
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 18th August, 1960.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3.00 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. F. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); 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*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. J. W. CORBIN and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 16th August have not yet been circulated amongst hon. members.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The time being after 3.15 p.m., the House will commence Private Members' Business.

On the last occasion the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before the Government Business was resumed on the last occasion, I was attempting to speak on the pickups. Before I deal with the pickups today, I think it would be wise for me to read from the speech I made when we were going to pass the Transport Board Bill. I am going to read it because it would make one feel as if I knew what was going to happen before it happened. It reads as follows:-

"Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill coming from the Government is one of the wisest that has ever come before the House. When one takes into consideration the fact that this Government appointed a Committee to go into the question of bus fares and that this particular Committee made recommendations for an increase, but at the

time informed the public that bus concessionaires must keep proper books, in my opinion as a layman, I feel that the particular books which this Committee expected would have been kept for them to peruse, they would not get.

"Again, I think if you are going to make recommendations for an increase in bus fares, that the figures which you should have seen would justify your making such a recommendation; but when you make a recommendation for an increase in bus fares and also say that those people must also keep proper books, I am at a loss to believe that the figures you saw gave you an accurate account of the business.

"Sir, I feel that this Bus Fares Enquiry Committee is responsible for all this confusion we are in today. If the Committee had done its job properly, the bus concessionaires would be carrying on their concessions up to today because the Committee would have recommended that bus concessionaires keep their concessions for another year, and would have called on them during the meantime to keep proper books.

"What caused the Committee to recommend an increase of bus fares? I feel the Committee recommended an increase just as a layman would. Looking at it from a layman's point of view, one would say that the bus fares should be increased because from 1939 the fare was three cents per mile and at that time a complete bus cost \$2,000 or \$3,000 and the wages of bus drivers and conductors were ten shillings a week, and \$5; but today the cost of a bus is around \$7,000 and the wages of bus drivers and conductors are \$14 and \$12 a week.
3.25 p.m.

"Looking at it from that point of view one would say that bus fares should also be increased. But you cannot go by that to recommend an increase, because there is the possibility in those days that concessionaires were making too much; but today they are not making so much, but yet are not losing money. When you do not keep proper books you leave one to wonder anything.

"I do not know what method this Committee adopted to go into the facts, but I think if the Committee had the way-bills of the particular routes and the data of how many miles were registered by each bus on the routes, and how much gasoline was used and the number of passengers transported to and from the City, such figures would be something to go by. As soon as the Committee suggested that they must keep proper books they put everybody in doubt; and I think the present Government must have had a doubt when they read that. What can justify an increase in bus fares if proper books are not kept?

"I am going to warn this Government about the setting up of this Transport Board because Government is very fortunate or unfortunate in picking the wrong people to do a job. Government has got to be very careful in appointing

personnel to this Board, because you may find that the persons whom you appoint are those who are just showing you a good face. I have noticed that the personnel of this particular Board would be selected by the Executive Committee; and I am warning you again to be very careful in selecting the personnel of that Board.

"I have also noticed under Section 5; subsection (iii) that a person shall be disqualified from being appointed or being a member of the Board so long as he is a member of either House of the Legislature. I do not agree to that for one moment.

"Here it is that you have on the Housing Board, the Sugar Agricultural Board and most of the other Boards, politicians or members of this House, but in this case you are muzzling the mouths of one or two of the members of either this House or the Other Place. What is a member of the Legislature? Is he a villain, a thief or a vagabond? What should there be to prevent either a member of this House or of the Other Place from being a member of this particular Board?

"I would like to know from the Hon. Minister the reason why you are trying to muzzle the members on this particular Board. It may be a commercial concern, but you have members of the Legislature who know about commerce. It is true that it is not everybody who knows about it, but you may go outside and get some people to be members who do not know anything about it. If you have a member of this Chamber or of the Other Place who knows anything about running this affair, I feel that such a person should be a member of that Board."

Now, Sir, I must apologise for reading from my own speech and reading it so poorly; my eyes are giving some trouble, but not my brain. My sight may be a bit faulty, but not my brain. You have heard the speech that I have made before we set up the Transport Board and that it was a possibility of selecting the wrong people. What has happened? The same thing has happened. You selected the wrong people and from the beginning you selected the wrong people. The Hon. Minister of Communications has inherited a bad egg and there is where I cannot sing the song, "He has to go"; I will continue to say that he is not responsible for it. I know of many things of which I can speak but I am not prepared to say anything of them here.

Relative to the pickups, St. Joseph and St. Thomas are the two parishes which have the most pickups. I have the honour to represent St. Joseph and the Hon. Minister of Communications and the Hon. Premier are the ones who represent St. Thomas. Now, how can anyone think that myself, or even those two Ministers who are responsible for the parishes which have to use pickups would be responsible for taking pickups off the roads? I would not credit them with any commonsense. I would think that they would be very foolish to do so. If that were their feeling, I would credit myself with the commonsense to shout for "murder" and "no, do not do that." I have that commonsense because I am representing a parish that has a great use for pickups.

There was a time when the Transport Board suggested that the pickups were causing the buses not to pay their way and there was a move to slow down the pickups or get rid of them. I did my part as a representative of the people and took one of the Officers of the Transport Board — I think it was Mr. Archer — to Melvin Hill and all the way up to Newcastle and to Bath. I may say that I was lucky enough to take him at the correct time, but in fact, I know the time the people would be on the roads and going out for their goods, and this gentleman saw the people all along the roadsides with their large bags of bananas and coconuts and so on, waiting for the pickups. I pointed out to him that the buses would not be of any use for that. I then took him down in a particular cart road which gave him a lot of trouble to turn around his car but the people were at the bottom of that road waiting for a pickup which came, and he had to admit to me that it would be impossible to put a bus at their disposal to do that job.
3.35 p.m.

The only help to which these people have to look forward, would be for the pickup man to go through on evenings and go into these cart-roads, take up their luggage and bring it to their homes. As soon as the goods are ready for Bridgetown, would it be fair to stop that pickup owner from taking these people into town? The buses may accommodate them from their homes after they have the goods ready, but it would not be fair either to these people or to the pick-up owners to get them off the road. You would thereby be inconveniencing these people in getting their goods to their homes and you would also be unfair to the pick-up owner in preventing him from getting a livelihood. This kind of job cannot interfere with a bus because the bus has its route and nobody who is going into town to do shopping with an ordinary hand-bag would use a pick-up when it is already loaded with luggage. These people are not going to use the pick-ups; these pick-ups are sticking to their jobs. I can understand if the Transport Board Authorities want to curb these pick-ups in some way or other from going into the bus stand and taking passengers out of the buses because that would not be fair. You may have a bus moving off at 2 o'clock and at 1.30 o'clock it may have half-a-dozen passengers; a pick-up comes along and the people, wanting to get home, may get out of the bus, use the pick-up and at 2 o'clock the bus will have to pull out of the stand empty. You cannot stand for that sort of thing. You will have to see how many pick-ups are helping the hawkers; you should have them registered and then do not give permits for any more. That is to keep them from going too far; but the present pick-ups which are doing the job, are doing a fine job, and it would be very hard to put them off the road completely.

You may tell the hawkers that you are not going to do away with the pick-ups because they can still carry their goods. There may be a goods vehicle, but do not expect for one moment that a hawker is going to fix her tray with her yellow bananas, put them into a pick-up and then wait for a bus to go into town to find the pick-up already waiting, or the same hawker will have to wait until the pick-up comes in with the goods. You are only asking for trouble if you prevent these hawkers from travelling on the same pick-up with their luggage. That is out of the question. If you say: "We are not preventing you from carrying the luggage; you can carry as much luggage as you want but not passengers", that is impossible. To begin with, some of the people, in order to get their goods into town safely and prevent them from being crushed, because yellow bananas cannot bear any insults — sometimes these people will sit in the pick-ups and keep their trays in their lap so as to prevent the other hawkers' trays from squeezing their produce. You cannot stop that, but you will be stopping it if you stop the pick-ups. I will never agree to that; I know that it will never happen. It may be that some people misunderstand this pick-up question. I have not seen the letter which I have heard came from the Director of Highways and Transport to these pick-up owners. I do not know what was in that particular letter which might have caused the honourable introducer of this Resolution to introduce it. He may have seen trouble in the air and he tried to put his foot on it right away. As I say, I did not see the letter, but the Director of Highways and Transport knows that he cannot stop the pick-ups. If you want to ask for any blood-shed, stop them; I myself will join in the trouble. I am not thinking of the pick-up owner now, but it is these poor people, the hawkers in general, who will meet a very big hardship if a pick-up man cannot come and take them up with their luggage and bring them back home. I have seen that for myself and I had Mr. Archer to go into the matter. We had certain hawkers who have certain days for going into town.

There is a vehicle — I would have to call it a lorry — the owner of which cannot put a top on it because he would be reported; he can only carry people with their luggage. One morning I passed them by Exchange; the hawkers were soaking wet and the man had to take them back home. Is that fair treatment to people who are trying to eke out a living? No. We have to do everything possible to keep the pick-ups on the road. I would not be a party to a pick-up owner going into the bus stand and robbing the buses; you will have to prevent that and you will have to stop giving

permits to people who now want to come into the business. You will have to keep those whom you have now, but do not stop the ones you have already.

Let us take the parish of St. Thomas. We are all politicians and we cannot get in here without the votes of these people. We have to put ourselves in all forms and positions so as to get the people to vote for us. You may have two pick-ups in St. Thomas - I do not come to St. Joseph yet but if you do away with the pick-ups in St. Thomas they are only two votes; but what about the hawkers who have the votes? They are all women, and it is the women who are responsible for most of us being in here. I do not say that the men do not do their jobs but the women do the voting and they canvass successfully too. When a woman begins to canvass, you only have to stand by and watch. (*Laughter*). I do not care who says: "Smith is only vote-catching;" if you do not do that, you, like everyone of us, can see what will happen. As to this vote catching, I feel good catching these votes; they are substantial votes which nobody else can get. (*Laughter*)

3.45 p.m.

I will never forget, Sir, that in the first year when the franchise was lowered, and these hawkers had the opportunity to vote, one of the members of the Vestry of St. Joseph brought up the matter of asking that these hawkers be made to pay trade tax. He was so vile at the results of the poll and felt that the hawkers were responsible for it that he brought up that matter in the Vestry seeking legislation to make these hawkers pay a trade tax. I shouted for murder, but the tide was against me, and when the tide is against you you can only go by it; but I was in the minority and the matter got as far as the Solicitors. The Solicitors' reply to the Vestry was that you could not make these people pay a trade tax because they may buy their goods in St. Joseph and sell them in Bridgetown. These people got the opportunity to vote and voted for the two members for St. Joseph at the time 100%, and that was the reaction and what one member in the St. Joseph Vestry tried to do.

Mr. Speaker, the same member is living and looking; he did not succeed in making them pay the tax, but he would be living long enough to see one of the same members whom these people voted for so wholeheartedly at that time being the same member to say: "get rid of the pick-ups." I do not know how one would take it, but I know how I would take it, and for that reason, I can assure this House that you would not see these pick-ups go off the road in haste. I am saying that it cannot be done, and I would not like to see it because they are doing a public service. The Government does not have to subsidise the pickups; the pickups pay their way through. You do not have to import a man to run them; they are on the road, they pay trade tax, highway tax. They are no trouble to the Government and I do not see why this Government should be any trouble to them.

You, Sir, live in a parish where I do not think there are so many hawkers, maybe only from the fish end of it, but I can remember a song which says that the breadfruits come from St. Joseph; but even with these fish people, at a certain time I can see the same pickups wending their way with these hawkers and taking the fish into the Bridgetown Market. How can one expect that that hawker must put her fish into a pickup and then wait for a bus to come into town to receive them? It cannot work. I do not think therefore that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy should have any fear. He may be sitting back and feeling happy to see that is not going to be done, and he may say that if he did not make this step forward, it would have been done. Well, the answer to that is that that may have happened if there were no representatives of the people in the parishes which have the most need for the pickups.

Mr. Speaker, St. Lucy is a parish which I feel can do without a pickup, but St. Joseph or St. Thomas cannot. They would have to do without it if legislation were enacted to such an effect that you could not get a pickup; but how long do you think they would do without it? They would only do without it for a session. If you were to wait until the next election and bring it in soon after that, you can only blow that comb for five years, after which there would be no more

comb blowing. I do not think that the members of my Party or of my Government could be so ignorant as to close their eyes to such a fact. They would not want me to tell them that because they know it. Why is it that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is so afraid as to want to pass this Resolution to get rid of one Minister when in my opinion I do not think that particular Minister could do everything on his own? He cannot do everything on his own because there is a Cabinet and he must put it before the Cabinet, and if it were so, it would have to be agreed upon by all.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has to depend on the same hawkers for good, nice votes, votes that make good men lose deposits, because I think there were a few in the last election who did lose their deposits. Whom do you think was responsible for that? Do you think it was the ordinary man or school teacher who is going to take the bus once a month? It is those girls who have to use the pickups daily; so I do not think that the hon. member should waste time in thinking that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas could make such a blundering mistake. As I said, I have not seen the letter; I do not know if the Director could write a letter on his own without the permission or approval of the Minister. I do not have any faith to put in these boys at the top, these Heads of Departments or Directors, because they can break up a good spree if they want to, and if any Minister were to sit there and allow any of them to make it hard for the Party, the Government or themselves, that is his business. I cannot see for the life of me a letter going out to these pickup owners telling them that they have to go off the road by such a date, and now there must have been another letter telling them not to go off yet. That is child's sport. (Mr. BRANCKER: Three months more.) They should have said three more years unless they want to adopt the policy of renewing licences every three months. If at the end of every three months you are going to give them another three months, that is all right, and the only person who would be losing would be the Government through the stationery used, but the pickup owners would not be losing anything. If these pickups are taken off, you will then see the people of Barbados and you would be more than deceived to see the reaction of those whom you think were angels all the time.

3.55 p.m.

It would be a big surprise to me, but I am sure that that is not going to happen during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party, during the time that they are in power. I am sure that you would not see these particular pickups that cater to these hawkers off the road. I am only one person, but I am sure that as long as the Barbados Labour Party is in power you are not going to see these particular pickups off the road. I would not be so boastful to say as long as I am in the House because one may say that Smith wants to get the people afraid and make them vote for him; but if I am in or out of this House, as long as the Labour Party is in power you will not see it. You will never see my people in St. Joseph having to go with these heavy breadfruits and coconuts on their heads from so far. It used to be done before. These people had to get out of their beds early on mornings and head these bananas, breadfruits and so on to town. That is what I know used to happen because it has happened to a particular school friend of my own. His mother used to wake him up on mornings and load him up with bananas and the two of them had to walk to town. On one occasion they went along together talking as was their custom, but when they got to Hothersal Turning, she discovered that he had few bananas in his tray. She asked him, "what has happened with the bananas?" and he said, "Ma, they were so heavy, I ate some and gave away some." Do you think we are going back to those days? As a matter of fact, the children of today would not do it for anything. We are going ahead.

Sir, if these few pickups are responsible for buses losing money, well, I think you better catch afire the buses. If these few pickups that are on the roads and doing a good job and are trying to help hawkers would be responsible for losses in any bus concern, well, the buses had better get off the roads and let the pickups run. As a businessman, I cannot see it. When a pickup picks up eight or ten people

and brings them to town, in order that that pickup owner should get through life and make a living, he has to look for other work to do. He has to look for anyone who has lumber to cart and such things. What he gets from taking these people to town is too small to keep him and he will not get that type of passenger to keep him running up and down during the day. As I have said, those persons who have to come into town to do business are different from those who are bringing their goods to town. Those coming to town to do business will be only carrying a handbag or so and they are going to use the bus because the bus is more comfortable, especially the buses which are running in the country nowadays; but these buses cannot cater to the people who are coming to town with breadfruits, bananas and such things. They may have racks for putting parcels; but if you put trays with bananas and breadfruits in them, you will not have any room for the passengers; so I cannot see how it would ever be the intention of this Minister of Communications to do the public such a disservice by trying to get these particular pickups off the roads — those pickups which I have referred to, those pickups that have to go all about those cart roads from St. Joseph and St. Thomas up to St. John and part of St. Philip for fruit. I say that because there are some people who plant bananas in those other two parishes; but the people who live in St. Joseph and St. Thomas have to drive up there to get these goods.

Sir, I do not think you will ever get a bus concessionaire to do this sort of work. I am sure that you will have to let the pickup run because this service cannot be done by a bus, especially these buses which are running nowadays. The present bus concessionaires seem to me as if they are competing with the Transport Board in their fleet of buses because they are doing away with their old gasoline units. Of course, it is said that the gasoline motors are carrying away the money; so these people are getting diesel buses. I cannot see the Minister doing away with pickups; I cannot see him thinking along these lines. I am not saying anything for the Minister; he is not dumb; he can talk for himself.

You also have this situation. At nights, these meeting-room people go from church to church when they are having their services. The boss of the mission room goes and hires these pickups because they do not get so many people going these places as to hire a bus; so they use the small pickups to get their meeting-people to and fro. You cannot stop them. Whether they are worthy of going to the church is no business of ours, but you should not stop them. Just as I get into a pickup and go to a dance, they get into a pickup and go to their meetings. No one can stop me from going where I like; so no one should stop them. Therefore, when you are interfering with these pickups, you are asking for trouble — and not sweet trouble; you are asking for bitter trouble. Some trouble is sweet.

Sir, I do not think I have to say anything more, but I will say this. I can remember one of the pickup owners coming to me. I think he is from St. John and he told me that he has to shut down going to town and it is a very serious thing for him to do. I told him "Man, do not worry with that; you are not going to see that happening." He said, "no, no, Sir, do not say that. 'Dips' knows more than you. 'Dips' says it is going to happen."

4.05 p.m.

He said: "I will wait and see because I do not think 'Dips' could put me wrong." I said: "He would more put you wrong than right this time; you are not going to be moved off." After he heard that the time was extended, he came back and said: "Skipper, you seem to be true; we are not going yet." I said: "You are not going at all." He said: "Well, I do not believe 'Dips' any more."

Mr. Speaker, after such an assurance like that which I gave to one who is not one of my electors, you would not want me to tell this House the assurance which I gave to my electors. They came to me in droves; they came to me in pickups. I said "I feel I should be selling 'grogs', but I do not sell them." These pickups are not going off as long as I am Lloyd Smith in the House and the Labour

Party is in power. I am appealing to the Minister to find out ways and means whereby he can keep these particular pickups which I have mentioned on the road for the benefit of these hawkers, the hawkers on the whole, not merely those who are in St. Joseph or in St. Thomas. Let the Minister see to it that no more pickups go on the road for this particular purpose; but as to the ones which are there already, he must allow them to remain until he can find a remedy for going up to Newcastle, Three Houses, Martins Bay and Foster Hall. Until he can find the transport to suit these people, let him not interfere with them.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend entering this debate for the simple reason that I was a member of the Government at the time when these buses were nationalised, or rather some of them. It is for that reason that I had no intention whatever of speaking in this particular debate because it can be said, and quite rightly so, that I was a member of the Government which took over these buses and I must have agreed entirely with the policy which was then adopted. I must say, however, that I am rather disappointed to see that, after all these years of trials and errors, we have not been fortunate in obtaining better results. I regard myself almost as a member of the Government and I feel about nationalisation now in the same way as I felt about it then. I felt that the Government did a wise thing in nationalising the buses then and I feel so now. I regard transport as a public utility service, and if the transportation system of the island is falling to pieces, so to speak, it is because at the time when the buses were taken over they were found to be deeply unserviceable. Mr. Speaker, I remember at the time that more than fifty percent of the buses — and that is a conservative estimate — which were taken over were unserviceable and useless. What has always struck me is that the Government nationalised the buses at that time and had unserviceable buses which were on their hands and which, of necessity, they would have to replace. As far as that aspect of the matter is concerned, it is not my business now; but the Government, in my view, did go to the rescue of the concessionaires at the time and played a great part in rendering a public service to the country as a whole.

When I see these enormous sums being voted for the Transport Board, to me it is not very surprising because I am aware of the fact that when the buses were taken over — I speak under correction, probably, but I speak *ex tempore* — I think there were over 64 unserviceable units. I do not mean that they could not be ridden in but they were unserviceable units, mechanically speaking. When the Government comes down here every now and then for enormous sums of money, when the Transport Board has spent over \$1 million, it is not very surprising to me at all because the buses were more or less old junk when they were taken over. That is the premise on which we must start. I am not attempting to defend the Minister: he can do that more ably than I can; but in fairness to him I must say that a very bad legacy was bequeathed to him and no matter which Minister it was — probably the Minister who finds the most favour in the sight of the Opposition is the Minister of Education — but whoever it was, no matter what Minister was handling that portfolio, he would find himself in the same predicament today.

In so far as the expenditure is concerned, no matter which Minister was in office of whichever Party, he would find himself in a similar predicament in that a bad legacy was bequeathed and passed on to him. I am not blaming the Minister who passed it on, either; a bad legacy was dumped on him; indeed something cumbersome was dumped on him. I sympathise with the Minister in that respect. Why I sympathise with him is that I think a bad legacy was bequeathed to him in taking over that portfolio; yet it is in this respect that I must agree with the Leader of our Party, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I agree entirely with his motion for a vote of "no confidence" in this respect.

4.15 p.m.

I agree entirely with his vote of "no confidence" in this respect, that although a bad legacy was bequeathed to

the present Minister in so far as inevitable and necessary expenditure is concerned, yet the Minister should realise that he is the Minister now in a new Government and should not attempt to enforce any old policy which might have been enunciated and laid down by a former Government, because that is where I think the Minister is going wrong.

This policy which the Minister is attempting to implement, Mr. Speaker, is an old policy with which I am familiar, and I think it was the policy in my time in the last Government up to 1956 which has been passed on to him. He can deny it if he wants to, but that is the mistake he is making because it is not a clear-cut policy and a policy of trying to withhold licences from pickups. With one breath they are luggage vans and people can travel on them with their trays, and with another breath or at some other time these same people are reported for carrying passengers and there is a lot of confusion with the police authorities. I know something of the history of this matter; so I can say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a lot of confused administration, confused policy and everything else.

The time has come when there should be a clear-cut policy. After almost four years, since 1955 when some of the buses were nationalised, one should have learnt one's mistakes; but after four years I must say the Minister has found one or two more competent people to run the Transport Board. There are no longer people who were not intelligent as at one time, and men of a certain amount of ability can now be found on the Transport Board. So as far as improving the personnel of the Board is concerned, various tries have been made in this respect and great improvement has been made in the bus service, because speaking for myself and the people for the parish which I have the honour to represent, we in Christ Church are grateful to some extent to the present Transport Board and the Minister for a better service. There are many new routes which have been created and it is now possible to get buses more regularly through a better schedule on many of the routes; so to jump up here and make a popular speech is one thing, but to get down to the real facts is another.

Where the Minister and ourselves in the Opposition cross swords is on this question of the pickups, because while agreeing in principle with the speech made by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew — and I consider it a very admirable speech although it might not have had the most scientific phraseology — I think it was one of the best speeches made in this Chamber on this particular matter. In other words, he has almost said precisely what I had in mind, and as I go along, you will see that my speech more or less coincides with his in many material respects.

It is on this question of the pickups, Sir, that we stand at variance and diametrically opposed to the antics of the Ministers, and in the Cabinet system to the actions and antics of the Cabinet, because I take it that the whole Cabinet is involved and just not the Minister. Since there is a Cabinet system of Government, the whole Cabinet is involved and that is where, although the Leader of the Opposition is a much more experienced Parliamentarian than I am and very well versed in constitutional law, being a Lawyer, and normally I should bow to his rulings or suggestions, I thought when I first returned that this might not have been the correct method of doing it — and you will remember that I came back when this vote of "no confidence" had already been tabled — in that a vote of "no confidence" should not be levelled at a Minister but at the entire Government. It is a very unorthodox way in my view, but I regard the Premier as the man who is completely in control over his Ministers. We in the Opposition may try to embarrass a particular Minister, but to do it in this way is not strictly constitutional. Anyway I merely said that for myself; probably I should not have spoken as I did but that is my general get-up. *(Cheers from Government.)*

While saying that I do not regard this probably as the most scientific way, yet if it is that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is correct from the constitutional point of

view, it is my duty to support him, and as I am doubtful, I accept his view as being the better view.

Now on this question of pickups, Mr. Speaker, it was since 1956 or thereabouts that according to the old policy of the Premier — I refer to the former Premier of Barbados who is now the Prime Minister of the West Indies — the Government insisted on having these pickups taken off the roads. There was no Cabinet in those days; the Ministers were members of the Executive and all went along with him including myself. Pickups in Christ Church were taken off the road and licences were not issued to them since 1956. As far as Christ Church is concerned, it is an old grievance with us; but I want the people of Christ Church to know — and I hope the Reporters would at least do me this good turn through the papers — that the ban has now been lifted. It cannot be lifted for the Leeward parishes — St. James, St. Peter, St. Lucy — and not for the balance of the Island including Christ Church; so I want them to fully realise that pickup owners island-wide, in St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. John, St. Philip and Christ Church and even in St. Michael are at liberty to apply for licences to the Director of Highways and Transport.

4.25 p.m.

The ban has been lifted for three months and they probably have two months to run. I take it that this three months period will be renewed and renewed until after the election has gone because I cannot see a sensible Labour Government taking such drastic steps with the elections just a year off.

I happen to know for a fact that the Democratic Labour Party which is the Official Opposition has won a victory in so far as pickups are concerned and we have to thank the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is the Leader of the Opposition for his remarkable speech on this particular matter in that after he had spoken it was really a repetition to hear the other speeches; but I think in politics that has to happen. One has to do a certain amount of speaking; else one's time in here would be shortlived. It is for that reason that the present Hon. Minister of Communications is merely implementing the old policy of the Government of 1956; and in doing that, he is making a mess of it and getting himself in muddy waters. He has to forget the old silly policy which could never be implemented.

For some reason or the other, the pickups in Christ Church and St. Philip were taken off the roads ever since 1956 and 1957. It may be said that there are not so many hawkers up there and that breadfruits and coconuts come from St. Thomas and St. Joseph and places like that; but I would like the Hon. Minister to know that we have many hawkers selling fish from Oistins right up to the Crane and so on and we need pickups to convey them around just as much as anybody else. What is more — the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries is not in his seat, but I warn him if he is attempting to set up proper marketing associations without the services of the pickups, the whole scheme would fail. I do not intend to attack the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, but apparently he is sleeping on this matter. If he had taken the proper stand when the Cabinet considered this matter, he for one would have dissuaded the other Ministers — and the Hon. Premier in particular — from any suggestion of withdrawing licences from pickup owners who ply in the Leeward parishes. Unless we have a cheap and easy means of transporting food crops from the fields and unless we have all the facilities for these hawkers to get along with their trade, their parcels and luggage, how can they succeed?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m., the House will proceed with Government Business.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day, under Government Business, stands in the name of the Hon.

Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the services of the Colony.

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1960-61, No. 13

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries. I should just like to say that it should have been under the name of the Hon. Premier on the Order Paper.

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (6) HEALTH CENTRES

Head XXIII - Medical (6) Health Centres - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as you will see, there is some mistake made, but the Hon. Premier generally deals with finance. According to the Note to this Item, Incidentals, it sets out clearly the purpose of this expenditure. The volume of work at the Public Health Laboratory at Enmore has so increased that the technicians have had to assist in washing apparatus, which is contrary to laboratory practice and it involves delay.

Supplementary provision of \$317.00 is required to provide a part-time bottle washer for the Public Health Laboratory at the St. Michael Health Centre.

I beg to move that Head XXIII (6), Item 55, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: The note to the first Item under this Head, Item 4 - Purchase of safes for Government Departments - says -

"A safe has been extensively damaged and has had to be replaced. This has almost exhausted the vote, and further provision is required in order that funds may be available to purchase safes which may be required at short notice by Departments."

As regards the second Item - Item 43, Ex-Gratia payments for Compensation, the note says -

"It is necessary to pay compensation of \$342.62 as a result of an accident which occurred on the location of certain Government works. The balance in the vote is insufficient to meet this payment and opportunity is being taken to supplement the item to meet any other claims during the year."

I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, Sir, this Resolution was given notice of by the Hon. Pre-

mier. It has no "Objects and Reasons" which I can see, and I received it for the first time last night. We seem now to be dealing with something with which we are not very *au fait*, neither the people on this side of the House nor the Minister who has introduced it. I think it is necessary that these matters of public expenditure should bear more scrutiny by the persons concerned whose job it is to do that.

Now, Sir, this note says that a safe has been extensively damaged and the amount I see here is \$470. The note goes on to say:-

"This has almost exhausted the vote and further provision is required in order that funds may be available to purchase safes which may be required at short notice by Departments."

Mr. Chairman, what type of safe is it which will cost in the vicinity of \$470 or less? If at short notice a safe is going to be purchased, I would like to get some idea of what this type of safe is, because an ordinary, simple, little 18" x 18" safe which is fire-proof would cost more than \$400. I would be glad if I could get some information as to the type of safe which was damaged, how it was damaged, with what type of safe it is proposed to replace it and what is the cost of a safe envisaged.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say that, apparently, the hon. member has made a mistake in referring to the Objects and Reasons. As far as I know, it is only Bills which carry Objects and Reasons; Resolutions carry Addenda. The hon. member ...

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. In the hon. opening remarks he mentioned that the "Objects and Reasons" say so and so, and that is why I said that he was not sure of what he was doing.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not aware of that.

Mr. DOWDING: I am.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure I mentioned the Addendum to the Resolution. Mr. Chairman, frankly speaking, the Premier is not here; I was not aware of the fact that he would not have been here this afternoon, and therefore I made no preparation in dealing with this Resolution. However, if the hon. member will agree, we can pass this Resolution and I will pass on the information to him as soon as I can get it.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree to the passing of a Resolution which neither the hon. introducer nor myself knows anything about. I suggest that the matter be postponed until the information can be obtained. I fail to see what type of safe one can get for \$470.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. Probably I may come to the assistance of the Minister although I have not got the file before me. A safe has been extensively damaged and has to be replaced. This has almost exhausted the vote. The vote has not been exhausted and this amount is to be added to what has not been exhausted so as to purchase a new safe. The price is not \$470 for a new safe, but it is \$470 plus what has not been expended and it may be another \$470. The Hon. Minister can probably find out if my information is correct.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for trying to assist me by thinking what he thinks are the facts. I want to know the facts as to how the taxpayers' money is to be expended. Just as it may mean \$200, it may mean a cent.

Mr. TALMA: What I wanted to point out is that I believe that \$470 as the price of a safe is erroneous. I am making the point that \$470 is not the price of a new safe; the price is \$470 plus whatever is the part of the vote which has not been expended. You can therefore well understand that this is more than what a safe would cost, so that the difference is normally what would be left here.

As to the taxpayers' money, I am just as interested in it as the hon. senior member for St. George is, but it is only that I am coming to the assistance of the Committee in reading this note carefully.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the safe is for the Mental Hospital and the cost of it is \$470. As you will note, under the original vote the sum of \$535 was provided and \$65 of that money has been left.

Mr. DOWDING: What does this note mean then when it says "and further provision is required in order that funds may be available to purchase safes which may be required at short notice by Departments"? This note does not explain that to me; what is the further amount of money?
4.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Frankly speaking, Sir, I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. DOWDING: The note says "this has almost exhausted the vote and further provision is required in order that funds may be available to purchase safes . . ." - in the plural.

Hon. M. E. COX: If a mistake is made in the drafting, I take no responsibility for that. Provision is made in the Estimates for this, and the Addendum reads "for the purchase of safes". We voted \$535 for safes for Government Departments, and as a result of one being damaged at the Mental Hospital, only \$65 is left in the Estimates, and all this seeks to do is to restore the estimate to what was originally voted so that in case it is necessary to have a safe before the financial year ends, we would be able to buy another one. That is all it means.

Mr. DOWDING: Am I then to understand that this is purely a matter of one safe and nothing to do with "safes"?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the note says that a safe has been extensively damaged. I would like to know what caused the damage. Has somebody been trying to get into it or carry it away to cause this extensive damage? A safe is something one places in a building; so I would like to know what caused this extensive damage.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, the note to this Resolution says that a safe has been extensively damaged, and therefore we are supposed to purchase a safe in order to protect the taxpayers' money. If a safe has been damaged, we are required to get one immediately because we have to protect the taxpayers' money; so I do not see in any way why it should not be granted. Maybe the note is not in order. The note says "A safe has been extensively damaged and has had to be replaced. This has almost exhausted the vote, and further provision is required in order that funds may be available to purchase safes." We know that "a safe" means one safe, but "safes" mean more than one. If that is the hindrance I do not think we should allow that one word to stop this Resolution from passing.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, to answer the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I think you will remember reading in the newspaper - and I have a Report before me - that on Good Friday morning 15th April, 1960, the Steward's and Clerk's section of the office was broken and the safe was damaged by explosives in an attempt to open it. The whole matter is being investigated by the Police and in the order of things it is necessary to replace this safe. The sum of \$470 is required.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to page 106 of the Estimates under Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services, Item 4 - purchase of safes for Government Departments. It is under that Head that we have brought in the Supplementary Estimate; so it is perfectly in order.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am getting some idea now of what occurred, but the advice I would like to give is that safes for \$470 are not safes. A tin box for \$470 is not worthwhile, and you are only asking for more trouble to put in a safe for that figure. If you want a safe, Sir, you have got to have a safe that is a safe, and you have got to spend a few hundred pounds, not dollars, to get a safe. You are naturally asking for more trouble because an ordinary iron door is as simple as ever to open; so I suggest that some investigation should be made as to the type of safe you want rather than buy a whole lot of tin boxes. You had better purchase one good safe and feel safe.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have to thank the Hon. Minister of Social Services for enlightening me on this particular item. I see here Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - Item 4, "Purchase of safes for Government Departments", and the explanatory note says that a safe has been extensively damaged; it does not say where, so it could be at the Post Office, at Ministerial Buildings or at Highways and Transport Department. We would not know for which particular Department this is wanted. I did hear or read about something in connection with a safe, but I would not know that it is this particular Department which needs a safe, and that is my reason for asking how this safe became so extensively damaged.

The question that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Resolution in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded in each case by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, the Resolution was read a first time and second time and agreed to.

4.55 p.m.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 3

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 2, and that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the following Resolution: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1960".

On the last occasion, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking. I have observed that he is not in his place.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a question of resorting to a system of turnstiles on buses which these regulations seek to enforce, and it is a system which has been adopted in other countries, and to some extent turnstiles have been satisfactory; but to introduce a system such as this in Barbados where there is such great unemployment, such great masses of people unemployed, is, I think, very wrong in Government to attempt because it would be a means of depriving the average young men and women of livelihoods as conductors. Any labour saving

device of that nature in an island such as this for redundant population and thousands of young people unemployed with no hope of immediate employment is, in my view, a wrong course to adopt. On these grounds, I am not in favour of the implementation of these regulations which will bring this system into force.

To suggest that turnstiles would be a means of getting in more cash, would be a means of collecting more fares, may be one system of doing it; but in my view, Sir, provided the fares are reasonable, buses have always in the past provided reasonable profits to their owners, and even up to today there are certain private concessionaires who appear to be running their buses at a profit and on those buses, the question of turnstiles does not arise. Therefore, I for one, cannot see that in order for the Transport Board to show a profit they must institute this system of turnstiles.

I say that the Transport Board, which is a statutory authority, like all statutory authorities in other countries and other places should have on it men of the proper calibre. It should have men who know about the running of buses and men who have a fair amount of business acumen. I am not censuring the members of the Transport Board in its entirety now, but I know that although the Transport Board may have an excellent Chairman or other excellent members, yet all the members are not of that calibre. We want men of experience and ability and men able to handle such matters on that Board.

Sir, I want to sound this note of warning to the Government in so far as nationalisation is concerned. It is very good in principle; but in actual administering and enforcing certain things which are nationalised, like the buses, unless and until the present Government or any Government for that reason desist from adopting, employing or appointing political affiliates or stooges and think that they alone can run these concerns, and unless they adopt a policy, as in bigger places, of trying to enlist the support and assistance of competent people, men with the necessary ability, training and experience, the best men for the purpose of running these concerns that are nationalised, nationalisation will always remain a big joke and a losing proposition. I am telling this Government, or any Government for that matter, that when any concern is nationalised, although the principle of nationalisation for certain lines of endeavour is good, such as the nationalisation of electricity, telephone, transport and water, yet you have to be very careful and see that you get the best people to run them. If we are making such a blunder with the running of these buses, I do not see how this system of nationalisation would go very much further. It is very sound in principle, but in actual practice it is a bugbear. Until the policy is adopted of enlisting the assistance of men who are competent to run these things that are nationalised, unless that is done and unless the present Government seeks the assistance of men competent to speak on transport matters and to sit on the Transport Board, the Transport Board will always show a loss.

5.05 p.m.

I am asking the Minister, whenever he is thinking of the personnel of the Transport Board, not to think in terms so much of political stooges or political affiliates, but let him think of people who are competent and who have the necessary amount of experience in such matters; let him leave out the political stooges and the political affiliates. If he will bear that in mind, he will find that he will get competent men to assist him and so make a success of running the Transport Board. I have never agreed, and never will agree, with this implementation of the turnstile system, good as it may be, in an island such as this where we have a redundant population and mass unemployment, unhappily, still. Instead of a measure like this, it would be better to try and assist in getting emigrants out of Barbados and assist them with their passages on easier terms. I shall vote against this measure because I regard it as one which is inflicting a greater burden on people and one which will throw them out of employment. Any Regulation or Bill which will do any harm or injustice to an already downtrodden people I am not in

favour of at all. It is not a question of shouting one tune on the platform and another tune in here; if a measure is against poor people who are undernourished and it is one which will throw them out of work, I will never be a party to that. However simple and good these regulations may appear to be in phraseology, I shall be voting against this Resolution.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, the public of this island, or rather the integrity of the people of this island, is being vilified constantly for the benefit of a few inefficient, political appointees. It seems regrettable to me that we have now come to the stage in this island that in the administration of the Transport Board, the people of this island have now got to be put through turnstiles, one by one, like sheep, so that you can count them in order to make sure that every man is accounted for. If one hears a lie repeated often enough it becomes eventually a belief. I am one who could never agree that the masses of the people of this island are so dishonest that 40% of the fares are not going in to the Transport Board; you will never make me believe that. I do not know whether that may be claimed to be a straightforward lie or not, but I saw it in the newspaper. I have some knowledge in being a part-owner of a bus fleet and there is no doubt that a few conductors and a few passengers, as is the case in any part of the world, will try to put one over you; but to tell me that 40% of the people that travel in buses are dishonest, I cannot believe it. If it is that 40% of the fares do not go in to the Transport Board, it is the public who will be told time and time again that the fares are not going in and therefore the public is not paying these fares.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, whoever said that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order and on a point of correction. Whoever said that 40% of the people are dishonest? The hon. member is saying that; nobody from over here is saying it. If the hon. member wants to interpret the matter in his own way, let him do so; but do not let him say what we did not say.

Mr. DOWDING: I did not accuse anybody of anything; I was wondering if it would be refuted but I saw in a newspaper that 40% of the fares are not going in. Well, if 40% of the fares are not going in, 60% is left. If you reduce it to 20% or even 10% of the people who are dishonest — I read that 40% of the people are dishonest. If 40% of the fares are not going in, they are not going in (a) because of the people not paying (b) from the conductors not collecting it and (c) that the persons who are collecting it are handing it over for going to the top, but it never reaches where it should reach. I do not know which of those things it is; all I am saying is that this constant effort to make out that the bus transportation of this island is not paying or that there is the failure of the Board with such loss of fares, has nothing to do with the facts of the case and the turnstile system will not help. The Government need to change their style and to put in authority somebody who knows what he is doing and who knows that the people of this island are, in the majority, good, honest people; and if they are given the right services and courtesy under the right conditions, the Government will get all that is due to them in their affairs. What are you going to go on doing? You import enclosed buses and now you import turnstiles so as to enclose further parts of these buses; how far are we going to take this nonsense? I have travelled over the world and I have only seen this type of turnstile in one place. In the majority of cases, people get on the buses and they pay their fare; if the persons concerned do not know how to check and find out as simple as A.B.C. from the reports which are coming in as to where something is wrong — again in every business there is a profit and there is a loss, and there is not reason for a constant repetition of the fact that conductors, drivers and everybody concerned are supposedly dishonest. I cannot agree with that at all; rather would I agree with the view that

if their affairs are so bad, there are a few at the top who may benefit even more than the people at the bottom. There is something rotten in this whole matter if the good people of Barbados have got to be huddled through turnstiles rather than be allowed to pay their money honestly to the conductors.

5.15 p.m.

I cannot agree with making laws for assisting in teaching people what is honest, simple, everyday, reasonable honesty. This is not going to get us any further. The turnstile system is going to be blamed as well, and if you put in a safe in which to deposit the money, that is also going to be blamed. The whole point of my speech is that the inefficiency of operating the Transport Board is the reason why the public and the conductors and all concerned are being blamed. If the top is incapable of seeing after man management and knowing which man and which woman to keep, and having correct organisational methods put into operation, there will be no improvement. It is as simple as that.

When we first took over buses from the company that owned them, we found the same thing happening, and in the first year in which we ran them there was a loss; but we did not run them at a loss any more because at the end of the year we knew who was who, and there were no political favours. We knew the ones that were good, and up to today, thank God, those people can still say that under our administration they were treated well and they did not as a whole constantly have things thrown at them. As soon as you put in turnstiles, you are telling the public that there is something wrong when in actual fact there are a few people who do not know what they are doing. They are doing their best; but their best is not good enough.

I am not at all in favour, Sir, of further lowering the honesty of the majority of people in this island by suggesting that you must have turnstiles to ascertain that the Transport Board gets in this extra 40% out of the 100%. I am told that they are losing 40%. That is remarkable. Never in the history of our running transport, even in the first year, did we lose 40%. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Who are "we"?) If the Hon. Minister wants to know who are "we", I mean the General Motor Omnibus Company. This is purely a matter of spending more and more money to support more and more inefficient people who do not know how to run a bus company. They will never learn that a bus company has to have personnel who do not sit down in an office all day long, but who know what is meant by man management. When they learn that, if they ever do, and do not hand out favours to Mary and John, and also learn who is the right man and get rid of the wrong one no matter what happens, then, Sir, we would not need any turnstiles. Each person would get in and give his money to the driver and go and sit down and would only have to remind the driver where he is to stop. I cannot agree with this constant effort to vilify the integrity of the people at large in this island by a method such as this.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry to think that this Government is today thinking of placing turnstiles on buses. First we must realise that there are hundreds of conductors who will be put out of employment. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Hundreds?) We do not know how many there will be, but we know that the majority will be out of work. These turnstiles show clearly that hawkers with large baskets and trays cannot get into these buses; so if you are putting turnstiles to save money, you will be losing more. If you think that money is only going through the conductors, you are making a sad mistake. The money is going in various directions as well as tyres, batteries and other parts at the Transport Board.

I heard a conductor say sometime ago that if they caught him with 25¢ they would call in the Police, but if he goes to the garage a morning and they lose 25 tyres they do not call in the Police. In my opinion, these are going among the higher officials. I have already told the Minister that the rain is falling and the tanks are catching their portion, but it is leaking out. Everytime a bus goes on the road, it makes the same portion of money,

the conductors bring it in and yet we always have to be subsidising the Transport Board. Why is that? It is because of bad management. A man that has no honour, as I said before, and understandeth not, is likened unto a beast that perisheth. If you take any kind of man and put him over the Transport Board to run it, he would run it all right, but down into the gully or the sea; and all the turnstiles you may bring are not going to prevent money from going, because you do not have proper people running the transport services.

I heard the hon. Deputy Speaker in reading from the *Official Gazette* say that the owners of private buses have their family helping them with the books and the running of their buses, but sometimes your own carries away more than a stranger. I would tell the Government that if they mean to run the portion of buses which they have, they must look around for proper people who can be trusted to see after its administration and I am sure that they will save some money if they run it right. You will never see the private concessionaires put in turnstiles. They are not going to spend that foolish money, because they know how many people they will put out of work, and they know that if a conductor wants to take out a breakfast he will take it. If you put in a safe like the one which you asked for today and let the conductors or the chauffeurs see that the money is dropped into the safe, when you open it you would still lose money.

5.24 p.m.

Putting down turnstiles cannot save money. That cannot bring back the \$2 million that has been thrown away. If we allow such a rotten state of affairs to go on in the Transport Board, we will run this island into a dilapidated state because if a man is running a business and he sees that it profiteth nothing when he takes stock, should he continue with the thing which satisfieth not and profiteth not? Why should we waste money in that way? We in this small country cannot keep up with the big countries like the U.S.A. and Great Britain. This is a little country and we have a large population; therefore, we have to try by all the means we can to find work for the poor people.

You cannot get anything unless you have proper management. We have leaders here. The Ministers of this Government are the leaders of this Government and they have been placed in that position to see after the people, to save their money and to look out for their welfare. If the Hon. Minister of Communications has on his spectacles and cannot see, then he should pull them off. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would not be able to see then.) I am telling the Hon. Minister that we have placed him there to look out for the people, but where are they leading us? They are leading the people of this island to another Dunkirk. At present we are going on pretty reasonably but you see riots in other parts of the world. What do you think has caused them? Bad dictatorship has caused them. If you are trying to shorten up the work in Barbados what are you going to do? What effect do you think it would have? Thousands of people will soon be scattered and without employment in Barbados as soon as the Deep Water Harbour is completed. Let us try to get work for them. Do not turn conductors off buses and put in turnstiles. The Ministers of this island have a great position but they do not regard it. All this money which is thrown away in the Transport Service could be put towards the building of roads, more schools and extending the water supply. Look at the dilapidated state of many schools and yet we can find money to throw away on transport. The Ministers are the people whom we have put in Government to look after the welfare of this country. There are one or two of them to whom you can make an adjustment but with some of them the adjustment screw of their hearts is worn and they cannot stand a proper adjustment, no matter how much you try. They are doomed to failure. However, I hope when they come to the end they will leave a good record. I sit here day after day and hear members of the Opposition warning them, teaching them and showing them out the different ways where they are losing time and throwing away money; but they come in this House with a concrete mind, a mind made up and do not want to take advice from any man. Let us take the Hon. Minister of Communications. He

would not even come outside of his office and see the dilapidated state of the roads and the conditions in which people have to live. I have been so far as to ask him out one day to see the roads in St. Andrew. He came and stood for about two hours and then said that he had to go back to town because he had to take lunch with a few delegates. He has not come back yet. Fancy, Sir, I have been to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and said to him, "Come and see the conditions of the roads in St. Andrew; come and see if you can repair some of them for us." His reply to me was, "When we do the roads you will get the honour." He is sitting down in the Ministerial Building and he would do nothing about them. But I tell him that his day of reckoning is going to come. If we allow such people to carry on in such a manner, what would we do?

Getting back to the turnstiles, I hope that the authorities of the Transport Service will take the maxim from the private concessionaires and see how they are running their buses. I have sat in here and heard one of the members of the Opposition saying that the private concessionaires have bought old buses which the Transport Board had turned down and those buses are now running like oil. Those private concessionaires are buying new buses out of the profits of those old ones. Something is wrong with the Transport Board. Either we do not have the right manager for that Board or the right authorities for it. Your money is being thrown away and will continue to be thrown away if you do not have proper management.

Sir, I hope in the future that we will have the right people on the Transport Board, and the only way that you can get it running right is when you get the right men to direct it. We want men with honest minds, men with good ability and men who can be trusted. Unless a man can be trusted, it is no use employing him and that goes whether he be white or black, whether he be Englishman or African. We cannot put a mind in a man, but we can put rules in front of him; and if he fails to comply with the rules, we can dismiss him. I hope that the Government will take heed and with the number of buses which they have in possession now that they will try to run them from henceforth to the best of their ability for the end of the season. If they fail to make money by then, then it is better to put them back into the hands of the private concessionaires.

5.35 p.m.

They must take care of the fares and see that the buses run in proper order, and if the concessionaires are in any need of money, the Government should lend them that money and see that they pay it back in due season, instead of throwing it in the gutter. I am quite certain that if they do that we will have a better service.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I realise that the Transport Board provides a winning post for members of the Opposition. I am not surprised at the last speaker, I would excuse him; I am not surprised at people like the hon. senior member for St. George because that is expected of him. Shakespeare once said or advised that it is sometimes good to assume virtue where there is none. The hon. member seems to have read that part of Shakespeare and he has taken it to heart. When the hon. member waxed so warm - I believe he has gone to sleep but his ears are still open - but when he waxed so warm on the integrity of the people of Barbados and of the employees being the best in the world, one wonders if he should not have joined some histrionic society probably led by the Minister here, who used to stage plays at Kensington. The hon. member would have played a good part in those plays. I expected what he said of him. Fundamentally he never had any love for the Transport Board and therefore anything which comes down he must criticise merely for the sake of criticising it. We cannot expect anything different from that. I hope he does not expect that I will not reply and hit back where it can be felt.

The hon. member told us that the integrity of the public is being vilified for the benefit of a few political appointees. Who said anything about the integrity of the public in so far as this matter is concerned? Who has

assailed the integrity of the public? What is directed against the public in this respect? This is absolutely nothing to do with the public except to get them to agree with the new system. Everybody knows that in Barbados there is a resistance to any change; there was a resistance to the Market too and people have become accustomed to it. As to anything which is different from the past, there is a resistance to it. You insert a coin in the slot, then you push the turnstile, and you go in and take your seat; there is no struggling to get in before anybody else or anything like that. A lady who lives in Station Hill and who has been to New York, welcomes the turnstile system because she says you get order; before we had the turnstile you had people pushing you down, but now you have to queue up. But the hon. member is against the use of the turnstile because he never used it; he never knew anything about it. Why does he not say that the factories should close down and they should use certain types of machinery so that the people would be laid off? Why does he not go back to the tractors? Why did he not oppose the Deep Water Harbour which affects hundreds of people? We still keep on the conductors but it is these oppositionists who drive fear into the hearts of the people. The conductors cannot be affected by the use of the turnstile because it is a single fare system and therefore it cannot be applied to every route. It takes five cents, ten cents or twentyfive cent pieces.

For the benefit of those hon. members who are always hurling it at us that we are throwing money down the drain, well, the hon. senior member for St. George is following in the footsteps of the hon. junior member for St. John. He speaks about all this money going down the drain, but this is a method of preventing this money from going down the drain. He talks about \$2 million being lost, but it is only \$1 million. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this thing is exasperating; you try to do something and you hear carping criticism when people should try to help you.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy seemed to welcome this system; he only had a slight criticism to make. But another member of the same Party said that he is not in favour of this system because there is too much unemployment. However, this has not led to any unemployment; we are running the same thing for which they criticise us for losing money. In the one case, the conductor cannot get in all of the fares and we have introduced the turnstile system where people have to put in their money before they can get in the bus.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. Can the Minister say how many posts or how many employees will be involved in this new method?

5.45 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We are not laying off anybody, but if somebody goes to England and it is not necessary to re-employ anybody else, then we do not. Even if we did, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the members who criticised us for carrying too much staff. (Mr. TUDOR: Not in that Department.) Now they are saying not in that Department. When you try to bring down these remedies like a good doctor and apply the knife and so on, then you hear you are cutting out the patient's bowels; just a pruning knife applied in the right place, but from the same people who say that the patient needs a little surgery, as soon as you apply the knife, they say: "There it is! You are going to kill a man."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can forgive the hon. junior member for St. Andrew; I believe that at present his brain is befuddled because he accused me of going down in St. Andrew and looking at the roads and saying that I said I would come back because I had to go to town to meet somebody to have lunch. At no time when I went to his parish did I have to leave to meet delegates in town at 12.30; so he might have got a little mixed up. I never left St. Andrew at the time he said I did; so I excuse him.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the Minister was invited to come to Belleplaine and look over the roads with me. We went to Shorey Village and as

we got to Cane Garden I asked him to go to Hillaby and see the deplorable condition of the roads. He said to me that he had to go to town to meet some delegates who were coming in to have lunch and that he would see me some other time, but from then until now I have not seen him return.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a bit off the bus route. The hon. member is talking about Hillaby, and I am sorry that his colleague is not here to testify as to the number of times we went to Hillaby and stayed there almost the whole day. If I went to St. Andrew the number of times the hon. member invited me, I would live up there. I revisit the same spots all the time, and when I get there he addresses the small crowd saying that he has the Minister up there.

To get back to the Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am earnestly asking hon. members not to imbue people with the spirit of resistance. We do not introduce these changes for sport, because they work in other places. You can collect more in one half day, and usually a bad half day, than you can collect in a whole good day in a system like this. The hon. member can say that I slander whoever I like, but this is no slander to anybody. He knows that his company kept inspectors, spies, checkers and everything else.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of personal explanation, I remember mentioning man management and that in any organisation you must have supervisors. We kept supervisors, but we never kept spies or had people jumping out of the bushes. I do not think the hon. member can quote one instance of our having people jumping out of the bushes, but in any organisation you have to have supervisors; so I do not know what the hon. member is trying to point out. I am saying that his organisation is full of supervisors and spies.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is not all the hon. member said. He said we were vilifying the people of Barbados in their character.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I still say so. If you go on bringing these things which are against the honesty of honest people, that is what I am saying.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member rose on a point of order to repeat what he said. I am replying: so he must sit down and take his blows. He is the same hon. member who got up here during the debates on the Estimates and told us that the workers at Highways and Transport are dishonest and do not give a proper day's work and that half of them should be fired; but now he is talking about human nature being good and so on. We did not say so on this side; he said it.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order, I never said that the workers at Highways and Transport were dishonest. I said they were not giving a full day's work, and I still say so today.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: But if you say it, keep to it. Do not let him say that there is nothing wrong with the whole community of Barbados, that they are absolutely all right and do not need supervision when he knows that he used to employ supervisors. What did he keep them for? If they were, as I heard in a monotone, "pimps", the Company made them so; they were not born that way, but they had certain instructions to carry out. If he says that by having spies it is an assault on the integrity of the people, I agree; but he should have said so when he made his first speech. If you go all over the world, you will see inspectors, even on the London Transport system. I think the hon. junior member for St. John said that the most efficient buses do not carry turnstiles. He knows that they cannot carry, but he is not here now and I would not worry to reply to him. Those buses have to have a large entrance so that three or four people can get in at the same time; some swing one way and go upstairs and some go downstairs; so it is useless for the London buses to carry

turnstiles. Puerto Rico went away from that system and have come back to it. Nobody is assaulting the integrity of everybody, but it is a fact that the conductors cannot get around when the bus is crowded. This is a system through which every fare is collected, because when they go through the door it is registered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opposition is divided on this matter. Some members opposite said that they are in favour, while some do not like the idea of unemployment through it. I can assure them that there is not the big unemployment talked about. In fact you can only use this system on certain routes, and as far as the hon. senior member for St. George is concerned, I think I have demolished him, because we certainly do not expect him to agree with this.

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

LEAVE TO POSTPONE ORDERS Nos. 4 AND 5.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to ask leave to postpone Orders Nos. 4 and 5 and to take Order No. 6.

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

LEAVE TO POSTPONE ORDER No. 6

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry, but on the last occasion, Order No. 7 was put in front of Order No. 6. Therefore, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 6 and to take Order No. 7.

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.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave that the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing take charge of this Bill in the absence of the Hon. Premier.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken already on this Bill: so I am asking leave to speak again in order to explain to the House the point made in explanation to the point I was making.

If I may explain, this Bill was postponed on Tuesday last following a point made that this Bill was a matter which concerned an amendment to the Transport Board Act. It is simply because of that that I am asking leave to reply to that point in the absence of the Premier who was speaking at the time.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, further consideration of this Bill was postponed on the last occasion because of the fact that certain hon. members pointed out that while this Bill was making provision for any lottery to be conducted by the Transport Board there was nothing under the Transport Board Act or in any other Act to give the Transport Board power to conduct a lottery. I drew to the attention of the House that by Clause 9 of the Transport Board Act, 1955, that the Transport Board had such powers. The lawyers on the other side did not agree. I can only say that we know lawyers differ on all these things. We have had a different opinion: that is, that it does. It is a general Clause and because of some legal rule which applies to that Clause those hon. members feel that a lottery could not be conducted because a lottery would not be a generality.

My considered opinion differs from that. Of course, I am a layman but the Crown Law Officers feel that under that Clause the Transport Board can conduct a lottery.

I would like to repeat what I said on the last occasion and that is that this is not morally wrong; it may be unorthodox but it is not more morally wrong than the bond system which the British Government recently introduced under which the British people were induced to buy bonds by a system of prize-drawing, that is, after six months there was a drawing and the holder of the bond with the number drawn would receive a prize. That has paid off in Great Britain today and it was said that the British people buy bonds anyhow, but it was added as an inducement for them to buy bonds that if they bought bonds they would get a prize. It is the same thing as regards the buses. You buy a ticket and you may get a prize. I do not think there is anything morally wrong in that. It is the same thing.

That is the reason why we accepted this suggestion. I do not know if hon. members on the other side will persist in that legal argument; but even if they are correct, it will still be necessary to pass this Bill in order to carry out the aims and objects of the Transport Board. If they are correct, we will have to bring down an amendment to the Transport Board Act; therefore, we are asking that you go ahead with this Bill.

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

6.05 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, it is no intention of mine to get into any legal argument with the Crown Law Officers or anybody else for that matter; but to suggest that the Transport Board already has the power to do any illegal act although it is not expressly stated here - and we heard it said that the Board does not have any special power to do illegal acts, because there would be no reason to have this Gaming Act amended in its own right. There is the necessity to amend the Gaming Act so as to permit lotteries to be conducted by the Transport Board. That is why we are amending the Act; then you are saying that the Transport Board already has the power although you cannot point it out. It is not expressly stated in the Transport Board Act; but you are presuming that, in a general phrase, the Transport Board will have whatever power it wants to facilitate certain other things. However that Clause is a general Clause for the purpose of implementing other Clauses. If you are going to read into it that the Transport Board has the power to do these things, you can say that the Transport Board has omnipotent power to do any thing under that Clause.

Of course the Minister has to be guided by the Crown Law Officer but if the Crown Law Officer is saying that 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" covers all these things,

are we saying that in order to carry on the business of the Board we must run a lottery? That is the most far-fetched thing I have ever heard; it is a very peculiar way, to say the least of it, of trying to get in your bus fares.

Mr. Chairman, I have not got the energy to quarrel or to argue with the Crown Law Officers on a point like this; they are the Crown Law Officers and they are being paid for this job; I am not being paid for it and I will not be a party to any quarrel; but this is a case of the *ejusdem generis* rule. It does not carry the Clause any further, but merely enables the Transport Board to carry on whatever powers it already has. According to this Clause, the Transport Board has the 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"

In other words, this Clause merely allows the Transport Board to do things which are incidental to the above powers which are set out. A thing which is incidental is not running a lottery and carrying on an illegal act; but if the Crown Law Officers feel that this is good law and that they are the Government, it is a matter for them. The Minister has to go on with the Crown Law Officers, but if this criticism had come from someone else it would have been accepted. If you were to make a check with the lawyers on this issue, 99% of them would tell you that this is a case of the *ejusdem generis* rule and it does not carry the Clause any further. If this opinion had come from Sir Grantley Adams or from Mr. Henderson Clarke, it would have been accepted; but because it comes from me, the Crown Law Officers will feel that they cannot be told how to do their work. If you want to persist in going on with the wrong procedure, well, it is a matter for you. However, this Bill is badly drafted and the power which it seeks to give will not be given in that the power has never existed with the Transport Board. The Transport Board is not a gambling Board; it was never intended to be. I do not see where any Crown Law Officer or Minister could get that opinion from. I was a member of the Government when the Transport Board was set up and I had the privilege of reading all the papers in connection with the matter, and at no time was there any intention that the Transport Board should run lotteries. If the Crown Law Officers do not know that I am aware of that, well, they can know it from now.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the remarks made by my colleague; but if the truth must be spoken, it is not so much on the legal argument which has been put forward, not because I judge that argument to be unsound, but my reason for supporting my colleague is rather different. It seems to me difficult to believe that the Crown Law Officers, wanting to amend the Gaming Act and the Gambling Act, both of which have mentioned the Transport Board, would not wish to make sure that no amendment was called for in the Transport Board Act. That is how I look at the matter from the layman's point of view. It seems to me that this is a howler; if the intention is to permit the Transport Board to organise and run lotteries and the purpose of amending the Gambling Act and the Gaming Act is similar, and both of them mention the Transport Board Act, I would have thought that it would be the next duty of the Crown Law Officers to examine the Transport Board Act thoroughly to see whether it did not need any amendment. I do not feel, for instance that the decision not to amend the Transport Board Act is a deliberate decision.

6.15 p.m.

What I think has happened is that the Crown Law Officers who were engaged in drafting these two amending Bills completely forgot that they would have to take into account the Transport Board which is mentioned in these two amending Bills. They have overlooked that and I would really like to know what sort of questions the Cabinet put

to get advice, because the answer given us could never be the answer to a direct question. The Minister himself cannot guarantee that the Transport Board Act will not have to be amended. As a matter of fact, from the way he spoke, with him it is a distinct possibility; but I positively feel that if it were drawn to the attention of the Crown Law Officers that the Transport Board at the present moment does not have power explicitly to organise a lottery, they would immediately have told Government that they must amend the Transport Board Act.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand all the legal technicalities of the matter, but I know that if you have two bits of amending legislation and in each of these two amending Bills, should we say, a third Act of Parliament is mentioned, you cannot properly enact or amend legislation except by a cross reference to an Act which is common to both of them to tie in all three of them, and I think that it is the average commonsense point of view on it that an amendment to the Transport Board Act is necessary, because everything that comes after is consequential when you say the Transport Board can do this, that or the other, and then you say that so far as the Gaming, Gambling Acts are concerned, you are exempting the Transport Board from these provisions.

Another thing is this: and I think this analogy, Mr. Chairman, is even more pointing; we have recently, I believe, had legislation before us amending the Housing Authority Act. We have had legislation amending the Peasants Loan Bank Act. Now both of these amendments had to do with creating pensionable posts for officers employed in these two establishments, but you realised, Mr. Chairman, that in order to do that properly you had to amend the Public Employees Pension Act. That is just the point because it did not matter that you were only creating pensions for people working in the Housing Authority and the Peasants Loan Bank; you were doing that and you had two separate Acts dealing with them, but you could not have done that thoroughly and properly unless you had at the same time amended the Public Employees Pension Act to put employees of the Housing Authority and of the Peasants Loan Bank within the scope of the Public Employees Pension Act, and therefore you had three Acts of Parliament linked together. By the same analogy, therefore, an amendment to the Transport Board Act is clearly called for giving it explicit power.

Now it does not mean that because we say that, we feel the Transport Board should run lotteries. That is a different question altogether; but if it is to have power, that power should be clearly set down in the Act itself; that is how we feel about it.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the inconsequential and in one respect unnecessary bits of legislation that we have been peremptorily brought back twice within the course of one week to deal with in this Chamber. The most remarkable thing about the Bill which is now causing so much discussion, debate and controversy is that the Section which is now under discussion, as you will see from the Objects and Reasons Clause and by the wording of the Section itself, is to legalise in one part something which is already legal, and something which in the other part is from a moral, from a business and from an economic point of view highly questionable, certainly a legitimate ground for criticism. When I said that it legalises something which is already legal, anyone who studied the Parliamentary Debates of the House of Commons between the years 1952 and 1955 and the history of pool betting legislation which was enacted in the United Kingdom would see there set out very, very clearly that it was beyond any realm of dispute that by a long series of decisions culminating with cases which actually went to the highest official authority in the land, the House of Lords, there was nothing illegal about pool betting.

The test which has been applied hitherto in the judicial interpretation of the Gaming Act of 1891 and the analogous legislation in the United Kingdom has been whether the game is a game of skill or a game of chance. There

are consequently inexhaustive definitions of what a lottery is and what is not a lottery. If there were any latent or patent ambiguity in the wording of the Gaming Act, that ambiguity would have to be cleared up by the way in which the spirit of English Law has developed by judicial interpretation, and it becomes as much a part of the law of the land as the statutes which are enshrined within the covers of Halsbury's Laws and Statutes of England. *Mutatis mutandis* applying the same criteria to our situation here in the benighted colony, you would find that since the decisions of the House of Lords, there certainly has been no doubt for the last fifteen or twenty years that pool betting is supposed to be a game of skill.

Now, Sir, I must myself confess to a certain degree of ignorance as to the benefits to be derived by participating in this highly problematical speculation which is known as pool betting, filling out coupons and matters of that kind. I would never say I have never participated indirectly because long before I came back to this Island I had a friend who used to deprive me of the princely sum of 2/6 every week so that he could fill out forms for me, but I myself have never taken any interest in the actual filling out of coupons, and that particular friend used to stake 7/6 a week, and I have no recollection of his having won a penny although I tried to inveigle it out of him. I am not interested in betting of any kind or description.
6.25 p.m.

I realise that there are in the community people who get some degree of satisfaction in taking up their hard-earned money and speculating with that money, whether it is with stock exchange, whether it is on horse racing or filling out coupons for the various pools.

When we examine the history of the judicial interpretation, one will frequently find without reflecting in any way on the high standard of integrity of the English Courts and the Courts of the U.S.A. that where there is some doubt as to the legality of certain forms of activity, where there is some doubt as to whether the restriction imposed by statute in some way inhibits the exercise of this particular activity, whether it be pool betting or otherwise, the overall question of benefit to the community often tips the scale on the side of legalising what may be considered at any moment of history to be illegal or doubtful. I do not have the precise figures at my fingertips, but it is significant that the Postmaster-General of Great Britain derives a revenue running into millions of pounds out of these things. I would give a conservative case right here and now and say that that figure is in the vicinity of \$10 million but I speak under correction. I had the House of Commons debates with me in which this amount was given when I thought that this matter would have been concluded; but I do not have them with me now.

I will only say this. It is not really necessary for the Government Printery to indulge in this kind of escapade or the hard pressed Legal Draftsmen to have their time taken up with this kind of legislation because from the Premier of Barbados, to the Attorney General back down, I think no one in their right senses would say that they have a better understanding of the Law than the Lord Justices sitting in the House of Lords and in the Privy Council; and since it has been already declared by these Justices in the Council that pool betting is legal, why should the Government waste the time of the House in bringing an amendment to make it legal?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has made certain references in dealing with sweepstakes.

Mr. BARROW: This is an amendment to the Gaming Act of 1891. I think I was reading the same thing as Your Honour was reading.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This deals with Section 2, "any lottery organised and controlled by the Transport Board, etc."

Mr. BARROW: With all due respect to Your Honour you do not deal with a section by sub clause; you deal with

a section as a section. Since I have been in this House, Your Honour has not put to the members of this House that it has been moved and seconded that Clause 2, sub-clause (a) stand part; therefore, it is competent for me to discuss the whole section.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I wanted to find out. I do not mean that you should deal with sub clause by sub-clause.

Mr. BARROW: When I went to school, A came before B and therefore, I always deal with A before I deal with B. I do not know what the situation is now that we have a Labour Government. I do not know if they deal with B before they deal with A. I do not know what the Hon. Ministers are perpetuating now.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit down in this Committee and receive the taxpayers' money and see that you are legalising something which absolutely no doubt is legal. I do not approve of betting in any form. I may indulge in it myself - I may or may not. I do not know when I may change my outlook on many things; but the whole thing as far as the Law of Barbados is concerned is that you cannot legalise something which is legal already. That is the point which I am trying to make. I very much regret that I do not have the House of Commons Debates with me, but if you will give me an opportunity, at a later stage, I will bring the authority and all the other authorities to prove what I am saying because they are in the Library of the House. I will bring you the debates in the House of Commons on this same pool betting tax to prove that what they introduced in the House of Commons was not a Bill to legalise pool betting but to impose a tax on pool betting. Up to now, the House of Commons has left it to judicial interpretation as to the legality of certain forms of betting activities of this nature.

It is a very simple point which I am making. The point which I am making is that only people who are not sure of themselves in the first instance and, secondly, who have bad advice would come into a responsible Chamber to legalise something which the highest judicial authorities in the British Empire have stated to be legal. If this were not so, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister a certain question. If they come here now to legalise pool betting, why is it that they have allowed Mr. K. R. Hunte, the agent of Vernons, the "Advocate", who is the agent for Littlewoods and all the other pools which we have here operating to operate for all these months without prosecuting anyone of them? Surely, they have a highly paid Attorney General, they have a Commissioner of Police and 600 Policemen and they have allowed the Post Office to be used for the purpose of paying in premiums and receiving money and so on from these pools and to transact the business for them.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member is reflecting on a vote of the House. The second reading of this Bill is passed and now he is opposing it all over again. If some hon. member were to reply to what the hon. member is saying, we will go all over the second reading again.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas talks as if somebody over there could ever reply. If I move that Clause A be deleted, it is a perfectly legitimate amendment to make and I can say everything that everybody else said on the second reading.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: You are reflecting on a vote of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Bill has two Clauses; therefore, this second Clause is the whole Bill.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: That is the whole Bill and in Committee I can move that Clause 2 be deleted in its entirety. A vote of the House is only a vote of the House after it has passed three stages; it is a vote of the House when three readings have been passed, because a member has not got the op-

portunity of talking more than once in the House and we are to prevent them from railroading nonsensical Bills like this through the House. As soon as I mentioned that point, a member on the other side of the House jumps up on a point of order; why do they not prosecute K. R. Hunte & Co. and the other people who have been running these pools? There is no provision granting dispensations to organise and operate football pools, and by the passing of this Bill they are releasing people from criminal responsibility. They are going contrary to the House of Lords; there are a lot of people who are committing criminal offences by going to the Post Office and buying postal orders for the purpose of posting away money.

This is a nonsensical bit of legislation and we have been haled back in this House to consider matters of this kind. Mr. Chairman, I have sent for the Report and I promise you that I will be staying on my feet until I get that Report of the Parliamentary debate in the House of Commons.

When you come to Section 2 (17) (b) of this Bill you will find that lotteries and sweepstakes which are run by the Barbados Turf Club are also exempted from the provisions of the Gaming Act. I can see Section 17 of the Act on the left-hand page right down at the bottom of the Volume of the Laws, and I have not seen it for three years. My recollection is -- Mr. Chairman, did I say that it was on the left-hand page, Sir? Well, it is on the last two lines on the left-hand page of this Volume of the Laws. It is the year 1891, Chapter 4, page 462 of Volume 1 of the Laws of Barbados. Sixty-nine years later these bright sparks are now catching up with the times. Mr. Chairman, all of this paper here is so much waste of the taxpayers' money; this is legalising pool betting so that the Government can tax it. They feel that the Lord Chancellor himself is not good enough and they must go one better; they must legalise what is already legal. I will show you why we should not accept this. Section 2 (17) (b) of this Bill says this:-

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

That is 69 years ago.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I should like to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that there is no quorum present; I ask that the Bell be rung.

On the Bell having been rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. BARROW: As I was saying, Sir, you will find that in 1917 actually, although the 1891 Act is consolidated, an amendment relative to the Barbados Turf Club was made about the same time that the Barbados Turf Club was incorporated, and there was a special Act for the Barbados Turf Club in 1917. You will find there in Volume 4 of the Laws of Barbados on a page in the 300's, - it is page 300- in Section 22 of the Gambling Act again this statement:

"The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any lottery or sweepstake organised and controlled by the Barbados Turf Club at or in connection with any Race Meeting held under the auspices of such Club."

That is twice that you have it in the Laws of Barbados; you have it first in the 1891 Act and then in the 1917 Act. We then have to look at Section 2 (17) (b) of this Bill so as to see what is the fly in the ointment.
6.45 p.m.

You will remember that I said that in the Gaming Act of 1891 which we are amending here, you will find that in at least two places - I say "two" advisedly - there is a special dispensation granted to the Barbados Turf Club lotteries. You will also find, Sir,.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there is no quorum.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John may proceed.

Mr. BARROW: In 1941, long before there was any responsible Government or semi-responsible Government, we imposed a duty on lotteries run by the Turf Club; but quite apart from the Gaming Act and the Gambling Act which specifically mention the Barbados Turf Club lotteries, you have a provision in the Vagrancy Act of 1897, and this is a bit of gratuitous advice which is well known by all the frequenters of the race course; and I will deal with that in a moment to show how perhaps the powers granted to the Barbados Turf Club - the licence was a shilling a year which they paid to use the Garrison Savannah - have been somewhat abused by them. I am going to make a very categorical statement on that in a moment.

You will find, Sir, in chapter 3 of the Vagrancy Act, 1897, on page 148 of Volume II of the Laws of Barbados, that the provisions of the Vagrancy Act are really very stringent. As a matter of fact, one Lord Chief Justice of England said it should not be used to extend the horizons of criminal liability, and it is because the Vagrancy Act is so sweeping in its terms that Section II which is the very last section of the Act of 1897 says that "the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the operations and transactions of the Pari-Mutuel conducted under the authority and control of the Barbados Turf Club at any race meeting which may be held in this island by the said Turf Club, nor to any person or persons employed or authorised by the Barbados Turf Club to conduct or assist in conducting the operations and transactions of the Pari-Mutuel conducted as aforesaid."

There is absolutely no doubt. In other words, had it not been for the three dispensations which have been granted in the ultimate sections of the three Bills which I have mentioned, the Gaming Act of 1891, the Gambling Act of 1917 and the Vagrancy Act of 1897, chapter 3, Pari-Mutuel betting and buying of sweepstakes are illegal lotteries but for these saving clauses. But pool betting, whether or not you approve of it from the point of view of legality, does not rest on the same basis as the buying of sweepstake tickets at all, because there is a sufficient element of skill in the filling out of a pools coupon, whether it be a Soccer pool or Cricket pool or any other kind of pool, because I believe there are all kinds of pools; they even have pools now on the same Turf Club races.

Now I said I would make a remark about the Barbados Turf Club just now, and I know that there will probably appear in the newspapers a host of letters stating that they never intended this or I am misinterpreting what took place; but I am speaking now pure, unadulterated facts. When the Football pools started, the operators of the Barbados Turf Club sweepstakes whoever they are - no individual and no aspersions at all - moved Heaven and earth and even tried to move the Government of Barbados.

6.55 p.m.

They certainly moved the Commissioner of Police and did everything. They used all the back-door lobbying and the power that they had to try to get the people who were operating the small pools like the "Dime" pools prosecuted. I am making this as a pure unadulterated statement of fact. They did everything to have these people prosecuted for running illegal lotteries. They even went further. I am really in such a state of confusion of what their intentions are that I may be speaking *sub judice*. The Stewards of the Barbados Turf Club are to file or have filed an action against the operators of these pools, but I am leaving that alone because I cannot well remember what it is now. Any-

how, they wrote letters to the other pools telling them that unless they give them 10% what would happen and they threatened them with criminal action and everything. I am not deceiving you; I have given them legal opinion. I am not a turfite or a racehorse owner like the hon. junior member for St. George. A few meetings ago, the hon. member said in this House that he was making more money before he was a Minister. I do not know if it was out of race horses. What I do know is that his assessable income for trade tax was only \$1,500 for the whole year, but he said that he was making more money before he was a Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. That has nothing to do with this business.

Mr. BARROW: I said that his assessable income for trade tax was only \$1,500. People own race horses for different reasons. I will leave out of the debate the hon. member who was making so much money.

I was saying, that the Barbados Turf Club threatened and actually went to the Commissioner of Police to have these people who were agents for these pools hurled before a Police Magistrate for operating illegally and that was a big joke because there is nothing illegal about operating a pool bet. There is something illegal in operating a sweepstake. After they found that they could not frighten these small operators of pools, they, themselves, ran a small pool and they waited until a decision was given in the Littlewoods case against the Amateur Football Association and tried to make their case fit in with the Littlewoods case. That is the real history of it.

Sir, I like to give people the inside story. That is the whole history leading up to this legislation which we have before us now. Do not be misled by anything which I have said up to now into thinking that Clause 2 is completely innocuous and useless. It is not as innocuous as it looks because there is a little, slight variation. The hon. member is trying to avert a danger by instituting this kind of legislation so as to prevent a drain of revenue out of this island and to discourage the flight of capital from the island of Barbados. Whereas, you will find as in the Gaming Act and the Gambling Act it is specifically restricted to the Barbados Turf Club...

SUSPENSION

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House but before I move that motion, I would like the Order Paper fixed with Order No. 1 and No. 12 being made Orders No. 1 and 2 respectively.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 23rd August, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the motion, may I ask, is there any change for Private Members' Business?

Mr. BARROW: I believe that Order No. 1 will continue to maintain the same position on the Order Paper.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 23rd August, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.01 p.m.