairman, is Labour Welfare money, and I have to point out incessantly that Labour Welfare money comes from a source other than a Government source; it comes from the manufacture of sugar in

Barbados and the workers play a very important part in it; and if at the Housing Authority you have people to whom you are going to give pensionable rights, we want to know at what stage you are going to stop. These people must be made known to us because you have a large number of people working in the Housing Authority, and knowing the nature of your work, some work and some are laid off, and some go back on to work; but we want to know the people. Are you going to treat these people in a manner where you will consider the amount of time they have put in? All of these are things we want to discuss; you may have it in mind, but it is not stated, and we want these things stated.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member wants to know who these people are and the posts that will be declared. That is a matter for the Governor as soon as this Bill is passed, because this amendment will give the Governor power to declare certain posts pensionable; so we do not know yet who they will be. When the Bill is passed it will be declared by an Order that will come down to this House, and we will know; but as far as I understand, nothing of that nature can be done until this amendment is passed which will give the Governor authority to do things.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Premier; but what I wanted to point out is that there are people at the Housing Board who are not pious Civil Servants that cannot ask questions. They are people who are represented by a Trade Union. We do not work with any Governor and we want the Government to say who are these people before the Bill is passed. We want to be in a position to know, if you are passing a Bill creating pensionable posts, who are the people you have in mind.

No employer, Mr. Chairman, can come to Barbados and say: "This is what I am going to do for the workers here, take it." I do not care what was done at the Peasants Loan Bank; they are Civil Servants and we do not represent them; but we represent the workers and we do not want, after this is passed, the Governor to tell us whom he is going to appoint, because the Governor has nobody to pension; he cannot pension anybody in Barbados. It is for the Government to tell us now so that we can say we do not feel these are the people you should pension. I want to say that these are not the days when you pass a Bill for everybody willy-nilly. We have a direct interest in this, and when you say that the Governor is going to do this, we do not want the Governor to pass any pension for any worker we represent. We want to tell you the people whom we feel are entitled and ask whether you are going to give them a pension. We want to have a full discussion as to the person eligible and not whom the Governor decides, because this is an Authority.

We do not represent the Civil Servants, Mr. Chairman, and I am speaking here as one who has to speak on behalf of these people. When we pass this into law, the Housing Authority cannot change it. We want at this stage to know the sort of people you have in mind, because you will come back on another occasion and say the law is passed and we can do nothing.

Mr. TALMA: Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I must say that in dealing with this particular Bill we have not got enough information, because this is an unwieldy organisation in the sense that it comprises many workers, and we should have more information before us to guide us. When the hon. member raised the point about the various categories of workers who will be included in this Pension Bill, I agree with him wholeheartedly. I feel we need not only to know the various categories of workers to be included, but also the number of workers at present engaged and employed at the Housing Authority, the salaries and wages paid out at present per month and the number of people presently engaged, as well as things like what period of continuous service the Government has in mind. It is not good enough to pass legislation like this without knowing what you are doing; and when the hon. member made the point that the bulk of money which finances the running of this Housing Authority comes from the Labour Welfare Fund, he is on solid ground.

I think the Government gives a small grant, Mr. Chairman, but the millions of dollars spent by the Housing Authority is money created by the Labour Welfare Fund which is well known to all Government members and most of the members of the House. It is in reality ear-marking their own money, broadly speaking, for a pension fund; and if you ear-mark a sum of money from the Labour Welfare Fund for the payment of pensions and gratuities, you are incidentally reducing the Labour Welfare Fund *pro tanto*. I am not really concerned with that point so much. I feel it is a good thing to make provision for the payment of gratuities and pensions for all workers at the Housing Authority, and especially to see that for the service which was rendered in the past by these officers, whether it was under the old Housing Board or any other term by which it was known, when they resign, full remuneration and full consideration will be given.

I certainly feel that we need more information. It is not a small Board or small body such as the Peasants Loan Bank, Mr. Chairman, but it is an Authority which employs hundreds of people, and we should have these figures before us to guide us in determining whether a quarter of the total salaries or wages will be sufficient. The bulk of money paid out by the Housing Authority goes in wages to carpenters, masons and general workers because they are in greater numbers; so I suppose that the word "salaries" used here includes wages. I feel, Sir, that one-quarter should be ample, but we would like further particulars to guide us. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is on good ground where this particular Bill is concerned, although in the case of the Peasants Loan Bank I did not agree with him generally. In this case he is absolutely correct.
9.50 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I really do not see what more information is needed. When this Bill is passed, an Order will be made by the Governor and they will be treated as Civil Servants from the point of view of their pensions and their pensionable rights. If you were to look at page two, you will see at (1):-

"The Governor may by order declare any post in the service of the Authority to be a pensionable post and such order shall, subject to the approval of both Houses of the Legislature, have effect as if it were an order made under the authority of subsection (1) of section two of the Pensions Act, 1947."

I think there is quite enough safeguard for people who might be made pensionable under this Order. I repeat, that the Order cannot be made until such time as this Bill is passed. The Governor has no authority to make the Order until this Bill is passed and when this Bill is passed, the Order will come before the Legislature.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on behalf of over 300 people, not 300 little children. I am saying that this has been the custom in passing this type of legislation for Civil Servants; but you are passing something for workmen who are organised in a Trade Union and they want to know something about it. We do not like people doing something for us; we want to be consulted. We are not interested in what the Governor is going to do. You are passing a Pension Bill in which you say that you are giving certain people a pension. We say that there are things about this Bill which we want to know something about. We represent more people who are working in this Authority than people who are working in it on a salaried basis. We represent the people who build the houses. It has more people in that phase of work than in any of the branches of this Government. We have nearly as many people there as may be in the whole Civil Service. As I have said, we represent over 300 people in the Housing Authority alone; so we are not speaking for just one or two people. I want to know all of the implications on behalf of the workers. I want to know the number who will be affected by this and how much 25 per cent means. I want to know all of the financial implications. In British Guiana, and in Trinidad, the Government would not have the opportunity of passing any Bill

like this because you are passing a Bill which you, yourself, are going to administer. The Ministers decide how much money they must have. This is the only territory in the whole of the West Indies where you find Ministers are still administering the Labour Welfare Fund. The Minister of Housing and the Minister of Social Services can sit down and decide how much money you should give to the Labour Welfare Fund. No Minister decides that in British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica. That is done by a Board.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot participate in passing this Bill like this; therefore, I will have to withdraw. I cannot agree with this.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of a Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Employees Pension Act, 1937.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is consequential to the passing of those two other Bills. Consequent on the passing of those two former Bills, permission is now being sought to amend the Public Employees Pension Act, 1937, in order that provision may be made for paying pensions and gratuities to certain persons employed by the Housing Authority and the Peasants Loan Bank in the same way as pensions and gratuities are paid to persons in similar occupation under the Government of the Island.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 18th August, 1960, at 3 o'clock p.m.,

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 18th August, 1960, at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.05 p.m.