

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)



SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th December, 1967.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker) Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); and Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. YEARWOOD entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am waiting on my file. I apologise to hon. members.

I have the honour to inform hon. members that there are no Minutes available for confirmation today and there are no Notices for today; by that I mean, no Notices, so far as I am concerned. Nothing under Private Members' Notices.

The Hon. Leader of the House may now proceed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Drawback of Duties (Locally Manufactured Crown Corks) Regulations, 1967.

The Customs Duties (Materials for use in the Manufacture of Glassless Plastic Safety Mirrors) Order, 1967.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 1) Order, 1967.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$9,600 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 31 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$170,498 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 32 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$100,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 33 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$56,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part II - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 16 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

A Resolution to approve the Compulsory acquisition by the Crown in right of its Government under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949 of parcels of land together with buildings and erections which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

A Resolution to give effect to the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 11) Order, 1967.

A Bill to amend the Widows and Children Pensions Act, 1963.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution that from the first day of January, 1967 the postage of parcels to the destinations set out in column I of the Schedule to this Resolution shall go according to the poundage as in Columns 2 - 6.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1964.

Mr. ST. JOHN and Mr. LYNCH entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will know that with the approval of Your Honour, a previous intimation was given to them of a Resolution for \$56,000 and the Resolution of which the Hon. Minister of Communications has just given notice. It is our intention to proceed with both of these Resolutions in all their stages at this day's sitting.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the other money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 102, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 75, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 104, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Widows and Children's Pensions Act, 1963, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1964, was read a first time.

2.55 p.m.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, and I am informed that an Oral Reply has been laid to Question No. 75 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and that may be found on page 8, left hand column.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is it the intention of the Government to acquire beach land at various sites in all the parishes where sites are available, for the purpose of building resort houses for the workers?

2. If the answer is "Yes", can the Minister take immediate action to buy land and erect such houses?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

The policy for Workers' Resort Houses has been suspended in favour of public recreational facilities at popular beaches.

Mr. St. JOHN: May I ask, Sir, if there is recreational facility at Silver Sands which is owned by the Government. Will the Hon. Minister state when they are going to start to provide proper facilities there?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The question of erecting or constructing beach facilities at Silver Sands is being reviewed by virtue of the fact that it was felt that the expense involved was too extensive, and a revised programme is being considered now which will accommodate not only Silver Sands, but Bath, Martins Bay, East Coast Road and River Bay.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the only Question to which I am advised that an Oral Reply has been made. That is in respect of members who are presently in their seats. Accordingly, the House may proceed to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND LIMITED ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: At the last meeting of the House there was a discussion on Item No. 1 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. On the 17th November, 1967, the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister was speaking at 4.30 p.m. when the time for Private Members' Business had expired. I do not observe the Hon. Prime Minister to be in his place at the moment. I do not know if it is proposed to continue with this item now or on another occasion.

Mr. SMITH: If I would be in order relative to this Bill, I take it that there are other members who would like to speak on it. Again we are doing the people's business, and if the members who are concerned are not here we should not hold up the business. Let us throw the Bill through the window or something. If those who are interested in it do not care about carrying on, then we should not keep it on the Order Paper. Let us do something about it. The Prime Minister is not here; the member that is responsible for the Bill is not here; last Tuesday the Prime Minister was not here and it is all being held up like this. Let us do something about it. Allow other members to speak if they care to speak; put the matter to the House and let us do something with it one way or another. It is in your power to put it to the House. I think this is only making a joke. Some people seem to be afraid

of the Bill. I do not understand lighting fire and running and leaving it. If I light a fire I will either stay and help put it out, or throw fuel on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has made his point. I would remind him that he has also spoken on the substantive matter. If there is no other hon. member.....

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Bill so much has been said about it already, and even when we sat on the Select Committee it was a terrible time, if I may use that phrase. When the original Bill was passed, many members were against, but it was forced and forced, and the majority on that Committee carried it. Since it has been passed you have been hearing, reading, understanding and knowing that that Hospital Sweepstake Organisation did not stand up to expectations. When one comes to think about it, Sir, by using the words "West Indies" they involve the whole of the West Indies in that matter. If they had said 'the Barbados Hospital Sweep', it would have been worse for Barbados because they would have shown that they were dealing with an organisation which had no good report to the world.

It was understood that those tickets were banned in other continents and yet Barbados was dragged into it and aligned. Even in the Select Committee it had to be stopped at one time. The Solicitor who was looking after the matter could not give the Select Committee any financial information or the information the members of the Committee were trying to get. It was all good and well to say that a Company had so-and-so and a Company possessed so-and-so; but when it came to the basic point, the man who was representing the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake we did not know what he was worth. We heard about a Company, but in a case like that we should have known what he was really worth.

When one comes to think of it, however it is said and it is done, many people took tickets. Here in Barbados you buy a sweepstake ticket, you see what you are going to get, and if you win you will get your money. I am wondering if those folks who bought tickets did not receive their prize money or a portion of it.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, at our Central Airport as you enter, coming in from any part of the world, you will see that big sign up there. Those people who have come from countries where it is banned and it is against the law to sell those tickets, the first thing that presents them as they enter the Customs Department of our Airport is that advertisement.

I do feel, Sir, without making any exaggeration upon it, that it was certainly a black snag on our good fair Barbados. We have never indulged in those things; so why should we encourage racketeers to come into the Island of Barbados?

3.05 p.m.

I feel that why the law in Barbados is so hard upon our gamblers - and there is a lot of gambling - is to protect these people not to go wrong, and yet the Government brought in a firm which was known all over the world as being not a creditable, honest and upright firm. With those few words, I have made my impression that the West Indies Hospital Sweep coming to Barbados was a stain on it. There are many people who have written back from America and different places and asked what are we doing. In those countries they know what it is. I have a clipping in a letter which was written about it a few weeks after it was established here, by an hon. member of this House. You see, Sir, gambling is a big thing. Honesty must prevail in gambling. If I take on a friend to gamble only in a race, I cannot foul him. I would be dishonest. If we ran a race correctly and he won, I bow; he will get the prize. As far as I can read and understand and follow all that I have been hearing about this Hospital Sweep, it is a racket. I say so, with a full assurance of what I have been hearing about it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, when the West Indies Hospital Bill was to become law, I was not then a member of this Hon. House, but I was then, as now, a newspaperman and, as such, I was privileged to sit at the Press Table and observe hon. members and make my deductions. One thing is certain, Sir, that anyone who heard the Prime Minister stand up in this Hon. House during the past weeks making a bold attempt to defend the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, would, I am sure, be forced to do exactly what I have been forced to do, that is, to carry my mind all the way back immediately before this West Indies Hospital Bill was introduced into this Hon. House.

Why do I say that, Sir? The reason is this. Having heard from the mouth of the Prime Minister enough as to tell me what he thought of certain people in this island that I heard were supposed to be concerned with the promotion of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake in this island, and to hear the same Prime Minister put before this Hon. House the prospects of the West Indies Hospital promoters, I had to come to this House and sit at the Press Table and see and hear for myself that the Hon. Prime Minister of this House was really and truly inviting this House to support a Bill to be called the West Indies Hospital Bill and to offer its name well knowing what he had said and what he had thought of certain people who were supposed to be involved in the promotion of this Bill.

My reason for saying so is simply this; the Prime Minister well knew, long, long in advance that no good could have come out of this Bill. He knew that in advance. It was nothing which was foisted upon him, and therefore one must take a lot of thought and consideration of the defence which the Prime Minister is now putting up on this Hospital Bill. Believe me, Sir, how sorry I am today that the Prime Minister is not in his place, you could hardly believe. I am to tell you that if hon. members on that side of the House knew the history of this West Indies Hospital Sweepstake as it pertains to this island, I am

sure that they would each and everyone set about washing their hands of blood. Why do I say so, Sir? Believe me, if the Hon. Prime Minister had been called upon to rise in defence of the death of a former maid employed at Culloden Farm, who died under very suspicious circumstances, and, Sir, after this maid had removed from Culloden Farm some sums which had been collected by these West Indies Hospital promoters - nobody has called upon the Prime Minister or perhaps would want to call upon the Prime Minister, but this must be made known, that today, with the West Indies Hospital not being able during the past years to pay prizes to people who had won them, there are two sums of money floating about this island. These two sums of money are, by right, the property of the West Indies Hospital. These two sums were removed from Culloden Farm where the Prime Minister lives, and these two sums are floating about today because the person who removed them from Culloden Farm is not alive or did not live long enough to spend the money.

3.15 p.m.

All of this that I am saying is the history of the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited in this Island. In other words, it amounts to this - and nothing more; that the actions of the promoters and all concerned with it have been such that if a maid overheard a telephone conversation and it was thought at the time by the speaker at one end that the maid was present, I am sorry for her. You might not live to spend the money you took away.

I am saying, Sir, that there are two sums of money belonging to the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited that are floating about this Island; but anyone hearing the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House, in their defence of the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited ought to give some thought to one or two things.

Now, Sir, throughout the United States of America certain parts of Canada, throughout the West Indies as we know and other countries as well, when one hears of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, it is linked with the name or the word "Hospital" and it is taken to mean the "Queen Elizabeth Hospital" at Barbados. There is no denial of that for the simple reason that it was held out that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake was to operate based in Barbados, and that from the proceeds some contribution would have been made for the support of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Barbados.

Now, Sir, what do you find up to this moment? You find that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake has absolutely nothing in common with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Barbados except that the Sweepstake tends to drag the name of the Hospital, which incidentally bears the name of Her Majesty the Queen, down into the mud. How then, Sir, can the Leaders of a Government in the British Commonwealth stand up in support of anything at all which by its very nature tends to bring discredit to an institution such as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which as I said before, bears the name of Her Majesty the Queen? One has

to look around and think of all there is that is associated with the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited.

The Prime Minister in his defence said that the Government's concern was at the unfounded accusations that has been made by the Press and the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister - if the Government for that matter - wanted to know anything of the functions of the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited, they do not have to go very far to seek that information. Why? The wife of a Senator who was employed with the same West Indies Hospital Funds Limited was one of the first persons who to save her face and her name and, evidently that of her husband, was one of the first to quit the job which she was doing. She saw and knew that things were not right. Let us ask ourselves what wife is she doing a job - and the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited had been paying good salary - well, what wife is going to quit the job and go home, and does not tell her husband the reason why she quit the job and if her husband has an interest in the Government, and undoubtedly he must have it - he is now Senator - are we to understand that these are not links or channels through which Government ought to know that all was not well within the walls of the building housing the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited? These are links.

But no, Sir, it is known that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake did something for somebody in Barbados, but unfortunately, it is not for us to say all that we know, and especially all that we know about the person who stands to benefit from it.

Now, Sir, the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake sponsors were to have given half million dollars a year for the running of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and at the time when that was mentioned, the Government had a sufficient warning that dealing with big time gamblers was a business too risky for the type of people who had hitherto lived in Barbados; but the assurance was given that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Funds Limited would be operating on the strictest of financial principles and with integrity.

Sir, what principles, what integrity? It is no secret that Court action had to be taken for the Government to receive a portion of what was due.

3.25 p.m.

We on this side of the House do not mind what has been said about what has been paid back, and who benefitted and who did not benefit. Believe me, Sir, we do not accept two words of what the other side had to say on this particular matter. We have had to listen to them and we did so; but, Sir, everywhere one goes there is that feeling that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake has some sort of association with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at Barbados. Until this hour, what has the Government done even in its defence of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, to disassociate it from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Absolutely nothing has been said in that respect by any member of this House; but we know, Sir, that there are still holders of winning tickets in this Island who do not want their names mixed up or men-

tioned. They do not even want it to be known that they have been robbed and swindled, but nevertheless they have been publicised and advertised in the local Press and elsewhere as having received large sums of money which they are supposed to have won.

May I tell you, Sir, that it will take a long time after the death of the sweepstake to regain Barbados that which she has lost through the harm which the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake has done to the good name of Barbados?

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister told us of certain members who did not vote against the Bill when it was launched. We now know the reason why they did not vote against it. One reason is this: they thought they could have taken the Government by its word; they thought that the promoters of this grandiose scheme had been subjected to the scrutiny one would have thought Government would have outlined in such a case, and it is under those circumstances that hon. members on this side of the House at that time felt that they should do nothing to hinder what had been held out to them as a possible boosting for the running of a hospital in Barbados, and what seemed to them to be investment, so to speak. But what has it turned out to be? It is only to my mind in this Hon. House that one can hear or one can find anybody saying anything for the retention of the West Indies Hospital Bill on the Statute Book of this Island - and that, Sir, only among one or two Government members, because we are sure that there are members of the Government who are embarrassed and have been embarrassed by what has been going on among the promoters and the sponsors of this West Indies Hospital Sweepstake.

There was a time when it was known that one of the big shots in the Company had been arrested, detained, convicted and fined for offences arising out of the operation of the Sweepstake. Well, Sir, perhaps the full impact of it was not felt in Barbados mainly because we look inwards in some respects, and we feel that all is well that ends well; but those things have had a very damaging effect on the operation of the Sweepstake in this Island.

You will recall, Sir, that in the first place these Sweepstake tickets were not to have been sold locally. They were not really intended for the Barbadian. Whether they were intended for the Barbadian or for the outsider or both, it has happened that Barbadians are amongst those who have been swindled by the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. That is a fact. Now, Sir, what do we find? Our Post Office in Barbados has been involved in much with these promoters. We cannot say, Sir, that the Postal Authorities knew what the promoters were up to. What we can say is this: that since others have done enough to bring it to the attention of the Postal Authorities to convince them that being associated with the West Indies Sweepstake, even in the remotest manner, tended to cast reflections on the integrity of the said Postal Authorities, we feel that something should have been done, and at least a statement ought to have been published, whether by the Minister in charge

of the Post Office through the Government Information Office or however they go about it, to let the public in Barbados at least understand that the Post Office was above suspicion.
3.35 p.m.

That has not been done, as far as I know. What do we know? The West Indies Hospital promoters have been using a lot of phoney Postal Box numbers - perhaps some of them do not exist at all. But what do we find? Our Post Office has been silent on all of these things. We are to wonder if the silence of such authorities as the Postal Authorities, the silence of our Minister of Communications, must be taken as condoning the actions of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake promoters in using our postal system for the promotion of a spurious type of business such as the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake.

Much has been said about the number of persons now employed by the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. We do not want to reduce ourselves to nothingness by asking what were these people, now employed by the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, doing before the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake came on the scene. We do not want to say that. Let us ask ourselves this: if it has been established, as it has been established in this Honourable House, that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake's operations are contrary to everything that is decent and honest, are we, for the sake of saying that we are finding employment for 2,3,10, 12 or else people, to continue to tolerate such actions?

Mr. Speaker, the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake employed people who will have to find a job after the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake ceases to operate in Barbados or elsewhere. They will have to find a job, and they will have to find a job which does not provide them with ill-gotten earnings. That is what we are concerned with; not how many people the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake now employ. Our concern is this: if this operation is to be carried on, it must be carried on like any other honest or reputable business that can bring credit to this country.

In other words, do we really look to see what the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake operations are doing to the people employed there? We have heard it said from this side of the House - it has not been denied by the other side - that tickets have been shipped in tamarind barrels. We have heard of the methods employed to encourage other people to break our Postal Regulations and our Customs Regulations by taking tickets out of the Island in a manner contrary to our Customs Regulations.

Are we to understand then that because a few people are employed, they must be employed - doing what? Contravening our Postal Regulations and trying to corrupt every other living soul under the sun? Those are the things with which we have to concern ourselves. The longer the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake continues to operate in Barbados, the more corrupt the employees tend to be in the process of time. Why? Because they are being schooled in

things that normally, throughout the years past, we have not been accustomed to in Barbados.

In other words, they are being schooled in what is called bigtime crime. That is what it amounts to, and that is what the Hon. Prime Minister of this country wants. Remember: there are some youths who have been employed at the West Indies Hospital from time to time, and the Prime Minister would have his youths brought up in that type of atmosphere because they are being employed for a few dollars. If the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake had come on the scene and its operations had been such as to give it a good name, we on this side of the House would have supported it just as it was supported at the beginning, and we would have supported it today.

As a matter of fact, there would have been no necessity for the introduction of a Bill now seeking its repeal. It is patently strange that people who hold out, or would have the world to believe that they are more honest than honesty itself are people who, knowing all of this, could stand up in this Hon. House making speeches to defend the actions of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake.

3.45 p.m.

One cannot understand it, Sir. Our view is this: the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake has been carrying on either honest business or dishonest business. If it has been carrying on honest business, let it be explained why so many by-ways and side-ways have to be employed to get these tickets out and about. Let it be explained why so many people have written letters in the Press - and they have written to the same West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Office; they have written to their friends and lawyers and solicitors in Barbados and lawyers in other countries. They had to communicate with lawyers in this country I, personally, have known of a Barbadian in the United States of America winning money - or he thought he had won some - who came down here on holiday to spend some of the money in Barbados and buy a little property, and I am to tell you that when he came here, he was twisted and turned around and turned about, all sorts of frivolous and vexatious excuses have been given to him and the man almost went frantic. The man could be seen on Broad Street day after day with crowds around him telling them what had gone wrong with him. Does that speak well of Barbados? We are saying that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake is either doing honest business or dishonest business.

I am not in a position to excuse all hon. members on the other side of not knowing of the corruption which has gone on in the West Indies Hospital Sweep. Why cannot I excuse them? Mr. Speaker, I will sum up at this point. The name of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has suffered; if not doomed, it has suffered abroad. What has caused it to suffer abroad? On its being publicised that it stood to benefit half-million dollars from the operation of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. As a result of this, many Barbadians, particularly in the United States of America, saw to it that they supported the West Indies Hospital Sweep-

stake, because they thought they were supporting their own Hospital at home. Now, Sir, it has been established that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake had only used the word "Hospital" as a means of luring and deceiving people into buying these Sweepstake tickets, believing that they were supporting an institution for the sick. Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said in this matter. We are well aware that hon. members, the backbenchers on the other side, the quasi-Ministers, cannot exercise what is called a conscience vote on this Bill. Even if they know, and they must know, even if they see before their eyes, as I have tried to make out here today, that the operation of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake in this island was in some part responsible for the death of a maid, even if they see and know that, even if they know that because they know they will be supporting a plea, they cannot vote for the repeal of this Act. Dangling before their very eyes are salaries unknown hitherto. But, Sir, what I say is this; come what may, they will, some day, come to realise what is right and what is wrong. It is alright when a child does something wrong and one may excuse it. You may excuse boyish tricks or something of the sort, but when an adult is faced with a decision as we are in this Hon. House, to support what is right and vote against what is wrong, it is a challenge which we, on this side, intend to see how the others on the other side will face up to.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew first caught my eyes. Apart from that, the hon. introducer of the motion has the right of final reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on this Bill this afternoon and I want to try to point out some of the benefits derived from the existence of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake for this country. If the benefits outweigh the disadvantages, then I ask hon. members to vote on the side of the benefits. I am dealing with the benefits firstly in respect of the employees. I am the Minister of Labour in this country, and I know the problems facing the people of this country where unemployment is concerned. Mr. Speaker, we have 20,000 people in this country either unemployed or under-employed and it is the duty of the Government to seek employment and to devise ways and means to find employment for the unemployed people in the country.

3.55 p.m.

There is a high incidence of unemployment in Barbados. The West Indies Hospital Funds Limited, I understand, is employing in the region of between 27 and 30 people. Statistics from our Economic Surveys have pointed out that it costs industry in this Island \$10,000 to employ one person. Therefore, let us take the 30 people employed by the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited. If we are to bring in an industry or industries to employ, according to the statistics, these 30 people, we would have to find \$300,000 to put in industry.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Would the Minister of Labour say what statistics he has of how much the gambling business needs to invest to employ one person? He is talking about how much industry needs, but we are talking about a gambling business. His statistics are meaningless.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is no point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was saying, Sir, that from our statistics that it takes \$10,000 to invest in an industry in this country to employ one person, and now with the devaluation of the pound it will cost more. The position is, if you close the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake down, you are putting 30 Barbadians out of a job. The hon. junior member for St. Peter said that these people employed at the West Indies Sweepstake would have to look for jobs. Yes, I agree that if the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake is closed down, they would have to look for jobs. The question is where are they going to find the jobs? The position is that the hon. junior member for St. Peter, perhaps, may be able to employ some of them, but he cannot employ all. Some may go to the hon. junior member for St. Peter and ask him to assist them in looking for a job and some may get a job, but the majority of them will find the Ministry of Labour.

Only this morning I was having discussions with an American employer trying to see whether I could find avenues of employment for some of our unemployed nationals. I may find employment for 50 men in the U.S.A., as a result of my discussions with the gentlemen this morning, in another four or five months. But this is only 50 out of 20,000 unemployed.

Everybody that we can find employment for, it is important to the economy of this country. For everyone we can place in employment we can say that about five mouths are being fed. One of the biggest headaches of the Government, as I said earlier, is the question of unemployment. A hungry man, Mr. Speaker, can be a very vicious man. As a matter of fact, even some who are full are vicious. The greater the incidence of unemployment, the more insecure you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and all of us in here, will be because as I said, Mr. Speaker, a hungry man is a very vicious man, and he must look for food to eat; if he cannot find food to eat, he must steal. I am sure that if any of us in here would enter our home any night and find one trying to steal what little we have, if we do have it, he may resort to violence and we ourselves may be the losers.

The position is that because of the present unemployment situation in the country, we cannot afford to place any of our people who are employed out of employment.

Let us take the money paid to the employees at the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake and see what happens to that money. Although there are only 30 people benefitting from the weekly wages or monthly

salaries, thousands of others benefit from what they earn. It includes the spending capacity of the families.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the Hon. Minister of Labour say what the labour multipliers in Barbados are? If the earnings of 27 to 30 people can benefit thousands, what does he take the multiplier to be, if he knows what that means?

Mr. SPEAKER: That I do not deem to be a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that I expect this sort of interruption. I am going to show how it benefits thousands of other people. As a matter of fact, it benefits 250,000 people in this country. I am going to show the hon. member. I am not an expert in finance. I am not even a mathematician or even the Shadow Minister of Finance; but I am going to explain to the Shadow Minister of Finance and the House how it benefits 250,000 people approximately in this country. Yes, the funds paid to the workers at the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, Mr. Speaker, when they get their money, they go down to Broad Street, they spend some of the money they work for. They go into Swan Street and spend some. They go to their shopkeepers and they spend some. They go to the butcher's shop and spend some. All of these people with whom they spend this money that they work for at the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited employ people to work for them, and part of this money is paid to the employees of the firm at which this money is spent.

At the end of the year all of these firms in this country, the stores in Swan Street, Tudor Street - even the bakers - all of them have to make some sort of return to the Department of Inland Revenue. They all make some sort of profit, and 40 percent of their net profits comes into the Treasury of this Island.
4.05 p.m.

This assists Government in providing hospital services, social services, education for our people, repairs to roads and all the facilities which our Government provides, and the facilities provided by the Government are provided for the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Peter. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is getting on as though he does not benefit from it. As a matter of fact, I may say here, Mr. Speaker, that some of that very money which the workers at the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake are working for is paying the hon. senior member for St. Peter, is paying the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is paying all of us who put our hands out to the Treasury for even one dollar when the month comes. Regardless of what it is, Mr. Speaker, it is all added up to provide facilities in this country to keep the country going. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is adding something to the economy of this country. If it is only one cent, it is going to circulate. The Hon. Shadow Minister of Finance does not seem to understand that one cent can

circulate in a country and add something to the economy of that country.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, didn't the Minister hear me ask him what does he take the labour multiplier to be in Barbados? "Multiplier" is a short word for what the Minister has been talking about for the last five minutes. Ask him what the word means. If he did not know, he could have asked me.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point to which my attention has been directed on which I am being desired to give my decision?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is a point of elucidation I am asking the Minister to give way and elucidate.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the amendment to his alleged point of order, I think elucidation must refer to some point made by the hon. member in the course of his speech which that hon. member is rising to elucidate.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that is true of a point of explanation. Any hon. member may be heard again under a different rule from the one at which Your Honour is now looking to explain something he said earlier, but explanation goes beyond interruption. But elucidation as I take it, Mr. Speaker, is to be found under the same Rule dealing with interruption. You can always interrupt a speaker to ask him to elucidate.

Mr. SPEAKER: No member shall interrupt another member except to elucidate. In other words, to elucidate some matter raised by that member in the course of his, i.e., that member's speech.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: With respect, Sir, "elucidate" does not mean "explain"; "elucidate" means "ask for an explanation", or "get an explanation from". That is the dictionary meaning of "elucidate". It does not mean "explain". I cannot elucidate something I have said, but I can ask somebody else for an elucidation. That is what the dictionary would tell us "elucidate" means, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member and I do not consult the same dictionaries. I will refer the hon. member to the Oxford English Dictionary. It is perhaps one of the few good things which have come out of Oxford.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Send for the dictionary, Mr. Speaker, and let us put your recollection of what it says and mine to the test.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intention of embarrassing the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. Let the hon. senior member for St. Andrew proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am going to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the money paid into the Treasury by the West Indies

Hospital Sweepstake. It is my understanding that to date \$1/4 million have been paid into the Treasury in some form or other by the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. Even if it is said or thought that what is paid out in salaries could make no impact on the economy of this country, I would like to see anyone denying the fact that \$250,000 does mean a lot to this country. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Which \$250,000?) I said it is my understanding that approximately \$250,000 have already been paid into the Treasury from the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Absolutely untrue. It is dishonest to make a statement like that to this House.) I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is my understanding that approximately \$250,000 have been paid into the Treasury from the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. That, Mr. Speaker, is a lot of money in any language.

I prefaced my remarks by saying that I am going to deal with this Bill as far as it affects employment in this country.

(Mr. CORBIN: Man, silence, and let the man speak. What is wrong?) *(Laughter)*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, all of us expressed great concern over the length of time which the Financial Building took in construction. We were all concerned about the amount of money spent on it. We were hoping that that building would have been completed almost one year ago. (A VOICE: The money was stolen.) If money was stolen, you had to find money to replace the stolen money. The longer that building took in construction, the more money the Government has had to look for.
4.15 p.m.

One of the reasons that the building took so long to complete is that some of the people who were employed did not feel that there would have been work elsewhere for them, and they tried to drag along the work in order to guarantee some sort of employment. (Mr. SMITH: Employment is not in the Bill. You are out of order.) I am coming to you now, too.

Mr. Speaker, those people could not afford to be put out of work; therefore they dragged along the work in order to remain in employment as long as possible. The same \$250,000 that I mentioned has assisted the Government in giving these people employment.

With regard to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, since April he came here with a Resolution asking for the acquisition of Lammings to replace....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Lammings is not in this Bill, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is not mentioned in this Bill. The Hon. Minister should keep to the point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am keeping to the point. We are dealing with \$250,000; we are dealing with employment occasioned as a result of the money which has been collected from the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake by the Government of this country. I am saying that since April the hon. senior member

for St. Joseph came in here with a Resolution asking us to acquire Lammings..... (Mr. SMITH: I have it now.) It takes money to acquire Lammings. I would like to see the hon. senior member for St. Joseph voting for the closing down of the West Indies Hospital Institution that is bringing in some sort of revenue to this country to assist the Government in acquiring Lammings and to assist in finding employment for people in St. Joseph who could be employed on the preparation of the site, the re-siting of the people whose homes are affected in St. Joseph, the provision of a playing field at Lammings, and the re-siting of the St. Bernard's School and all of those things in St. Joseph. I would like to hear the hon. senior member for St. Joseph saying that he is not going to support an institution which is making some sort of contribution to giving him the things he has been asking for in St. Joseph.

I am speaking on employment vis-a-vis the money we get from the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. We have our Public Works Department; we have our Highways and Transport Department, and it takes money to run these Departments. What the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking for is the spending of money. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph and all hon. members on the opposite side are talking about the spending of money. Take, for instance, the provision of electricity; the installation and running of wire and so on at Boscobelle, Black Bess and Coggins Bridge and so on must call for money. It means that if we do not receive that \$250,000 in taxes from the West Indies Hospital Fund, the taxpayers of this country would have to provide it. When we tax the taxpayers in this country, you will hear the same hon. members on the opposite side saying that we tax the chicken backs, we put 4¢ on a snap of rum, and all sorts of things will be said about the taxation policy.

We have tried to ease the burden on the taxpayers of this country, and if we can find money from other sources, especially from hard currency, to reduce the incidence of taxation on our nationals, what is wrong with that? The position is that only this week or some time last week \$18,000 was paid into the Treasury from the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. I am not sure when it was paid in, but I know that it was paid within the last 10 days. (Mr. MOTTLEY: They never paid \$250,000'') If they did not pay then, the position is, Mr. Speaker, they are paying now. What they are paying into the Treasury is easing the burden on the woman who has children down in Chapman Lane; the one who owns a house in Chapman Lane; the one who owns a house in St. Peter, in Dark Hole, at Black Bess, at Boscobelle, and places like that. If we are to carry out our works programme, and if we are to complete the programme which we put before the people in 1961 and again in 1966, we have to find the money.

The position is that if we tax the people more, the same hon. member for St. Peter, who is talking about getting money by hook or crook, will come here and say that we have taxed the people too heavily. Whatever the Government does will be criticised. We

have got accustomed to this by now. The position is that we are trying to keep taxation as low as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am not yet finished with the question of employment where the West Indies Hospital Sweepstakes are concerned. I understand that they have paid the *Advocate* \$190,000 for printing. It means that people were kept in employment, and the *Advocate* was able to keep the incidence of unemployment down in the printery, and these people did not have to starve. The children of these people were able to eat, to go to school, and be clothed, and several people benefitted from the money paid out for printing those tickets. That has contributed something to this country. If it continues we will be receiving more and more benefits as a result of the continuation of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake.

We talk about the Barbados Turf Club. We have heard hon. members on the opposite side say that the Barbados Turf Club received nothing from the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. That is true. The Turf Club received nothing because they did not ask for anything.
4.25 p.m.

The Barbados Turf Club made no representation to the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake during the time they were in trouble. They came to the Government and we gave them two years tax free. Over and above that - again this is my understanding - I understand that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake are willing now to assist the Barbados Turf Club only if representation is made to them. They were willing to do so all along, but the position is that no representation has, as yet, been made by the Barbados Turf Club to the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. What I would advise hon. members - some of them who have very close relationship with the Barbados Turf Club, Executive Committee members etc. - I would advise them to advise the Barbados Turf Club to make the proper representation to the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, and if they are denied assistance, then they can criticise the action of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake; but is not fair to say that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake do not give the Barbados Turf Club any assistance. I understand that they are willing even to sponsor a race. They have approached individuals in this country sponsoring races and I understand that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake are willing to sponsor a race for the Turf Club. But what representation is made? They will go to the British American Tobacco Company and say: "We need a trophy". The Company will put \$3,000 or \$4,000 in a race and will buy a trophy; but the position is that they have not gone to the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake and said that they want them to sponsor a race, whether it is for a thoroughbred horse or otherwise. Representation has not been made by the Barbados Turf Club to the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake and I am sure - indeed I am confident - that some sort of consideration, even favourable consideration, will be given to the proposals or the representation made by the Barbados Turf Club.

Now, Sir, any country in the world, whether it is Barbados or Trinidad which is in the sterling area, is proud to have hard currency brought into it. That is one of the benefits of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. Most of the business of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake is planned from the hard currency area and that is what is the desire.....

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now the desire to proceed with Government Business.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before we entered upon Private Members' Business, I intimated to the other side that it is my desire to move the suspension of certain Standing Orders, and it was the desire that Private Members' Business be first done. With that understanding, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not got my copy of the Standing Orders here, but I am wondering if the suspension of the Standing Orders at this time is in order. I am seeking information as to whether, at this stage, the Hon. Minister can move the suspension of these Standing Orders. I think that that is controlled by the time Schedule of the sitting. I do not think that any time the Hon. Leader of the House may ask permission to move the suspension of the Standing Orders, but I am speaking without having the pertinent Standing Order in front of me. I think that there is a particular time when the Hon. Leader of the House has to move for the suspension of the Standing Orders. As far as I can see, this is what Standing Order 62 says:-

"A question the object or effect of which may be to suspend any Standing Order of the House shall be proposed only with the consent of the Speaker, either after notice given or after the expression of the general assent of the House."

There is a Standing Order which deals with the time for moving the suspension of the Standing Orders. I am seeking Your Honour's Ruling. I think that we are controlled by that Standing Order which says that notice must be given or we must have the expression of the general assent of the House. I do not think that any notice has been given or that there has been the expression of the general assent of the House in evidence. However, Sir, I do believe that somewhere in these Standing Orders it says the time when the Standing Orders should be suspended. I do not think that this is the proper time to introduce a motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders. 4.35 p.m.

Again, you see, we are dealing with Miscellaneous 62. This is only, probably, something extra and

not direct as to the time schedule as suspended that we asked for. Mr. Speaker, I will await a pronouncement from you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member would have sat. It is my ruling that it is not out of order at this stage for the motion to be put that certain Standing Orders be suspended. The expression of "general assent" of the House would be given when the question is put and only, of course, then. The motion, as I understand it, has been duly made for Standing Orders to be now suspended.

Hon. members who are in favour will please say "Aye" and those of the opposite view will please say "No."

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS -

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS was called.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (*sitting*): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I really was getting up to say something before the question was put. However, what is the purpose of your going to suspend the Standing Orders when operation of them have already begun for the day's sitting?

The list of Standing Orders which are to be suspended is as follows:-

Standing Order 14 - which is really not relevant now.

Standing Order 16 - which deals with a definite matter of urgent public importance.

Standing Order 18 - which deals with the precedence of Government Business and should be set down in such Order as the Government shall deem fit.

Standing Order 19 - which deals with notices of motions.

Standing Order 40 - the second reading of Bills, and

Standing Order 45 - procedure in Committee on Bills.

I have never been able to understand why the Government wants them suspended. This is what I was really asking Government. Is it in order to suspend Standing Order 14 even though the operation of it has already begun? What I would like to know is, what is the purpose of suspending the Standing Orders?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point.

NOES (Continued): Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. SMITH, Mr. St. JOHN - 8.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that nine hon. members voted "Aye" and 8 hon. members voted "No". Accordingly, I declare that the "Ayes" have it. That is indicative of the general assent of the House.

I will ask that in respect of any Standing Order which may have been named but which now would have no effect, it simply has no effect, but it may negative the effect on any Standing Order which would relate to the remainder of this day's proceedings.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE, Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. HUSBANDS, Mr. SMITH and Mr. St. JOHN - 8.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day under Government Business stand 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 Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolutions of which notice was previously given earlier today and of which copies have been circulated.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

4.45 p.m.

The House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 29

Head 6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, supplementary provision for stationery is required under Head 6. The original provision in the Current Estimates of \$400 has been insufficient. There has been unforeseen expenditure due to the typing of draft legislation for the Law Revision Commission as well as the stencilling of Bills for introduction into Parliament and other things.

I beg to move that Head 6 - Legal - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 15 - Statistical Service - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, supplementary provision is required under item 20 (A) which is a new item (Overtime). The sum of \$2,080 is required to meet the cost of overtime fees in the Statistical Department for work which is required to be done outside of normal working hours.

I beg to move that Head 15 - Statistical Service - stand part.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we on this side would very much like to know what the work involved is. The Minister has just said "work". I hardly heard what he said; it was so quick. What is this work which has been done outside of normal working hours in this financial year? What is the basis of estimating overtime fees? In any case, what employees of the Statistical Department are being employed to work overtime? I was not aware that overtime applied to the Statistician grade in the Public Service. This is a new item altogether, Mr. Chairman, and would seem to need more explanation than the Minister has given us.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it appears that in the Department of Statistics, in addition to the normal day-to-day processing of data relating to such subjects as migration, trade and employment, the personnel there are called upon from time to time to undertake certain special projects including labour force surveys, tourist expenditure surveys and processing of statistical data for other Government Departments such as the Inland Revenue and sometimes the Post Office. For some time now we have requested - I cannot remember whether the request has been acceded to - assistance from the United Nations for a survey to be made regarding the possibility of streamlining and centralising these operations by more up-to-date data-processing methods. Until this is done, there is a certain amount of overtime work which the staff and other personnel of the Department are required to do, and it is in connection with this, as I have outlined before, that the overtime fees are required to be paid.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is in connection with the request to the United Nations Technical Assistance in new methods of data-processing!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not say that. I said it was hoped to get assistance to streamline and centralise these operations which would make it unnecessary for extra labour to be put in on the other things which I outlined; but until that comes, it was necessary for the personnel of the Statistical Department to work in addition to their normal working hours, and it is in respect of that additional work that the overtime fees are proposed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I really must admire the fluency of the Hon. Leader of the House. He has explained very carefully what work the Statistical Department does without even beginning to answer what was the reason for the overtime. It is quite a simple question. What is the extra work which they have been doing in the course of the year? It is more to it than this. When you just look at this item, there must be something behind it. There must at some stage have been some question of some Statistics to be got out, of public officers perhaps saying that they could not work all those hours, and representations made about overtime, because overtime is not normally payable to public officers of this grade. There must have been some argument in the Statistical Department, and some Government Statistician must have felt he was being called on to do more than he was normally being called on to do. A Department must have been falling down on its statistics and pushing the Statistics on the Statisticians to do. I cannot help feeling that this payment of \$2,080 is the result of some dispute.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us how many people are involved in it and how many are receiving it. What are the overtime rates? Is it being done on a piece work rate? One of the reasons given for giving public servants a salary and not giving them overtime at this level where they cannot be supervised is because you cannot tell a man how long it is going to take him to add up figures or work a calculating machine, and one of the reasons for not giving them overtime is to stop them sitting down for eight hours and putting in two hours to get overtime afterwards. What we want to get at is what is behind it. Is it some kind of reward payment? Is this a settlement of a dispute? Is it one officer concerned? Is it one officer and an assistant concerned, as the case may be? Maybe the Minister is as much at sea as we are, and if he says so, there is nothing more we can do about it, but I would be glad to hear.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I had explained, as I thought, to the hon. member that in addition to the ordinary work which the Staff is normally expected to do, there had been in the course of the year certain extra duties required of them for other Ministries and Departments, other surveys which had been asked for and which had been done. Now there were two ways, as I see it, in which this extra work could have been coped with: either by the installation of new and more up-to-date machines, or by the employment of the same personnel outside of their working hours; and so far as I can gather, the latter course was more immediately feasible and four persons were employed for a period of twenty weeks,

each at a rate of \$2.00 per hour, and this brings it up to the amount of \$2,080. The number of persons: one for verifying, two for tabulating, and one for key-punching. The number of hours per person: in the case of the tabulator, eighteen hours, and in the case of the other two, eight hours each, and the total number of hours per week was 36, 8 and 8, a period of approximately twenty weeks for each of them which would be 160, 160 and 720, a total of 1,040 hours in the aggregate, and at a rate of \$2.00 an hour making a total of \$2,080. This is all the information I can find to give the hon. member, and I do not know that it is as complicated as he may wish us to believe. 4.55 p.m.

The question that Head 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 20 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Supplementary provision is required for Head 20, Item 37 (New) Electrical Installations - \$4,302. It appears that this amount is required to complete the installation of a new distribution board and an emergency alternator switchboard at Seawell Airport. Provision was already made for this during the last financial year. I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 27 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Head 27 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Head 35 - Public Works - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that a Resolution for \$8,118 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 30

A Resolution for \$25,000 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This amount is required to complete construction of the Caribbean Meteorological

logical Institute at Husbands, St. James. Of this sum, \$21,250 is recoverable because contributions are also made by other territories, and the amount also includes what the United Kingdom makes as a contribution on behalf of the territories of the Associated States. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 32

A Resolution for \$100,000 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks supplementary provision for items 11 of Head 2 - \$85,000 and \$15,000 respectively. As a result of the increase in the number of officers going on vacation and study leave and consequential acting appointments, a further sum is required to meet the cost of acting allowances and for the provision of substitutes.

The other sum is for officers who qualify for leave passages prior to 1966. They have a certain period of grace within which to take these passages and this has resulted in an increase in the number of officers going on leave. This sum is required to meet the demands for the remainder of the financial year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, we realise that it is quite a difficult thing to forecast the expenditure that would be required under an item such as Item 2, but to have to come to the House for a supplementary Resolution to the extent of \$85,000 out of an original estimate of \$220,000 seems to us to have been either extremely bad estimating at the beginning or that something has occurred which was not foreseen and should have been foreseen originally.

Now in the Addendum it says that this is as a result of an increase in the number of officers going on vacation. Surely, it would be within the competence of those who are responsible for framing the Estimates to know, throughout the Service, the amount of officers who would be eligible for vacation. It does seem to me that there must be something further behind this than the reason that is stated here. It goes on and says: "The cost of acting allowances and provision for substitutes for the remainder of the current financial year."

It is known that when there are people acting for a certain period of time, substitutes will come in to fill their places; so that, too, can be foreseen. I wonder if the Minister can tell us whether this unforeseen expenditure can be related to any particular Department or type of Department in the Government. That would be useful information for us, and then we would be able to see what is behind this \$85,000.

Mr. SMITH: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I would like to say that I have only seen this Resolution for the first time when the Clerk passed it to me.

5.05 p.m.

When it was handed to the Chair by the Speaker I got up to let the Speaker know that I was not in receipt of the Resolution when he had put the question. I did not want to vote "No" because I did not want to hold up the Government Business, and the Speaker ignored me. I am very sorry and I hope that he is around the precincts of the House so that he can hear me. I respect every hon. member in this Chamber and I demand respect from every hon. member, be he Speaker, Chairman of Committees or anybody else. I got up and the Speaker looked at me and then he took to his feet and went out of the Chair. I hope that this is the first and last time that the Speaker does that to me; otherwise I will exercise my democratic right in this Chamber. He could name or blame. I take it that this is a disregard of my authority in here. I only got up to let him know that I did not receive any copy of the Resolution, but the Clerk has just handed one to me. I am not against this Resolution; I will let it go ahead; but I only want the Speaker to know that I hope that this will be the first and last time that he does it to me; otherwise I will exercise my democratic right in here.

While I am on my feet, I want to say that there is no one in this world whom I am afraid of, none at all whatsoever. Now, I see in here this amount of \$15,000 for leave passages. I would like to know from the hon. introducer if these leave passages are for officers who are away from home, their time has expired and they are going back to look for their families, or if this is to pay Barbadian officers to go on a spree. That is what I want to know. Is this for the purpose of paying officers from overseas whose time has expired, for them to return home to look for their families, or is this for those who were born here, who worked here and who are living here and you are giving this to them to go on a spree? I want to know that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Perhaps I could just answer the hon. member who has just sat down first. This matter, of course, involves all public officers who are entitled to acting allowances and who are entitled to leave passages. There is no discrimination with leave passages above a certain type of salary; everybody, whether Barbadian born or any national, so long as you receive a salary above a certain level, you receive leave passages under certain conditions of service.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church asked as far as I can gather, among which Ministries or particular departments this bulge, or so-called, arises. I cannot find any information which tells me which departments, but all the evidence appears to be that it is spread out generally throughout the Service. I will see if I can trace something of the background so as to help the hon. member. It appears that in the 1966-67 Estimates, the sum of \$200,000

was provided for acting allowances and the payment of substitutes. When the salaries revision came up in the middle of that financial year or towards the end of it, an additional \$39,000 was put within the Estimates, and the total expenditure in that year was \$230,000. It seems from that that the expenditure pattern of 1966-67 was properly maintained this year and that at least the same amount is required. However, the Service Commissions have said that because of the services provided in this island, it was impossible for them to make an accurate estimate of the likely demands of the vote, and expenditure based on the expenditure at least of the previous year was not as they expected it to be. They said that the expenditure pattern under this vote is something like \$24,000 a month. Consequently, they estimate, for instance, that the estimated expenditure for the period from 1st November, 1967, to the 31st March, 1968, is going to be \$120,000 and the balance to the 31st October would be \$34,000. They represent that \$85,000 is what they would need between the 1st November and the end of the financial year. There is no specific case given as to which Ministries or Departments contribute most of this expenditure on acting allowances, but you could hazard that it would most certainly be true of the Ministry of Education with the teachers, and those Ministries or Departments which employ fairly large professional staffs. It would appear to me, from what I know of the problem, that the expenditure is justified because of the nature of the problem and the difficulty which the Service Commissions have found in estimating accurately the expenditure pattern.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 34

COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS - TRANSPORT BOARD

A Resolution for the sum of \$56,000 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, the amount of \$56,000 is required to supplement Head 102 of the Capital Estimates to meet the cost of financing the first phase of improved accommodation for the Transport Board. It is proposed to undertake the second phase during the next financial year. The first phase includes clearing and raising yard and roadways; paving and drainage. The second phase will take care of new offices and workshop accommodation and ancillary services. Any person who has passed by the Transport Board recently will be aware that since we have been having the rains - anybody will agree with me that the area of the yard as a whole is nothing more than a quagmire. That is so whenever we get rain. The place is not really suitable for any human being to go to work in. Members of the Opposition may ask if that is the case, why we did not do something before. The reason is simply this, that after the Jaycees offered the Government money to put up a Stadium, everybody thought that the best place to put the Stadium

because of its proximity to town, would be at Roebuck Street.

5.15 p.m.

After a lot of soundings, measurements and what not, Mr. Chairman, it was then decided that Weymouth, Roebuck Street, would not be the most suitable place. It is only recently that the Transport Board came to the decision - at least the Government - that the Transport Board would remain in its resting place, and as a result, we had an officer from England who was loaned to us by the name of Mr. Jessop who was also very instrumental in helping us to construct these buses - and he was also giving us a general lay-out of what he thought was the most suitable place for putting the workshop and so on. As a result that is why work on the Transport Board has been lagging for so long.

It was not a matter of indifference on my part, or the Government, or anybody; but the truth was that we were getting out plans which would be suitable for the Transport Board. After the first plans, we decided to take the Transport Board down to Deacons Road, but the expense for doing so was in the vicinity of half million dollars, and we thought that if we had to spend that amount of the taxpayers' money, it would be a wise thing to spend it wisely and not spend it for the sake of spending it. As a result of that, the Transport Board yard became worse than some people's backyard when it rained. I have warned them, and they have agreed, that one morning we might get up and discover that the workers of the Transport Board - not that they went on strike, but they said that they were not coming to work under those conditions, which would be fair. Well, it did happen one morning, as everybody knows. The workmen said that they were not going to work.

As a result of this, I am asking the House to give approval to this vote as expeditiously as possible so that we can start and have the yard paved and drained so that even if it rains, the water would run off immediately and would not cause any problem with the workers.

As you know, the workers do not work in Church's or Saxons' shoes; they work in old shoes; and the moment it begins to rain it means that the workers are going to get sick because the water seeps into the shoes that they wear. As a result of that, I am appealing to the members of the opposite side. There is nothing wrong in asking any question which they want to ask; but I think it is a clear-cut case. And since some of them have friends working up there and they would not like to see them get sick with pneumonia, I am asking that they expedite this matter for us.

Sir, I am moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I will give the Resolution my blessing. I will inform the Minister of this at the outset. This deals with the accommodation for the workmen of the Transport Board.

This is a question for the Minister. Several buses are now being accommodated in the St. Peter Girls' School yard in Speightstown. It appears that they want to make it a permanent bus terminal, a regular bus stop, and a turning around place for these buses. The St. Peter's Girls' School yard is a sandy area, and pools of water settle whenever more than ordinary drizzles fall.

I do not think that the St. Peter Girls' School yard is a proper place for the buses to be housed. It seems to me that they are so bent on retaining it as such, that they have installed light so that when these come there, the drivers can see exactly where to park without a collision taking place: but, at the same time, this school is suffering.

As a matter of fact, there are some bus drivers that seem to forget that Major Walk is a public highway, and, Mr. Chairman, you know what I would do? If a bus is parked there, and you toot your horn and the bus driver would not move for you to go up, I have promised to create a test case out of it. If a bus driver refuses to give me passage to Major Walk, I am going to the District "E" Police Station and bring down a Police Sargeant and make him put the bus driver in court. This is a public highway.

If you go so far as to use the St. Peter's Girls' School yard as a bus terminal, you are infringing on the rights of the Ministry of Education. Well, if one Minister tolerates that, that still is not good enough for me.

As far as the bus drivers parking in your way in such a way as to prevent the free flow of traffic, I am going to promise the Government to bring a test case whenever I am being embarrassed from passing into Major Walk in Speightstown. It is not good enough. The school yard should not be a bus park.

While I am going to give this Resolution my blessing, I am going to draw it to the attention of the Minister, as I have done before, that it is not good enough. I do not know what plans Government has; but the St. Peter's Girls' School yard should not be a bus parking place.

They have a watchman. I will say that he does his job. Some time ago, I had business to be out late at night as I came from Bridgetown; and whenever I drop in at a friend whom I have at Major Walk and whenever I pass there, the watchman is awake and alert. Nobody can steal a bus, because a bus is a big thing. But, I know, what happens is this. There are no cleaners in Speightstown nowadays. When the buses remained at Weymouth, they used to have cleaners, and when a bus had finished its day's work, the cleaners went into it and cleaned it; but no cleaners go on any bus in Speightstown now.

Now, these buses park in the St. Peter's Girls' School yard in Speightstown, and that school suffers every half an hour because they come right down and turn around in the yard during the school hours. I do not know how the Headmistress gets on with her

work. I do not know if it is any business of the Ministry of Education or not. I do not know; maybe, it is no business of the Ministry of Education. What I am saying, I know of.

I am asking the appropriate Minister to have this matter settled. See to it that as far as the Northern end is concerned - the Speightstown end of it, where the buses park in the St. Peter Girls' School yard, that there is proper accommodation for these buses. This sort of slipshod accommodation is not good enough. They are watched; they are not cleaned properly. Human beings have to travel on them every morning. This is not good enough for public transport in Barbados.

5.25 p.m.

I am just bringing that to his attention, because that is incidental, and it is a matter of Government bus transport.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the Hon. Minister if he could inform us as to when the new buses for which we passed some money in this House some time ago will be pressed into service at the Transport Board. I do this because in my constituency, like the constituency of the Hon. Minister of Education and the Hon. Minister of Health, there is a tremendous problem, particularly from Silver Sands to Bridgetown. It is a very populated area, and it is well known that there is a shortage of buses on that route in particular. It is one of the most remunerative routes on the Transport Board Service, and there is great demand for it.

I myself have been trying to find out from the Transport Board when they would press into service the new buses, as they have been always telling me that they realise it is a remunerative route and that the services there are not up to the standard which they would like the service to be up to; but they were still awaiting the new buses which they have not got yet. I saw some time ago in the Press that some of the parts for the new buses which were being built locally will soon be delivered; so I would really like to know and to hope that the service on that route would be improved in time for Christmas or, at least, for the New Year.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay this Resolution. It has got all my good wishes. I will begin by saying that when the Minister used the words that the road leading into the Transport Board is a quagmire, he had better say it is a lake. I was there just a few days ago, and I was surprised to think that a condition like that existed up there. I did not go into the buildings; I just went down the road and I had to hold up my pants to get down. I read some time ago that they intend to move the Transport Board from there; but if they intend to move it, they should not allow the roadway to get into such a bad condition when there are buildings being pulled down all around, and they could get some old stuff. I do not think the Minister used the right word. He was bashful to say it was a pure lake. I was glad I had seen it, as I intended to ask a question in the House if we had

met last Tuesday; but to my great surprise, two days afterwards I read that the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and the Minister of Tourism had visited, and I was exceedingly glad. The conditions under which those workmen work there are something appalling, and I do hope that they will do something. December is around the corner, and we get lovely rains around December.* Go right along and harden the road, and where you are about to pave, go right ahead and do it! I agree with the Minister; it was past a quagmire; it was a lake.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, when it comes to motor vehicles, accommodation and things of that sort, you are talking up my street, and they should be fixed right. Now, Sir, I cannot let the Minister get away with the statement that the expectation of this boxing arena and things of this sort prevented them from doing so before. Up there was in that condition long ago. It makes me believe now that, since the big boss of the Union stepped in, the Minister got frightened and rushed in here with this overnight Resolution. It should have been fixed long ago, but the big boss can frighten a lot of them. He even frightened himself and that is what happened. Anyhow, I am very glad to see that the Minister has seen fit to make the conditions up there for the workers and everybody safer.

Now, Sir, whilst we are on transport, I think you will remember that as a boy we had the tramcars running and they used to run up White Park Road and all up Bank Hall, and they were pulled by two mules. Now, Sir, since we have mechanically-propelled machines, the Government has abandoned transport from Bank Hall Cross Road and down White Park; but in the days when we had the mule-drawn tramcars, people up there were considered, and rightly so. Now, Sir, we have people and workers, and the youth of Barbados - whom we heard so much about last Sunday afternoon, going to school at Washington School in Strathclyde and at Rudder's School; and these children have to walk from Strathclyde all the way down to the bus-stand in Fairchild Street - or very nearly down to the Deep Water Harbour. These are the youth that the Prime Minister appealed to last Sunday. Now do not let us forget them now. They are still young now. Now we have people living in the districts there who have to go to work, and go into town. I am drawing this to the Minister's attention, and I hope he is listening. Some mornings ago, I was travelling up Passage Road, the rain was drizzling, and I saw a woman running like anything up Country Road, and when I got to her I stopped and asked her what had happened, and she told me she had to run up by the Coca Cola building to catch a bus, because if she did not try to catch it then, she would have to walk down to the bus stand to catch a bus to get to the St. Michael's Infirmary and she would arrive late. Now this woman came from Passage Gardens. You can see the inconvenience that this woman was put to; whereas if a bus was passing that way, she would be able to take it, go into the Fairchild Street terminal, whether or not the rain was falling, and then on to the St. Michael's Infirmary. Again, I was coming down some time ago and I saw an old man on a stick, and I

stopped and asked him where he was going, and he said he would like to get to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but there was no bus passing that way and he hoped someone would come along and take him up. I put him in my car and took him to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.
5.35 p.m.

It is all right to say: "Do not put a bus on this route"; it is all right to take it off, but it is unkind to deprive the people from those districts of a bus service. You have the Garden Land, Passage Gardens, Strathclyde - everybody in Strathclyde does not have a motor car. Several people need the bus service. I know of a man who has to drive from Collymore Rock and go to Bank Hall to take his sister into town to her job.

Now, Sir, I feel that it is unfair to those people. You have sufficient people up there, and you should not discontinue the bus service from Bank Hall Cross Road right down to White Park. You have the Local Government Office up there, and the entire staff do not have motor cars. These people have to walk from up there into town. You have the Empire Club up there and so on. There is a big village just above the Local Government Office. I cannot remember the name of it at the moment, but I think it is Yearwood's Tenantry, and the people have to walk to Town.

It would not cost the Government anything to run a bus service in that area. The Government would not lose anything; it would make money. You have any amount of children at the Washington High School and at Rudder's school. If you are not going to give the people a bus service all through the day, then give them a bus service during the peak hours and during school hours. Let us put a bus service at the disposal of these people.

I think I have said sufficient for now, but I am not stopping here. I am not satisfied about this matter. I have to be moving these people, and I have moved two of them already. I have taken one to Roebuck Street to catch a bus, and I have taken an old man to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am not above doing that; I am only too glad to do that because it will be giving me a chance when I am moving into the City of Bridgetown for a seat. I will stand a chance; I may have to run for the City of Bridgetown. I do not know what is likely to happen, but I am saying that the Government and the Minister should see to it that a bus is put up there.

Sir, for those reasons I have to be serious. I am moving the reduction of \$1.00 from this vote as a mark of protest against the Government for depriving these people of the service of a bus. It would have been a different thing if a bus service was never there. A bus service was there before. There was always a service even when we had tram cars. Today these people are deprived of any kind of service. I am asking the Government to reconsider putting back the bus service. In order to show the Government that I am serious, I respectfully beg to move a reduction of \$1.00 from this amount as a mark of protest against

the withdrawal of the bus service from Bank Hall Cross Road to Bridgetown.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion for the reduction of \$1.00, I am glad to see that the yard at the Transport Board is now going to be paved because it is expected, as we know, that new buses will soon be delivered by the Acme Engineering Firm at Grazettes, and it is expected that the Prime Minister will be driving the first of those buses. I would like to see all of the pot-holes in the Transport Board yard levelled so that he would not go into any ditches. At least the Prime Minister is trying to show that he will be complying with the law, because he has seen to it that he has a Transport licence to drive a bus; he did not have it before, but he has looked after the matter quite recently.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question of the buses and the paving of the Transport yard brings to our mind that quite recently the poor school children were being turned here, there and everywhere - they could not get any 5¢ tickets. At the time the conductors on the various routes called on them to pay the normal fare that other passengers were paying. I do not think that it was altogether fair to the school children because, as we know, many of those children were forced into taking money that was normally given to them to buy lunch and use it for subsidising their bus fares. It meant then that they were able to drive to school; but their lunch, as you know, would not be there at lunch time.

It is a situation which, I think, the hon. Minister should look into in order to see that it does not occur in the future, and especially due to the fact that, I think, he has seen by now that all the tickets that are needed can certainly be printed locally. We do not see the necessity any longer - if it is still obtaining - for the Transport Board to have tickets printed overseas.

Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, there are complaints coming out of the Transport Board from conductors and drivers that they are being denied promotion. Quite recently conductors and drivers were overlooked - men who had done 10 or more years - and other were brought in over their heads. I am sure that such a situation is causing some uneasiness in the employment of those people.

There is also the case where cars belonging to the Transport Board are being used to drive about the families of certain employees of the Transport Board while conductors on their way to work cannot be given a lift in the same cars, and drivers who would be glad to get a lift home by the same Transport Board's cars cannot be accommodated. But one can imagine how those same drivers and conductors must feel when they can see the cars being used for transporting to and from work - not to and from work at the Transport Board, but to and from work for other employers in Bridgetown. The families of those people are being taken in those cars.

Those are things that we would like to see some check being made on in order to bring about not only the case of paving the yard to make the workmen feel more comfortable. We are glad for all of that. We hope that the engineers have given careful consideration to the possibility that when they raise the yard the water would not run off the yard into the main floor of the building. We know that Weymouth has given considerable cause for concern where water and drainage are concerned.
5.45 p.m.

That has been going on for many years and we hope that enough attention has been given to that phase of the matter so that with raised yards and the like, we will not be faced with the situation of having to find money to raise floors so as to prevent the water from going into the building. There are cases where conductors and drivers find that members of the public make complaints to the Manager of the Board against them. I am not going to say that the behaviour of every conductor or driver of a bus is all that is to be desired, but we find that the management of the Board finds itself in a position of the Board having gone so low in attempting to put it back on these people that reports are received from members of the public against these drivers and conductors - and these reports are often by telephone, some have been by letters; but on no occasion, as far as I can gather, has a conductor or driver been tried or called by the management to answer any charge or complaint that has been made against him on no occasion has he had the opportunity of being called to face the person who made the complaint originally. What I understand is that immediately the management receives a complaint, it is taken for granted that the conductor or driver is at fault. I do not think that conductors and drivers could always be at fault. There are times when they will be wrong; but is not fair to them that very often they are laid off or suspended for two weeks without pay, which is wrong.

Somebody merely telephones the management of the Board and makes a complaint against a conductor, but the person never appears to answer any question. I know that passengers on buses provoke conductors and drivers. They can do things which are not fair to these people and then run to the telephone and make a complaint; and the moment that a complaint is made, the Management of the Board assumes that the driver or conductor is wrong.

Another thing which has happened with conductors on buses is this: I would be glad if the Minister could have some sort of in service training for these conductors. In those buses where you have to go from seat to seat in order to collect the fares, you will find that a conductor stands behind a passenger and assaults that passenger by touching him or her in the back when he wants to collect the bus fare. I do not think that that is good enough. If these cases were looked into at this stage, I feel that that would make for better relationship between the passengers and the conductors and drivers, and much of the unpleasantness which is complained of would be re-

duced. The conductor and driver at times find that they have complaints to make. They first try to draw a matter to the attention of an Inspector or Supervisor or whatever you may call him, on the buses, but it is not yet known that conductors and drivers have found in the Inspectors the protection which they seek on such occasions. As I have said before, it is not always that the conductor and driver will be wrong; sometimes they will be wrong, and members of the public will be wrong sometimes; but if an Inspector would discharge his functions impartially, it might be an occasion where the Inspector has the opportunity of seeing the passenger or person who claims to be offended; it may be the person against whom a conductor or driver might have complained. It has happened that conductors and drivers, when taken before the Management, called on these Inspectors to give an account of what had happened or what had been reported to them, and for some unknown reason the Inspector feels that if he says anything which would be in the interest of the driver or conductor, the Management would act in a manner towards him which will find him remaining at a particular salary scale much longer than he would remain there, or he would not be given the opportunity to supervise others. What we are concerned with is this; there is not that machinery to know the Manager who is always jumping, and the moment he hears something complained of, he says that the conductor or driver is wrong. Persons who complain against conductors or drivers should avail themselves of the Board, or the Management should make these people available to assist in bringing about a fair trial. It is the conductor or driver who stands to lose a week's pay or two weeks' pay, as the case may be.

On the question of this bus service on the White Park - Bank Hall area, it is hardly necessary for anyone to say anything to bring this to the attention of the Minister. There is no doubt that people - and poor people - live in the avenues off the main road. They are the ones with whom we must be personally concerned.

5.55 p.m.

These poor people - men and women - have got to reach their jobs and have got to return home. Due to the fact that they live near the City, so to speak - and it is cheaper because of the economics of the situation concerning them - they have got to try and return home to get their midday meal. It is much more inexpensive for them to return home and partake of their meals with what the other members of the family are sharing than to go to the shops or one of the restaurants in the City and pay the cost of a lunch.

We all are in favour of the workers - drivers, conductors, clerks, whoever they may be - being given conditions under which they can work because we feel that the more conditions they are given, the more we can expect from them in return. Except for the fact that I second the motion for the reduction by one dollar of this vote, we are very glad to see that something is being done to get the yard of the Transport Board looking like what it ought to have been long ago.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Sir, it is true that the House of Assembly is a place of debates, and I would be the last person to expect to come in here and pass a Resolution without some form of debate on it; but I would also be the last person to expect, just for the sake of debating, that a simple matter like this would be held up with a lot of inaccuracies.

In reply to the various questions, the hon. senior member for Christ Church asked about the reason why the Silver Sands bus route is not adequately supplied. I cannot support that statement. Only a week ago, I was on the Hastings' route, and I counted something like five buses, one behind the other coming down that route from Silver Sands and this was within ten minutes.

The hon. member also said that we have voted this large amount of money to build bus bodies and asked when they would be ready. To be truthful, I do not know; but I can tell him that the reason is simply this. The Acme Engineering Works, a firm in Barbados, undertook to build these buses. Let me say here and now that from what I have seen of these buses, they are stronger than what I see built by the Bedford people. The stress panel is of a thicker material. I believe that we would get a better bus service; but the reasons why we have not got the buses as has been stipulated by Mr. Butcher are these.

One is that this is the first time that Mr. Butcher, the manager of the Acme Engineering Works, has ever been building buses like these; so while he is building, he is learning. And secondly, while building, Mr. Butcher is re-tooling. When we move to get the second set of buses, we would get them in far less time than it took to build the first set.

Another thing is that we in Barbados must never be too quick to run down our fellowman. We must give Mr. Butcher a chance with these buses to hit the road. The only way you are going to know that this bus is a locally built bus is, most likely, that it would be a stronger bus. The junior member for St. Peter said that he heard the Prime Minister had a licence for driving the first bus. That is my prerogative.

However, Sir, I hope I have satisfied the hon. member. I repeat, the reason why Mr. Butcher has taken so long to finish these buses is because he is almost feeling his way. Mr. Jessop, the person whom I spoke of first, has given us invaluable service in the building of these buses, and he has commended Mr. Butcher for the remarkably good job he is doing. It is my belief that you will get these buses for Christmas, or before Christmas.

Now, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, he said that the buses are being kept in Speightstown. Yes, the buses are being kept in Speightstown, but they are kept there from a humanitarian point of view. Most of the drivers and conductors who work on these buses live in the Speightstown area; and in order to facilitate these people, it would be inhuman to expect these people to drive a bus up to Bridgetown and then find their way back

to Speightstown. It would mean that they would have to keep two homes, and on that kind of pay you really cannot keep two homes. That is where you get this bad living. For all that you may get more trouble than leaving the buses down there.

The hon. member talked about the buses not being kept clean. I cannot say "yes" or "no" to that statement, but what I know is that you have 16 or 18 buses which are kept there at night. We have a watchman for these buses in Speightstown. I do not know what he does besides watching. If, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, these buses are not cleaned, I would look into the matter for him.

Now in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, first of all, I would say to him that the reason why I came down with this Resolution is because I want to help the people at the Transport Board. It is not because that one Mc. Guffy came and saw me that I got scared. It has always been said of me that I know no fear. But on the 2nd September, the manager, Mr. Hill, drew to my attention the deplorable state of the yard. My Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Harewood - he was then the technical director - Mr. Thompson, and somebody else journeyed down there. It was a rainy day when we could have seen the conditions. We saw for ourselves; and immediately after I came back, I notified the Cabinet that we would have to come to the House with a Resolution to get this money. I did know it was that amount of money. I said that we could not leave the Transport Board yard in the state in which it was, because one morning we might wake up and find that the people have gone not on strike - but just say they cannot work under these conditions. The Workers Union has absolutely nothing to do with this matter. It is only since I came back from Trinidad that the Union Representative came and saw me and brought to my attention what I knew already. As he is representing the people, it is his duty to come and say something.

I must say to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that he is erroneously wrong when he said that Route 24B belongs to the Government or that the Government is responsible for that route. That route was once run by the Federal Motor Bus Company. 6.05 p.m.

Route 24B does not belong to the Government and has never been run by the Government, as far as I know. Route 24B used to be run by the Federal Bus Company. Mrs. Rock, who has the Rocklyn Bus Company, has taken over the route which has only been stopped because of the Mitchell people digging up the road. The Government never stopped Route 24B. I would be the last person to do that, but I will tell you what happened. Route 24B used to go from by the Library up White Park, up Bank Hall, turn left down by the Roxy Theatre, turn left down Eagle Hall and down to the Princess Alice Bus Stand; but there were quite a number of people including the concessionaire and the concessionaire's representative, Mr. Sandiford, who came to me and told me things concerning the route. Mr. Sandiford said that the

route was not lucrative, and I have good reasons to believe this because he put an inspector to check, and people were complaining that the route was not serving its purpose because the route stopped by the Library and they had to walk into town.

Now our big problem is really this: I can get the buses into town, but I cannot get them out of town. We do not want the buses to go down by the Wharf, and that is why we moved the buses from the Fairchild Street terminal, because despite the fact that it has not happened yet, one day a bus may go over the side and some of our loved ones may be in it, and that is why we object to the buses going down there with passengers. The buses can go down there empty. Since then I have had in Mr. Sandiford and Mrs. Rock, and I am doing everything in my power to get the buses in and out of town in a manner that would be feasible to us and to the general public. She wants the route changed. All this we are going into, and we want to have it for her before Christmas. I met her at a funeral a few days ago and she brought it up again, and I told her we were working on it. We also had talks with the Commissioner of Police who would most likely have to have one of the routes changed. We are deeply concerned about this; so it is not fair to make a statement to the House that either the Government or myself is unmindful of the people in Bank Hall, or that we have taken buses off.

Furthermore, there is also another route run by the Elite Company which passes by the Globe, goes up by Glendairy, across by Combermere school, down Bush Hall and turns left at the corner back into Bank Hall. Whereas Route 24 B used to go up White Park and turn left, this route comes down and turns the other way. Sometimes another bus could come that way and turn up and reverse the route.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must not therefore make this statement, though I believe he made it in earnest without knowing that it is not me or anybody on this side of the House who has stopped this route. It was because of the Mitchell Construction Company digging up that part of Bank Hall - which you can see for yourself if you were to go up there. You will notice that the buses were going up through Barrack Road and coming out somewhere in the back and coming down. I am extremely sorry that the hon. member made that mistake because we really did not do it.

Now the hon. member said that the tramcars used to run up Bank Hall. I remember the tramcars as a boy, because the tramcar station was up by the Electric Company, and as far as I know they used to run from Bridgetown to St. Lawrence, from Bridgetown to Black Rock, and, I think, across Belleville. There was no tramcar up Bank Hall or running up Bank Hall. The hon. member had not come into town yet; so I excuse him for that. I think that satisfies the hon. member, but I want to assure him that I am doing everything within my power.

I have just told my Permanent Secretary to try and get a meeting between now and Friday with the

Commissioner of Police to try and get ahead with this matter. We bring buses through Magazine Lane, but the trouble is that we cannot go back through Magazine Lane because we would be disrupting old established firms such as Herbert's Lumber Yard. We have to take all these things into consideration. They are Barbadians, too, and we cannot, because we feel they are rich, put them out of compliance, because the first thing they would do would be to lay off all the people and then say that the Government chased them away; and we know how the Government gets blamed for everything. If the hon. member can help me with a solution in getting the buses from the terminal back out of town, I am willing to accept it, and as soon as we are finished, he can come over and tell me and I will put it up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter who mentioned something about tickets, all I can say about it is this: the Transport Board was short of tickets, but it was not the fault of the Transport Board, because the Board does not control the British Government or strikes in Britain. There was a strike in Britain and that is what held up the tickets, because they are printed in Britain; they are not printed here, and that is why they ran out of tickets.

Another thing he mentioned, and I want to bring this to the attention of the House, is the question of promotion. Promotion at the Transport Board has absolutely nothing to do with the House or with me as Minister. I have appointed a Board, and the Board in turn picks a Manager who is responsible to the Board. The Manager can hire and fire whom he likes when he likes. It is a matter for the Board or the men who have been hired or fired to join the Union, and all of them are Union represented, so far as I know; so do not come in the House and talk about promotion. I am absolutely nothing to do with whether the Transport Board employs Hitler, Eichmann or Churchill or Oppenheimer. I am interested in seeing that the general public is serviced. If you find that a bus is not servicing a route, report that to me and I will talk to the Chairman and tell him he must put a bus on the route. If you find you do not get a bus in time, that is for me. But when you come to tell me about promotion, I do not know who works there, and I can tell you and the hon. senior member for Christ Church who is a friend of the Chairman, that since I have been the Minister of Transport, I have never asked anybody at the Transport Board for any job, because I know I am not going to get anybody employed there, since they would feel he has come up there to spy; so I do not worry to waste my time. I tell anybody who gets dismissed from the Transport Board not to come to me, because I was not there when they were hired, and I am not going to be there when they are fired. Let them go to the Union. I do not interfere with the Transport Board. If this used to happen with a previous Government, I can assure the House it is not happening in my time, or has never happened in my predecessors on this side. We do not interfere with the running of the Transport Board, and anybody who thinks so is barking up the wrong tree. Promotion is a matter for the Board. If the hon. member has any

problems about promotion, let him go and see the Board instead of writing all this filth in the "Truth" ..

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I must draw to your attention.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: There is really no need for that, Mr. Chairman. I beg to withdraw that remark. I would just like the hon. junior member for St. Peter to realise that he likes to speak and eulogise on everything, but he cannot be a champion for everybody. Even Joe Louis did not have everybody following him or Jack Dempsey; so he should not get up in here and make us believe that he is representing the poor. To prove the point, we were returned twice; so the poor are with us.

The hon. member went on to say that the Manager was, not inept, but a bundle of nerves when things go wrong. That, Mr. Chairman, is no concern of the Democratic Labour Party; that is a matter for the Board. We have appointed a Board and we allow them a free hand. The Board employs whom they want. I think I have answered all the questions that have been posed at me as adequately as I can; but if there is anything I have forgotten and anybody wants to raise it, I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said that I made some erroneous remarks, and then he said I was not in town too long. Anyhow I am very glad, because if I had been I would be in gaol. The Hon. Minister said that tramcars never ran up Bank Hall. I wonder if he knows where is the beginning and ending of Bank Hall. I will bet him my seat against his that the tramcar used to run up White Park and up Bank Hall.
6.15 p.m.

All the same he was too high up, and his mother could not let him come into Town. I came late, but he could not come at all; I was in time to see where the tram used to run. He says that he is not responsible for the bus not running up that way and it is not the route of the Transport Board.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. I did not say that I was not responsible for the buses running up there. I never said that at all. I said that the Government does not run the route up there. I said that the route was run by some concessionaire before and now that the "Rocklyn" has it, the buses would run on 24 B. There was a lot of inconvenience because of the road.

Mr. SMITH: Government is responsible for the transport of this Island. I am nothing to do with any concessionaire; I am something to do with the Government. That bus route was taken away during the change over.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. I have explained to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that that route has not been taken away from anybody. The Rocklyn Bus Company is responsible for Route 24 B, and he must not insist in these irrelevancies and keep saying that the route has been taken away.

Mr. SMITH: I do not know anything about any route 24 B or C or D. I want to know why the bus is not running from Bank Hall Corner, Sobers Corner all the way down White Park to Bridgetown. That is what I am speaking about. If it is 24 B, C, or D, that is what I am speaking about. No bus is running there now. Why is a bus not on that route? That is what I want to know. If you do not know why it is not running, then you must see to it and get it on the road at once. That is all you have to do. I have complained about it; the people are complaining about it. I have complained about the same route already in this House. Speaking subject to correction.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. I do not know if the hon. member will give way, because I do not want to keep jumping up and interrupting him. I have said that the people themselves - he represents people, and so do I - made representations to me that they did not like the route. I pointed out to them that the route was from the Library, up White Park, turn left at Sobers Corner, turn left down by the Roxy Theatre, turn left again down Eagle Hall and so on. The people said that they did not like that route and they would prefer the bus to go to Codrington and back to Town.

I have explained all of this to him. I have told him that the reason the bus did not come into town is that we were finding it difficult to get the bus back out of Town. The only way it could get out of Town would be by travelling at the back of the Wharf. That is what we do not want. If he can help me to find a route to get the bus out of Town easily, I should be very glad. I have a route in mind that I want to use, but I cannot tell him about it now because I have not yet discussed it with my colleagues.

It is not that we have taken the route and we have completely disregarded the people. It is a route that must be run, and it must be run from Princess Alice Bus Stand to the Library. A lot of people would not use it because they said it was not serving any purpose. The time it took them to get around in the bus, they felt they could walk to Town. It is difficult to get the bus in and out of Town, and instead of trying to criticise things he should endeavour to help me. I need help.

Mr. SMITH: I am going to help you. That particular route used to be joined up with Cave Hill. The bus travelled along Magazine Lane or Lucas Street. I cannot understand where your route is, because you have told me that the bus comes up White Park, turns down by the Roxy Theatre and then back down Harbour Road. That is wrong. The bus is to go up White Park up to Sobers Corner, swing left, turn by Eagle Hall and go to Cave Hill. That would be the same route.

If you do not want the bus to come into Town; if you are afraid of the Wharf, while you are coming down the particular route that I am complaining of, when you get by the Cotton Factory you can swing across like the other buses and swing below the Park

and come into town, or, if you care to, you can let the people get off in the little Bus Stand that you have for other buses. If you want to get away from traffic jams and things of the sort, you can come down White Park, swing left by the Cotton Factory and come across to Town.

When you are leaving Town you can travel as usual, swing by Rickett Street and go across without interfering with any merchant or any business people.

The Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose.....

Mr. SMITH: You ask me to help you, and now you do not want me to talk. Listen to me. This is a man with brains talking. *(Laughter)* You come right away round as usual, swing here and go across by the lights. No; you will have to stop there. You can swing and go to the Cotton Factory again. You are trying to help the people. You cannot be thinking of traffic jams always while the people at Yearwood's Tenantry, Passage Garden and so on cannot get a bus. If you want to get away from the midday bus service, and start again from about three o'clock. Do not take the bus service from the people altogether.

If you do not want to come across here, you can go right up by the Cathedral where the other buses travel and turn below the Park, down Crumpton Street down Roebuck Street, down by the Cotton Factory and up White Park Road in order to help the people. Do not let any Police Inspector, Highway Inspector or any Director tell you everything all the time. You must use your own commonsense, and tell them that this must be done. You can go down Pinfold Street and help the people. When you are going in, you can come across there. You have a lot of people in Strathclyde, Yearwood's Tenantry; you have children at the Washington High School, Rudder's School and so on. If you give them a bus service, you will be doing a great service. I am nothing to do with any Mrs. Rock or anybody else. Get up and do the job. Call me when you are going and I will help you. Do not be afraid; I am willing to help you. Wherever you want to go, when it comes to traffic I will go with you. I suppose that my Party will sack me if I am too close to you, but you should be glad if I am sacked. I want to help the people; I am only out to help the people; I am not against anybody; I am for the people. I am nothing to do with Mrs. Rock. Let me hear by Christmas that the people are going to and fro on that route, or else I will be back on you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the amount of \$56,000 be reduced by \$1.00.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Do you still want to reduce it?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Minister is quite willing to help. He has given me that assurance and I withdraw my motion. I withdraw and will wait on him.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 32

1. ANNEXED ESTIMATES POST OFFICE

A Resolution for the sum of \$170,498 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members were circulated with copies of this Resolution. It has a very long Addendum and I believe that hon. members have read it. The Addendum reads as follows: "Supplementary provision of \$170,498 is required to permit the Post Office to meet its obligations to the end of the current financial year as follows: Item 16 - Payment of Substitutes of Extra Clerical Assistance - \$32,825. No provision was made in the 1967-68 estimates to meet payment of wages to:-

(a) 15 Clerical Officers and one Assistant Supervisor engaged as a result of the implementation of the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme - \$19,500.

(b) 9 temporary officers who were engaged pending a review of the organisation and staffing of the Post Office - \$11,880 and

(c) the employment of additional staff and payment of acting allowances in connection with the Commemorative Stamp Issues during the period 16th October, 1967 to 15th March, 1968 - \$1,445.00

Item 18 - Overtime - \$22,855. The members of the Department's Staff have been required to perform longer periods of overtime work as a result of the increase in incoming mail from overseas and the constant exodus of experienced staff....."

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I would like to bore the House because it is getting late and I believe hon. members are tired. It is not that I want to run from it either. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$170,498 do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on this Resolution for the sum of \$170,498, the member on our side responsible for Post Office affairs, has been kind enough to let me get up and say I could hit in any direction which I want. I want to start off by asking, first of all, for a little elucidation of the Item 21 - Overseas Air Mails - \$111,708. that is the biggest amount; but it may, in fact, be one of the least controversial. The additional amount of \$111,708 appears to be required. It is known that at the present time, as a result of devaluation, a 45-day standstill on air line fares is in operation. It is a standstill only for those who can pay in American dollars because it is a rise of 14% for those of us who have to pay in devalued West Indian dollars. In passing, I hope that the Minister responsible for Aviation matters is taking a keen interest in this entire question of airline costs.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the hon. member is so concerned, he can listen to my broadcast at ten past nine, and he will hear what I have to say about airlines. Therefore, I adjure him to hurry up and let us get through the business so that he can listen.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Hon. Minister responsible for Aviation matters has said, but to suggest that we get through the business by ten past nine or not, to some degree depends on what the business is. While it is true that many of us have empty stomachs, and apparently some of us will have empty stomachs - perhaps emptier on that side than on this side. Despite that, there are certain things on the Order Paper which I do not think will pass without a struggle. In any case, why I mentioned the question of potential increases in overseas airmails is because I would be glad if the Minister responsible for the Post Office could canvass this particular item at a little greater length. We have not heard anything of what the effect of devaluation will be on air freight and air mail charges generally. I myself would certainly like to know how is it that an amount of \$290,000 requires to be supplemented by an amount of nearly 40%, by \$111,000. I understand that there is an increase in air mail business, and I am very glad to hear that because it means that this will be reflected in the revenue side in additional income coming into the Government. Having enquired about that particular item, I think I would leave the individual items to other speakers on this side who may be interested in one or another of them.

While we are talking about the Post Office, it is well known that whenever a Department comes to the House for money, it must expect its entire conduct to be called into question - the competence of its Ministers, of its Permanent Secretary, of the Postmaster General, of the Assistant Postmaster General and all those who occupy those positions during the period under review, and who are likely to occupy those positions for the period during which Supplementary Estimates have been asked. As a member of this House, I am being asked to vote more money for a Department headed by a Permanent Secretary at the Public Service level, and by a Minister at the political level, and by another official who was then acting Postmaster General when these officials, on August 12th, 1967, went to the St. Thomas Post Office in my constituency accompanied by a Detective Constable, when one of these officials, namely, the Minister, went into the Post Office, approached a certain postman, Wiles by name, who happened to have on him six copies of the Beacon Newspaper, the organ of the Barbados Labour Party, asked him whom they belonged to, demanded them from him saying that he should be locked up for robbing the Government and handed him over to the Detective Constable - all of this in the presence of the Permanent Secretary - in short trousers - and the Acting Postmaster General. It was a Saturday afternoon. That is the conduct of these officials at the head of the Department which is asking for this money.

6.35 p.m.

They handed them over to the policeman with this accusation made against the postman of robbing the revenue, and sought to initiate a police prosecution which has been advised against incidentally, by the Crown Law Officers. They thought to initiate a police prosecution about which I cannot go into at great length because I understand that certain proceedings may well be pending at the instance of the postman concerned against the police. Despite the fact that many persons said that the only person who should be locked up as a result of the whole affair was the Minister. I am afraid, we have to discount that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what confidence can be had in a Department where the Permanent Secretary and the Minister join together to go to victimise a public servant of this Island in a crude, political way on a Saturday afternoon in St. Thomas? What possible confidence can we have in a Department that is conducted along these lines? Nobody knows where the Detective Constable appeared from. A senior officer did not know where he was that afternoon. His name is Clarke, or something like that. He comes from St. George. He will be well advised not to get in political quarrels with the Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries. I hope his friends will advise him of that. Do not pick himself up and drag himself out behind the issues of Parliamentary Secretaries. They are not there to give him orders. He has Sargeants, Inspectors, Superintendents and Commissioners, and he had better listen to them before he finds himself in any thing attempting to victimise public servants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the Department which wants \$170,498; but before they can get that, Mr. Chairman, they have to satisfy us that there is a little version of the rule of law being observed here. They must satisfy us that we have no pocket Bradshaws operating on a system of venom or spite in our political life. Here in this House, Mr. Chairman, the Minister - the hon. junior member for St. Thomas - has said how this postman canvassed against him twice, and he still could not stop him from getting in. Mr. Chairman, he should be above that. It is not his place to say that. We do not put him here to say that, and all of us are electors as well as we are elected. We did not put him there to get into political quarrels with public servants in the departments which he heads. We did not put any Minister there to go and run about behind his servants to see who is reading the "Beacon", who is speaking to whom on the Barbados Labour Party side, who votes which way at the elections.

Mr. Chairman, in your own constituency, if you wanted to call names, there are Civil Servants who openly canvassed for you and for the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think at this stage that this is relevant to Item 21 on which the hon. member is speaking. I would wish him to stick closer to the Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I accept your reproof, but I have no fear; I do not care who Mr. Cooke canvassed for. I am not interested. This is not a debate about him, so we need not worry about that. Civil Servants have to vote just like anybody else. In St. Thomas, some voted for the junior member, some voted for the senior member and I dare say of the 98 who voted for both, some Civil Servants were included. I had an experience of that when the junior member for St. Thomas reproved one of them two Saturday nights ago for accepting a drink from me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that that has any relevance to the business under discussion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But, Mr. Chairman, I wish that the affairs of the St. Thomas postman would come to an end. It has been hanging fire for a long time. To me, the man deserves an apology. He deserves an apology. He deserves a letter from the Public Service Commission or the Permanent Secretary saying that the reflections made on him by the Minister on August 12 form no part of the official record. That is point number one.

Point number two is this. The law would say that he would have to get his "Beacon" newspapers back. After all, where the Solicitor General, and I believe the Attorney General as well, where those officials have all advised that there has not been even a conceivable offence that could have been committed by the man in the possession of those "Beacons", where advice has been general, and it is only that the police are afraid, having been dragged into something unwillingly at the end of this procession of persons in the St. Thomas Post Office that August 12 evening.

One way they feel in respect of this matter. They feel that they are pulled in one way by the Minister and in another way by the senior member for the constituency, and they do not know what to do.

As I say, we cannot investigate that at great length because I understand that the man concerned is taking action, or intends to take action, against the Police for certain things; so that matter presumably would be *sub judice* or is so near to *sub judice* that it would not be correct to canvass it; but, Mr. Chairman, the principles at stake when this kind of apparent political victimization is carried on are so great that this matter must be investigated whenever the Post Office comes and asks for money.

On the last occasion when the Post Office was discussing money, the Minister was then engaged exclusively in telling the House about his commemorative stamps, and I did not deem it suitable to raise it then; but I would not like to think that I am estopped, as the lawyers call it, from going into the whole issue of this particular piece of behaviour on this Post Office question.

I would like to hear something not so much from the Minister concerned, but from the Prime Minister as to what he thinks about this, as to what he has said to the Minister about this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am quite willing to tell the hon. member, since he called on me, that I think he is completely irrelevant and he does not understand what Parliament is for. *(Laughter)*

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Prime Minister's loyalty towards his colleague, Mr. Chairman, is deeply touching under the circumstances, and I hope that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas will appreciate his loyalty and use it to heal some of the wounds that have been inflicted on him from that self-same quarter in the past, because after all we have heard here in the House today that the Prime Minister told him to sit down. He did not tell him then to know his place. He just told him to sit down, but we were all here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member about Rule 26 (2):-

"A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to collect my thoughts. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in Post Office affairs in this particular matter. It was in fact in connection with the matter canvassed under Item 16 of this Head that I had the opportunity to visit the St. Thomas Post Office because I have heard that there is insufficient room there to administrate the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme satisfactorily. It is also felt that the safe is not secure. I am surprised that this place would have held so many people on the evening of August 12.
6.45 p.m.

It is a place which in any event I am surprised could hold so many people on the afternoon of August 12th, because it seems to me that once the Minister gets through that doorway, he might very well fill the whole door-way and leave no room for the rest of his retinue to get through, but I found a lot of dissatisfaction there in that Post Office. Item 16 may alleviate some of it, but it cannot alleviate the dissatisfaction of the Postman who, when the Police went there another day to question him to try to get evidence.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like also to remind the hon. member about repetition. This is about eight times he has been dealing with that one particular sentence.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a different day. I was there this day, not the Minister. I could not tell you what day of the month it was, but I was there. It was a morning and the Police were there. The Post Office business could not be carried on. The same Policeman, Victor Clarke, and other Policemen were there and filling up the whole Post Office. This is a Department that is now asking for \$170,498. Customers could not be serviced. The Acting Post Master of St. Thomas was there. The postmen could not sort their letters; they could not go out. The Police were

all over the Post Office, and it was no use to tell them that at some time in the future fifteen clerical Officers and one Assistant Supervisor would be engaged as a result of the implementation of the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. What one postman wanted to know was why when a St. Thomas postman got knocked down and killed in St. Thomas, no policeman came to question him although he saw what happened and could have talked about it; but when the Minister came and snatched six "*Beacon*" from a postman's hand, a squad of policemen came and took over the Post Office for a whole morning. No number of Resolutions dealing with furniture and fittings, incidentals, rent, \$700 travelling, overseas airmails, will satisfy people who feel like that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we all look forward at some stage to a change in Government. I do not think that the stage in Barbados any longer is set or could be set for any Party to rule forever or think that it could rule forever. The lesson of 1961 has been learnt by the Barbados Labour Party; the lesson of 1966 has been learnt by the Democratic Labour Party; they got a fright and the lesson of 1961 we hope, will underline the lessons of these earlier years.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member said the Democratic Labour Party got a fright in 1966. The House of Assembly got eight frights.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not deem that a point of order. I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to continue and resist the temptation of being irrelevant more than once, twice or thrice. I am not going to tolerate irrelevancies more than three times. I call upon you

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I understand that, Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister need not be afraid; we are not here to frighten him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All that I deem not to be in order. I want the hon. member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out to you at the earlier stage of your occupancy of the Chair, when a Department comes to the House for an Estimate or Supplementary Estimate, anything in that Department's entire conduct during the financial year or indeed during other financial years is relevant. As regards repetitions, I would be glad if when my arguments have sunk in and you understand them, you could tell me to stop them, because at that stage we can readily believe that everybody else would understand them too. But Mr. Chairman, how can we have confidence that a Department is properly run where so flagrant a breach of Civil Service rules and political conventions have been carried out by the Minister and the Permanent Secretary? What possible reason can we have for not believing that this Department is in dangerous hands? Nothing has been said during all the period August 12th to December to reassure a postman who is on the fringe of retirement that the opinions expressed

on August 12th are not the opinions held by the Public Service Commission and by those responsible for dealing with his pension. Nothing has been said to reassure the public that this was an aberration, that this was only a piece of Saturday afternoon madness, that this was not a permanent line of conduct. Nothing has been done to make the hurt to the image of the Minister and the Permanent Secretary any better; and in view of all this, Mr. Chairman, it could only be the fact that we have a respect for the Post Office as an institution and for the Public Service as a body that could make us on this side vote for this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I can hardly think of anything more important than for the Minister himself to be intervening in a case where so obviously he should make an effort to show that as Minister he is above pettiness. In the Minister's own interest - it may be hard for him to believe that I have his interest at heart - but in his own interest, for the sake of his own self-respect and the respect for other people, for the sake of people's respect for Government, for the electoral principle, the Minister should not have done that. Mr. Chairman, I only hope that today he will not rise hot and strong, he will not rise in any spirit of assault upon somebody who cannot hit back because he is not in a boxing ring now; he is not fighting Norfolk Kid, the Fighting Scavenger or whoever it was, where if these men put out a left, he can put back a right. He is kicking a defenceless man, a man whose only defence can be the voice of his other representative in Parliament, one of his own constituents, one of the persons for whose welfare he is responsible. That is what he is doing, and that is not the way to run a Department. It could not conceivably be the way to run a great Department of State.

Mr. Chairman, I have waited some time for this opportunity to call in question the behaviour of both the political and the public officials in the Post Office, and Mr. Chairman, if I think this represents permanent policy, and that other postmen and officials are likely to be victimised, it would be very hard, as I said before, for me to vote for this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, one last point about this postman, Mr. Wiles, must be mentioned.
6.55 p.m.

After the election of November 3, 1966, during which, as I have ascertained from Police reports, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas made certain remarks on political platforms about -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely nothing to do with this Resolution. May I remind the hon. member again of Rule 36(1):

"The Speaker or the Chairman after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of

the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, have I yet said anything about November, 1966? Have I yet used any argument relevant to what happened between the Minister and the postman after November, 1966? I have said that this is a different incident to which I have not yet referred.

Mr. Chairman, after November, 1966, following the remarks which were made by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas about the postman, Mr. Wiles, Mr. Wiles was transferred from his postal route serving Arch Hall, Redman's Village and part of Rock Hall and was made to walk up the hills to Welchman Hall. It was felt that this was done as a result of political victimisation. When it was discovered that the route he had been transferred to, in fact, was an easier route and that the new postman, a supporter of the Democratic Labour Party, who had been put to work on Wiles' old route could not handle the job and made complaints, I am told, to the Minister - I hope the Minister will -

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. I rise to correct that mistake. That is absolutely not so. Mr. Wiles had a noise with a lady in Clermont; she reported Mr. Wiles, and that is why he was removed. The senior member for St. Thomas felt that by moving Mr. Wiles into Welchman Hall where I got most of my votes, he would have been able to canvass for him. But I will deal with him further.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we have now heard the reason why Mr. Wiles was moved back from Welchman Hall to the parish of St. Thomas where it was believed that he had been canvassing for years. That gives you an example of what is going on. Complaints are made against all postmen all over Barbados, but it was said that Mr. Wiles is always canvassing and he does not do any work. That is a remark *sotto voce* by the junior member for St. Thomas. The junior member for St. Thomas is afraid of Mr. Wiles in Welchman Hall, and he transferred him again. That is exactly what he has said.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am afraid of Mr. Wiles?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could I have order? Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I need no better illustrations of what I am talking about than the conduct of the junior member for St. Thomas. Let him not think that even the very district that Mr. Wiles was transferred to voted for him, because I beat him there, too. Do not let him fool himself; let him go and look at the votes again.

Mr. Chairman, my attention, this evening, on this Resolution is directed to these matters: the behaviour of the heads of the Post Office. It seems as though I am going to be disappointed. It seems that we are now going to be treated to the same platform behaviour exhibited by the junior member for St.

Thomas. We are now going to be treated to a polemic against a civil servant by a Minister, and the Prime Minister is going to sit there and say nothing about it. Mr. Chairman, no further commentary is needed.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on this Resolution Item 28 - Furniture and fittings - \$1,000. I hope you would not have cause to tell me that I am straying, because I am going to read some of the things: "The provision of \$2,320 in the current Estimates includes an amount to meet expenditure in respect of post boxes." That is the point on which I am speaking. I have asked a Question in this House already regarding a post box that has been removed from Orange Hill, which serves Orange Hill and all the districts around there. No answer has been given yet, but I do hope that by now the post box has been replaced.

I do not know if the Minister took time off to find out why it was removed. I know the circumstances very well, and the circumstances started from the Post Office in Holetown, as far as I know. Orange Hill had a post box - I would not know the number of years, but I can gauge it from my own age. From the time I knew myself, it carried a post box. Now, that post box has been removed. If it has not been replaced yet, I am wondering why not. You do not have to put anything in the Estimates to get a post box. You bring the same post box back and look for some place to erect it.

It is exceedingly difficult for the people of Orange Hill and all the districts to do their business in the absence of a post box. I should be glad if the Minister would tell me if it has been replaced. There are various spots in Orange Hill; so the same box that was taken out this week can be carried back the next week and put up somewhere.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, in replying to the hon. junior member for St. James, I have to say that I do not remember what part of Orange Hill this post box was or is; so I cannot answer whether it has been replaced, but I will make enquiries. I thought that the Postmaster General would have been here, but he is not. Anyway, I will investigate the matter and let the hon. member know, either by phone or word of mouth something about the post box.

We do not really move about post boxes as such. If a post box has been erected at a particular place, it means that the area had been surveyed and there was need for it. Unless it was damaged and had to be removed for repairs, that is the only reason I can think of why a post box should be removed from Orange Hill. The truth is that I do not know what part of Orange Hill this post box was. I should be glad if the hon. member could throw a little light on it, so that when next I pass there I could look for it. I travel in that area very often.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, the pleasure is mine not only to throw the light, but to turn on a brilliant green light. The post box was removed - I did

not want to go into the whole matter from here, but the Minister said he would like to know where it was. There is no one there now, but it was in the wall of a building kept by Mr. Searles. When I was a boy it was in the cut rock as you enter Orange Hill - a very dangerous place so far as traffic is concerned. Then it was removed and carried to this shop, at Mr. Searles' business place, under the gallery; but the circumstances under which the Government or the Postmaster General was asked to remove it - I am not here to say that; but if you come back to this House and make any comment on it, then I will be able to speak on it with a clear conscience.

I can read out some of the decisions here, but that is not before the House. The Chairman may look at me, although I am speaking about a post box, and tell me that it is irrelevant. Never ever will he get the chance to say that, but you, Mr. Minister, should kindly get all of the facts properly. If it is not there, then you can give orders to have it replaced. You can send back the same box: the lock, the key and everything. You can go and see things for yourself. You can use one of the columns of the St. Silas Girls' School. If you do not like that, then you can put it back in the wall.

7.05 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. member, but what I have gleaned from what he has just said is, that apparently, because Mr. Searles was not returned by the people of St. James, then he must have got angry and asked them to remove the Post Box. I am not saying that he said so, but that is my belief. In reply to the allegations made just now, I want to say that this country is extremely fortunate in that on the 3rd November the electorate saw fit to return this Party to power, because if that had not taken place - I am speaking on Item 21, but I am generalising. If this had not taken place and the Democratic Labour Party had not been returned to power, we can clearly see what would have happened; because we have had a demonstration in here tonight by a member of this Chamber who, for some reason or other, got lost in the context of the debate and thought that he was in a Law Court prosecuting or defending a case. Why I say that we are fortunate is this: if the Barbados Labour Party had been returned to power, it shows conclusively what would have been going on for the amount of discrepancies which would have taken place. For instance, I being the Minister of Communications and Works, happen to have the Post Office under my domain, and I have the prerogative to walk into the Post Office at any time, as long as it is open, when I feel like doing so, without let or hindrance. But I should like to tell the hon. senior member for St. Thomas this; that it is the prerogative of every citizen of Barbados or of a country that if a misdemeanour has been brought to his attention, it is his duty not only to take the police on the scene, but also to assist the police in apprehending the culprit or culprits. Why I said that we are fortunate is this; a report came to me as Minister that copies of the *Beacon* Newspaper were being sent by the Post Office van of St. Thomas with addresses on them, but not through the post. There

was no stamp on them, which means that they are robbing the revenue. I am responsible for the revenue at the Post Office because I am the Minister. This is a glaring example of what would have happened to this country. This is robbery with a capital "r", as "Sparrow" would say. All these people have to do is to walk around with a razor blade and cut out your pockets. They could not do it because I was too adept. When I got this report about this flagrant violation of the Postal Act, let me tell the hon. member this; the Post Office vans carry mails to the various Post Offices in the outdistricts under contract, and in the contract it says that nothing can be transported in the Post Office vans other than by the approval of the Postmaster General. It is pointed out what is meant by nothing - no person, parcel or thing. (A MEMBER: Police food?) Not even police food. When we know that the revenue of our country is being depleted by a lot of unscrupulous, dishonest elements in the community who are only out - let them tell the lawyers that I say they are unscrupulous and dishonest - to feather their nests, and they do not have the interest of the working class at heart.

What was the intention of those who are responsible for the "Beacon"? I am glad that the hon. member has raised this question. He did not know that he was coming into my briar patch. This will show the general public whom they are dealing with. This is only a small item, that you put a four-cent stamp on a newspaper and you send it out. Nothing so was done. They put them in the van and the van carried them out. These newspapers were all addressed to the various people. This is a flagrant violation of the Rules; this is dishonesty in its worst form. People talk about Barbados; but Barbados was an angel when compared with some of the things which I see happen about here. Talking about the victimisation of a Civil Servant, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is the last person to come in here and talk about victimisation, if he does not know, I will tell him about victimisation. There is a man who hangs around the Union called Napoleon Layne; they call him "Commissar". You ask him about victimisation. He used to work at Rediffusion and hangs around the Union; and because he did not allow certain elements in this community to browbeat him and deliberately rob him, he was victimised. He had the Police walking behind him all over Barbados. Dorian Farrell, he was a Barbadian who died in England because of victimisation. By whom? By the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party and especially the Leader. Go and tell him that I said so. I want to meet him. Do not hang down your head like the person that sold our Christ. (Laughter).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. member address the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir, I am addressing the Chair. That was not meant for your ears; I am only clarifying this point. When people get in this Chamber and try to give the impression about a postman being victimised, what about Mr. Humby? I remember being down in the Lower Green when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that either Humby goes or he goes

and he has not got anywhere to go; so that the result was that Humby went, and Humby contributed something to the community.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that that is no part of this Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I know it is irrelevant, but, you see, you have to indulge in irrelevancies at times. I am extremely sorry about that, but, Sir, that is only by the way. Getting back to the Postal Act, if, as he said, the matter is *sub judice* I am glad about that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Since he knows so much more law than the Attorney General, the Solicitor General and the Director of Public Prosecutions

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Resolution. Let him say which section of the Postal Act has been violated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He knows more law than the Attorney General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for St. Thomas addressing the Chair?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you cannot be shouting at hon. members.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister responsible for Postal Services in Barbados, as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas knows quite well, I am always interested in making a dollar for my country; and as long as I am in this position, whether he rants or raves, he can rave, vituperate or anything else, I do not intend to let anybody rob the revenue and then come in here with this "mamby pamby" attitude thinking that he can vilify me. Fear is one of the things I have never known about, I have always boasted about that, and when my time is up, it is up. I should like the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, when he goes back to St. Thomas, if he can risk it, to tell Mr. Wiles that as long as he is wearing a postman's uniform and as long as he is in the island of Barbados dispatching mails from the Post Office to the recipients, he comes directly, or if not directly, indirectly, under the jurisdiction of the administration of the Post Office which I happen to be in charge of. All that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas can come in here and rave and rant about - I am glad for the opportunity to tell the world that if the Barbados Labour Party had been returned to power, they can see for themselves that if this is just a common four-cent stamp to put on a newspaper -

there were only six newspapers - if they cannot afford to put a quarter in stamps on these newspapers, then you can imagine what would happen in this island. Thank God that the eyes of the people of Barbados have been opened.
7.15 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the Hon. Minister get away with this kind of talk that he is talking about "if the Barbados Labour Party had got back in power, the country would be gone". You mean what I would call a little nasty four cents? Now, I want the Hon. Minister to keep it above board, and keep the debate up to a standard.

Now, Sir, imagine if one should make a mistake and it is four cents to post a letter and he puts on a three cents stamp on the letter, It either will not reach its destination or they will make you pay more for it. That you can say is a mistake. Now, Sir, how would newspapers get into the Post Office van without stamps to be delivered to another Post Office? How would they be inside the van without the knowledge of the people who are responsible for seeing that these things are put into the mail van and that it is locked or things of the sort? I have been made to understand that the driver of the van has no access to the back of the van. An officer of the Post Office sees to it that the van is locked or what is inside is locked. At the other end there is a key to unlock it. Does not the driver have the key?

It cannot be said that the Barbados Labour Party is responsible for these newspapers going without stamps. It would be the Officer in charge who put them inside there if they had been addressed to somebody and they were posted without a stamp, which I doubt very much. I would have to see it with my eyes.

But suppose they are even addressed to somebody. It is possible that the driver of the van might have had those newspapers in his compartment where he drives, just as he would put his breakfast and bring it down, or take a parcel for someone and carry it home. There are stores that send parcels by the driver of the Mail Van to be delivered to other people in the country, and the people give him a "berry". I call that a perquisite.

That parcel is put in the compartment where he drives. But behind him where the letters are being kept, they are locked up: and if these newspapers came from one Post Office to another one without stamps, you would have to blame the officer for not seeing that the van is locked.

It does not appear to me that the Minister knows his job. But it is not his job to load the van. I do not believe he ever saw a post office van loaded since he was a Minister. He must not get up here with his cheap talk to try to get away with anything. Keep it on a high plane. I did not intend to say one word, but I cannot let him get away with this.

So, Sir, really and truly, I have to chime in with the other people to say that he is talking foolishness

because the B.L.P. can never be responsible for those newspapers leaving this Post Office in Bridgetown to go to the other Post Office without stamps. It would have to be the officer at the Post Office in Bridgetown, and not the one who is at the country Post Office.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this matter of Post Office has to be considered. Now, there are certain things which we have to accept from the Minister responsible for the Post Office. We have to accept that he would not be as well versed in the niceties of the law as persons who are trained in the law, and, therefore, to some extent I regret my outburst when I challenged him to say which section of the Post Office Act could have been violated. He could not know. And it is no reflection on him that the Solicitor General and the Director of Public Prosecutions have gone into this matter and came to a different conclusion from him. It is no reflection on him because he is not a lawyer. He is not trained to do that; but he should not try to do it, if he is not a lawyer.

This is a case where we can honestly say: "know your place". Now with regards to the defence he has made faulting a member of repute, it is not against the law to carry things in Post Office vans. The Post Office van drivers are not Civil Servants, and the vans do not belong to the Post Office. There is a contract between the Courtesy Garage and the Post Office who own them directly. The Courtesy Garage agree not to carry anything in the vans except with the permission of the Postmaster General.

It is my belief that in years gone by the permission of the Postmaster General was assumed for certain things; otherwise I do not believe that the parcels which I have seen with my own eyes coming out of a Post Office van could have got there. The "Beacon" newspaper is not the only thing ever to have been carried by a Post Office van.

The police at the St. Thomas Police Station who talked about the same van, have to my knowledge their food delivered; they have their parcels delivered; people call at the van and say: "I have missed the post; carry up this for so-and-so." Nurses at the St. Thomas Almshouse have things delivered. All these things go on without offence to the Post Office.

The permission of the Postmaster General has from time immemorial been given for certain things to be delivered to the Police and Nurses. It is overlooked that the Post Office van carries things. I believe as a result of the affair with the "Beacon" newspaper now, they do not carry anything; but I really do not know about that.

But the main point here, Mr. Chairman, is "What has the Post Office van carrying "Beacon" to do with Milton Wiles?" A report was made by the Minister that the Post Office van is carrying things without stamps and he did not go and quarrel with the Courtesy Garage; he did not go and quarrel with the van driver. He thought, of all persons, to quarrel with the Postman whom he does not like.

I know he does not like Milton Wiles; so he goes and quarrels with Milton Wiles - not with the loader

because if these papers were in the back of the van, then the Post Office Officer out there in the yard of the Public Buildings committed a wrong. If the papers were in the front of the van, the van driver and the Courtesy Garage committed a wrong.

But the Minister did not go to any of these people. He went to a postman. The postman did not load the van; he did not drive it; so how can we believe the Minister is acting in good faith when he says that this report was made to him and that explains his behaviour to Milton Wiles? How can we talk of a flagrant violation of the Postal Act? I suppose by "Postal Act", he means the Post Office Act of 1911.

He and Thompson, studying the regulations out in the yard the same Saturday afternoon, could not find anything. Well, you cannot blame them. They could not find anything in such a short space of time, not even if they took the afternoon to look. The Solicitor General had to spend a couple of weeks, I believe, before he discovered.

The "*Beacon*" newspaper had been sent through the post without a stamp. The Minister does not understand what it means by being sent through the post. "Being sent through the post" means being posted. It means being handed into the Post Office or being put in a letter box. If he had any evidence that the "*Beacon*" newspaper had been posted through a letter box without a stamp, as the senior member for St. Joseph said, let him quarrel with one of his officers because it is their duty to put on an eight-cent postal due stamp on it. There is a remedy for all that.

"Unscrupulous, dishonest elements in this community, but unknown to those responsible for the "*Beacon*". I do not know what is meant by that. Facts do not show that those responsible for the "*Beacon*" are unscrupulous, dishonest elements in this community. Why did they not cause the police to visit those who are responsible for the "*Beacon*" and ask them why they sent the "*Beacon*" through the post? 7.25 p.m.

Why didn't he come into the *Beacon* the Saturday afternoon and interfere with those responsible for it? If he knows enough to pick up Clarke from the depths of St. George and drag him out to St. Thomas, why didn't he bring him in the "*Beacon*" Yard? When he said that the papers were all addressed to various people, that is simply not true. If he says that the six newspapers which he took away from Mr. Milton Wiles were all addressed to various people, that is a simple, terminological inexactitude or whatever phrase is parliamentary enough to mean "a damn lie".

Mr. Chairman, his defence will not hold water, and when he talks about Napoleon Layne and the others whom Frank Walcott victimised in those days, that is up to him and Senator Walcott, ex-Ambassador. Plenipotentiary and whatever nonsense he was. That is up to the ex-member of the United Nations.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I

never said anything about Frank Walcott victimising anybody. I said those people were victimised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He said they were victimised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I agree with that, and he said it in the House before. The person he is in fact talking about, he is uttering the name of the great, but the person he in fact means

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already reminded the hon. senior member for St. Thomas about irrelevancies. Again I must remind the hon. member about irrelevancies.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. Anyway, that is up to him and the former senior member for St. Peter. On the question of Dr. Humby, as far as I know, went on a political platform ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All of these things are irrelevant, and at this stage I will have no other alternative than to read Rule 36 for the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and ask him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, they are irrelevant in my mouth, but not in the Minister's!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I warned the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and he refrained from it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall your warning him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You don't, but I do.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, as regards the complaint from a woman in Clermont. I suppose there are some houses in Clermont which is in St. Thomas. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the most significant because it relates to the Post Office. The Minister is not responsible for the day-to-day discipline of public servants. (Mr. CORBIN: That is not true). Now the hon. junior member for St. Andrew says that is not true. From anybody else, that would have to be considered; so we would not have to worry with that.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a complaint from a woman in Clermont, what is that to do with the Minister? There is a disciplinary process in the Post Office. I am not aware that the Minister is a part of it. What is it to do with the Minister if I, the poor Opposition member for St. Thomas, want Mr. Wiles to canvass in Welchman Hall? Is it being suggested that my wishes govern Post Office rules in St. Thomas or elsewhere? If the Minister had not flattered me by saying that, Mr. Chairman, I would not be so rude as to say it about myself. I am flattered to know that the postal routes are adjusted according to where I am politically strong and politically weak, and according to where I am to walk what postal route. I was not aware of it. I think, if the Minister sits down in his office thinking to himself that we cannot have Mr. X working in Clifton Hall because he is going to canvass for Tom Adams, to me that reinforces my remarks that we have to look at the political direction of

this Department and say it is wanting. I never thought I would come in here and hear a Minister responsible for a Department say that in a matter of departmental discipline, the consideration of what the Opposition member for that constituency in which the public servant was working had to be taken into account. Mr. Chairman, I really am very flattered indeed. The Prime Minister has said that the Opposition is not here to carry on the Government. He does not have to say that to me; I know that. Let him tell the Minister of Communications that, and let him tell the Minister of Communications to run the Post Office in the interest of the people of Barbados, run the Post Office and leave the postmen alone, run the Post Office and do not mind Tom Adams. I believe he has told him that already or similar words. Let him fortify that impression in the Minister's mind.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister replied to me, I accepted everything, but at the last moment - and if I am wrong, he must correct me - he glossed over the reply to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and the last words he used when he was replying to what I am speaking on were that he supposed Mr. Searles did not get in in the elections and gave orders to take out the post box. That is not true. If I am wrong, I will bow; but if he said that I am saying now that I was keeping out of the picture, but I want a post box

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I never said that because Mr. Searles did not get in, he did this. I said it looked so to me. I am entitled to have my opinion like anybody else, Mr. Chairman, and I would be glad if I am wrong.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, we can change the English language to suit any occasion, but that was unnecessary because Mr. Searles had retired from politics in a sense for about two elections; therefore he would not have to ask to take out the post box. I will say now, Sir, and I do not think it would be irrelevant to the issue because I am speaking of a post box for Orange Hill, that for years a post box was there. After Mr. Searles opened his business - and this is for years now because Mr. Searles only got in the House just a few years back - he was selling stamps and the postmen would carry down a requisition form and he would send down the money by them and the stamps would be sent up. Now there is not much profit in selling stamps. I would not have detained the House if the Minister had not got up and replied on this. (Mr. ST. JOHN: Detain it!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will bring to the attention of the hon. senior member for Christ Church Rule 29(6) which says that when a member is speaking all other members shall be silent.

Mr. HOLDER: I began by saying, Mr. Chairman, that I was not revealing the facts, but since the Minister said something, I can reveal them. Mr. Searles would send down his requisition by a postman, a trusted servant of the Government, who would take the letters from the post box and then go to the counter, but this was stopped a few weeks ago. When Mr.

Searles sent down to get a requisition to get the stamps, the money was also sent down, but the postman said that the Post Master would not give it. He was told that he would have to come to the Post Office himself. He tried the other postman - because there are two to the district - and got the same answer. Mr. Searles said that if this was the case, he would have to close down his business. I am not exaggerating on anything. When his daughters leave on mornings for Bridgetown, he would have to go to town, then to Hometown and back, and when he sends in \$102, he is only making \$2.02. If he does not close his business and make that journey to Hometown, he would have to close at midday, and then he would have to close his business to take in \$102 only to make \$2.02, Mr. Searles wrote and told them to take out the box immediately. As soon as I learnt of it, I laid a question; but it was not politics or any losing of a seat. If he used to send down the money by a trusted servant of the Government, a postman, and it was going on for years, why such a change within three or four weeks?
7.35 p.m.

Mr. Searles wrote them and asked them to take out their post box. I asked a Question here and suggested that they send back the same box - send back the same men with cement and mortar. The walls are too feet square, and I measured them. You can cut out and put in the box, or you put it back in the cut rock. After Mr. Searles came back to the district the post box was removed from the cut rock and taken to his business place because it was more convenient for the people. You could go up the steps on to the platform, if the rain was falling, and post your letters. There is no politics in that. I have not come here to say something for Mr. Searles. I came here to talk and get a post box sent back to Orange Hill.

The same way the post box was removed, it should be sent back within three days. If a letter was sent in and in three days' time the people sent and removed the post box, then send it back and put it somewhere. The Hon. Minister can remove it from his mind that when I make a statement on the floor of this House I am talking politics for any individual. Mr. Searles won his seat; he subsequently lost it, and he is a loyal man up to today. This is nothing to do with politics, and I regret to think that the Minister, after speaking so nicely, could still go down.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Hon. Minister is not here, but I will pass on to the Minister of Works and Communications that the hon. junior member for St. James wants him to put the meat back into the rice.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me the passage of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

THE RATE OF INTEREST (AMENDMENT)

ACT, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, the instant Order of the Day is Order No. 4 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was read a first time on the 21st November, 1967. This date is rather significant because it is the date immediately after the new interest rate was announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech of the 18th November, 1967, at 21.30 Greenwich time. Therefore in a matter of three days the Government of Barbados had to make some rapid decisions consequent upon the devaluation of the pound sterling and the increase in the bank rate in England, which brought the bank rate up to the same level as the maximum rate chargeable by anyone in or outside Barbados for loans made in Barbados by anyone in Barbados under the Usury Act, 1754.
7.45 p.m.

I should like to remind Your Honour that permission was sought by the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with this Bill in all of its stages on that day,

and this met with much resistance from the other side; and in the process of another attenuating address on their reasons for opposing the passage of the Bill at that time, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas made a cardinal error in stating that the Rate of Interest Act in Barbados had been in existence since 1754, and it had never been amended. That is on the record.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. If the Prime Minister can produce my word saying that the Act had never been amended, I will eat the paper that those words are written on. I said that the Act has existed since 1754. (ASIDES).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member who made the asides about

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Prime Minister ignore those asides. They are too trivial to merit notice.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think it is a matter of great embarrassment for any one who comes in the House pontificating on matters, to be reminded of their errors. I pointed out at that time that the Act had not only been amended, but it had been amended in 1958 and 1959 by the Government of which the same hon. member is a member, although he was not with us at the time, and that the amendments had been repealed by this Government subsequently, after we came into office. If the hon. member is saying that he will eat the paper that that is written on, he could only be saying so, confident that the record has already been destroyed, or that he has eaten it already himself, because hon. members who were here are well aware of what he said, and members on his own side. I allowed him to go on and on until he got himself deeply enmeshed, and then I got up and read it out to him that it had been amended, and I forgave him because I said that he had been on an extended stay out of the island and therefore it was not his fault.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. What happened was this: when we were talking about the fact that it was the reign of George II (ASIDES) This is a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It looks like a point of exasperation to me, Sir.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Know your place. (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to hear it to rule. (ASIDES) Now, let me deal with this. I do not deem that exclamation to be unparliamentary but I deem it to be extremely bad taste, because, obviously, the Chair is being addressed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would not say to Your Honour "Know your place". I was saying this because the Chairman of Committees had just returned to the House. I must not say: "Know your place". If you please, my point of order is this: The Prime Minister is misrepresenting what happened. I was talking about 200 years and the Prime Minister was kind enough to get up and draw it to the attention of the House the fact that the Act was amended in 1958. I never said that it was not amended, because, if the Prime Minister really wishes, he can send a messenger of the House to my office in James Street where you will find in my handwriting two separate amendments entered in my copies of the Laws of Barbados - entered at different times, - when I first came back here to practise at the Bar and went through the entire Laws of Barbados amending them in accordance with the Acts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas has made his point of order. Let me assure him that the Prime Minister cannot send any messenger of this House to any lawyers' office. He would not get the permission of the Chair or of the Speaker to do it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I assure you that I did not even know that the hon. member had an office. His predecessor did not have one. He was at the top of the staircase over Knights Limited, if you call that an office.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, one is not concerned with whoever was the predecessor of the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should have said "progenitors". If the hon. member has an office, where that office is, I do not know. I know he had a tout outside somebody else's office.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not matter. Let us deal with the Rate of Interest Act.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. The Prime Minister said that I had a tout outside somebody else's office.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Outside Asquith Phillips Office taking away his clients.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The man you fought with at Independence Square! (*ASIDES*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I may, with the utmost reluctance have to suspend the sitting, but I know that hon. members will cooperate in the spirit of the Bar - with a capital "B".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief, Sir, because this is a comparatively simple matter to all but a few of the people on the other side. In 1754, the second Statute, as far as I can remember, on the Statute Book of the island imposed a limitation of six per cent per annum on any loan of monies loaned for any purpose, any design, machinery

or anything like that. There was a very exhaustive definition in the Act itself which will be found in Volume I of the Laws of Barbados on page 6. The first Act in the printed Laws of Barbados is the Act to prevent all forcible and Clandestine Entries into any loans or tenements within this island; the next one is the Three Houses Spring Act; the third one is an Act to quiet the inhabitants of this island in the peaceable possession of their estates and for removing the causes of expensive and vexatious Suits in relation thereto, and the fourth is the Usury Act or the Rate of Interest Act, and that Act said that it shall be cited as the Rate of Interest Act and then in Section 2 it says this:-

"No person or persons whatsoever, from and after the end of one month after the commencement of this Act, upon any contract which shall be made from and after the said time, shall take directly or indirectly for loan of any moneys, goods, wares, merchandise, or other commodities whatsoever, above the value of six pounds for the forbearance of one hundred pounds for a year, and so after that rate for a greater or lesser sum or for a longer or shorter time; and all judgments, bonds, contracts, and assurances whatsoever made after the time aforesaid, for payment of any principal or money to be lent, or covenanted to be performed upon or for any usury, whereupon or whereby there shall be reserved or taken above the rate of six pounds in the hundred as aforesaid, shall be utterly void: and all and every person or persons whatsoever who shall after the time aforesaid, upon any contract thereafter to be made, take, accept and receive by way or means of any corrupt bargain, loan, exchange, chievement, shift, or interest of any goods, wares, merchandise, or other thing or things whatsoever or by any deceitful way or means whatsoever, or by any covin, engine or deceitful conveyance for the forbearing or giving day of payment for any whole year of and for their money or other thing, above the sum of six pounds for the forbearing of one hundred pounds for the year"

The Act has three short sections: but what was clear is that this Act was to prohibit the charging of an interest rate higher than six per cent either by a pawnbroker for the deposit of goods, or a loan of money by a bank, for facilities by way of overdrafts or loans granted by the bank to its customers, on bills of exchange, on debentures, on contracts entered into by merchants with the bank, on mortgages - everything, Sir.
7.55 p.m.

There is no doubt about that at all. And the reason for that is that in 1754, that was at a time when usury was rampant not only in Barbados, but throughout the British Empire, as it was known at that time and many people were driven to destruction because they were called upon to pay exorbitant rates of interest by money lenders and then they found themselves in difficulty and even that they could pay back the high rates of interest, far less to pay back the principal sums. That is a matter of history.

Now, in 1968 some 204 years later, the last Government introduced a Bill here to amend the provision of the Usury Act and to make it possible for a sum greater than six percent per annum to be charged. What was significant then was that what is now known as the Commonwealth Development Corporation and was then known, as far as I can remember, as the Colonial Development Corporation, had been approached by the Electrical Undertakers - that is what they say in the Act; they call them undertakers - the Barbados Light & Power Company, for a loan of £300,000, and the Commonwealth Development Corporation or C.D.C. said that they could not lend them at a rate lower than six percent, or as low as six percent. The individual company - I want to draw the distinction between the state of affairs on interest then and the state of affairs with interest now - therefore was able to persuade the Government then to amend the Rate of Interest Act so as to make it possible for them to borrow money from the Commonwealth Development Corporation.

It is significant that by the time that the Bill came before the House the bank rate in England had drifted down from seven percent to five and one-half percent, but the Government of Barbados still pursued the Bill.

In 1959, the following year, C.D.C. said that they were not satisfied with the actual terminology used in the Bill: so a further amendment was made in 1959 to the Bill. Representations were made by various members of the mercantile community at the time to the Government that in the same way that they had allowed the Electrical undertakers to get it, that they should allow investors resident in to get it as well; but this did not see the light of day.

As far as I remember - I am trying to remember now - in 1961 there was a further amendment to the Bill. The first amendment was 1958-26, passed on the 14th August, and the debate began sometime in July and the Bill was then amended in 1959 again. This is what the Bill says before me.

Now, it is very important, Sir, to recount that what we are discussing here is individual legislation, is an amendment made to the Usury Act to accommodate a peculiar situation - a situation peculiar to the Barbados Light and Power Company and their dealings with the Commonwealth Development Corporation. The Commonwealth Development Corporation has made one loan in Barbados for all its years of existence, when the Canadian International Power Company bought over the Barbados Light and Power Company. That loan was repaid, and since then the Commonwealth Development Corporation has not made a single investment in the Island of Barbados where they have their Regional Headquarters.

As a matter of fact, Sir, in their dealings, they are often harder than the hardest money-lenders you can find anywhere, and they always shelter under the claim that they have to borrow money at market rates, and they have administrative expenses, and the British Treasury does not allow them to make money available

to Commonwealth countries at lower rates than one-half of one percent or one percent over the prevailing market rate in the United Kingdom. That is something which I personally have taken up with British Cabinet Ministers and even with the Prime Minister himself, Mr. Harold Wilson, on the last occasion that I spoke to him. I pointed out to him that it did not look good that in the very territory where they had their headquarters the Commonwealth Development Corporation had not been able to stimulate any kind of development since that time they were repaid a private loan which they made under the amendment to the Usury Act to the Light and Power Company.

The hon. member made another statement. He probably would deny it again. I had to point out to him that these were the highest rates imposed by the Bank of England on the instructions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 18th November, 1967, or the highest bank rate since 1914, or from the middle of 1914. He was claiming that the Bank rate was not higher before, and it was not necessary.

The bank rate has never been as high as eight percent for 54 years, and that is a lot older than me and certainly nearly twice his age - of course not too much older than me, but certainly I was not in being and under the King's Peace at that time. This is the last time that the bank rate had been as high as that, and of course at that time the whole of Europe was on the verge of a major conflagration. 8.05 p.m.

Now we live in what is called an open economy. We do not have a Central Bank. We do not print our own currency, neither do we mint our own coins. We are tied to a currency agreement of the pound sterling by the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority Agreement which was ratified by the Legislature of this Island two or three short years ago. Like any other country which has emerged only recently - and not in the dim and distant past - from colonialism, it is going to take us a long time to shake off the devices by which the overseas territories were shackled to the economy of what fondly used to be described as the Mother Country. Because Great Britain was the greatest trading nation in the world, it was convenient from the point of view of Imperial preference, because the pound was a unit of international account. It was one of the great reserve currencies of the world along with the French franc, the Swiss franc and the United States dollar. Every little country does not go off in a tantrum and set up its own currency with the gold standard, because you have to have something which in the fullest sense of the term in currency that is capable of moving from one place to another and capable of recognition and respect, and that is why invariably even in some countries much larger than ours, you have arrangements whereby you have your currency tied to some unit of international account such as the pound sterling or the dollar, as the case may be. Which of the great currencies of international account you select depends largely on historical factors, but more important, as in the case of the Bahamas, on your trade patterns and the kind of backward and forward movement of particular curren-

cles which you may have inside of your economy. If, therefore, as in the case of the Bahamas or Bermuda, the people in those territories earn more dollars than they earn pounds, if they do not export anything or very little from them - and most of their trade both by way of foodstuffs, building materials and so on is with the United States, and the United States in turn supplies them with a substantial proportion of the gross national income of the country which is derived in the form of dollars - then you will see that that country has little to do with sterling: and, as a result, in the Bahamas - a much - a much smaller country with a much smaller population than Barbados - they have been able to establish the Bahamas dollar on parity of \$1.00 for \$1.00 with the United States dollar; so when devaluation comes along, for the Bahamas to devalue their currency would be like the United States devaluing their own dollar because Great Britain has devalued the pound.

The whole object of the exercise, Mr. Chairman, was to give the pound lesser purchasing power than the dollar; so the people in the Bahamas are very fortunate. Here in Barbados with the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, we have tied our dollar at four shillings and two pence sterling. Whatever happens to the pound, therefore, happens to us automatically until we amend the agreement.

Now, it is also one of the unfortunate paradoxes of our monetary arrangements that frequently when steps are taken to do something bat and base, as it were, the situation which exists here may be entirely different from the situation which exists on the circumstances or the periphery; so countries on the periphery like New Zealand, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Mauritius and so on may have economic conditions which are entirely different; but unfortunately until we devise some way of freeing ourselves either of the trading connection or the monetary linkage or both, we unfortunately will have violent reactions in the overseas territories to the smallest movement or pronouncement made in the United Kingdom which is virtually controlling our currency.

The situation is that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer announces that the Bank Rate goes up to 8 per cent, almost automatically the bank rate in Barbados goes up to 8 1/2 per cent. Almost automatically the interest rate goes up by about half of one per cent more than the bank rate, and it makes money extremely difficult and expensive for the person who is in need of money. We have to examine it very carefully - and I apologise for spending such a long time - but the reason for that is that as far as I know in the history of Barbados, we have had one bank which is autochthonous, which has sprung out of the Island itself. That Bank has had a very unfortunate history, has gone into liquidation or has been put into Receivership owing something like \$800,000. It is the only Bank we had. Of the other Banks, three are Canadian Banks and one British Bank, Barclays D.C.O. in Barbados. They are linked directly with their Head Offices, and they draw on their Head Offices to expand their loans in Barbados. They do not lend money to their

Head Offices; they borrow money from their Head Offices. Everything is all right as long as the Head Offices can afford to lend them money below the rate prescribed by our Usury Act, but since for the first time in fifty-four years the rate has gone up to 8 percent and the amendment in Barbados only allows 8 percent interest to be paid - the amendment made by the previous Government - the purpose of this Bill therefore seeks to exempt institutions like the Banks which have to borrow money from sources where they cannot get it below 8 percent to lend it here, notwithstanding the provisions of the Usury Act, in order to keep the wheels of commerce and trade turning. This is something which the average Barbadian, including myself, does not like.

We would like to see the day come when we can have our own Central Bank, when we are strong enough to do that, when the Minister of Finance or the Chancellor of the Exchequer can prescribe the rates, which is the next thing we will have to come to the House with, or the different rates for the different kinds of transactions, because, as I have said on many previous occasions, there is no such thing as the rate of interest. In any community like ours, a democratic semi-capitalistic society with a socialist Government, at any one time you have several rates of interest. You do not have one rate of interest, but you have a maximum ceiling beyond which neither one of the rates can rise; so you would have a rate on Treasury Bills, you would have a rate for bank overdrafts, you would have a Mortgage rate, and you would have even a rate at the pawnbrokers, and all of them may be different at any one time. You would, therefore, have several rates of interest and it depends on whether you are borrowing "short term" or whether you are borrowing "long term".

The significant thing is that although it is called the Rate of Interest Act, this does not fix the rate of interest; it fixes the ceiling beyond which no rate of interest is allowed to rise. After all, interest is rent charged for the use of somebody else's money, and it should be an economic rent. You are renting somebody's money and you pay them rent for it, and all the Usury Act says is that the rate should not rise above eight percent. That is the situation in a nutshell.

I want to tell hon. members that I have never been a proponent in a society like this of lifting the lid off the rate of interest. This Bill has limited applications. It is limited to the drawing of funds on overseas investors, and as far as I am concerned, I would like to assure hon. members that as soon as the conditions change, I will be coming in here in the same way that I repealed similar provisions, I think, in 1962, enacted by former Governments - I will be returning having established the precedent myself for repealing these provisions, whether it is in February, March, April or May, and I hope it will be as soon as possible.

8.15 p.m.

But the indications are that at any time between February and May the rate may come down. It may not come down sufficient to justify the repeal at that time. I give hon. members the assurance that I am such a

strong fanatic about this kind of thing, I would like to make a complete break with the Colonial past and I will be bringing in an Act in here to repeal this as soon as conditions allow and no harm is done to the economy. I give hon. members that assurance, sound in the knowledge that I was the person who did it before - the only person in the history of this Island who did it before, and I will do it again. I did not send it up the first time. That is the assurance which I give hon. members.

I will at some time or other bring in legislation here probably repealing the Usury Act altogether, except the ceiling, of course, and amending it in such a way that it will be possible for the Minister, with the approval of the House, to publish or make an Order to be published in the Official Gazette from time to time prescribing what the different rates of interest on different things should be. I do not think I can say anything more than that usefully. This, Sir, is a national issue.

I assure hon. members - anyone who was in the House of Assembly in 1958 would know that I gave a complete exposition of my views at that time, and I do not recant, withdraw or regret a single thing I said on that occasion. I think there are about twenty pages in the Official Gazette in which I gave chapter and verse of what I thought the effects of the rate of interest on the economy would be. The senior member for the City and the junior member for St. Lucy also spoke, and I think we all have the same views. I would say that this does not affect mortgages, and I do not want any Solicitor tomorrow writing to anybody and telling him that he now has to pay more or calling in defeasances, because this is not to affect mortgages.

Further, there is provision, as hon. members will see - I think it is in Clause 3 of the Bill - that time to time, I will read the Clause exactly. Under Section 2 (b) - there is something wrong with the numbering, Sir, because they have two a's and two b's in Section 2. There is a second "b" in Section 2, and I do not know how we will get around that. It calls for some kind of renumbering. It is Section 2 (b), exempting the charging of interest in excess of that prescribed in the Usury Act by "any such other firm or body corporate or class of firm or body corporate as the Minister responsible for Finance may by order specify."

I have no intention of specifying any existing mortgages under this; but what I would like to come to the House with in future - and I serve notice on all members now - is that instead of amending the Usury Act from time to time, we should make an Order saying Treasury Bills, so much; Bills of Exchange so much; Drafts, as the case may be, so much, but recognising always that there is a maximum ceiling beyond which the rate of interest should not rise.

With those explanations, Sir, I will now leave it to the Pundits to enjoy themselves, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we have to be careful lest in our approach to our speeches - by "we" I mean the Prime Minister and I - we turn into a comedy of errors; for where the one genuine error which the Prime Minister has been able to point out in the hurried preliminary remarks made when leave was sought to deal with this Bill at an earlier stage, was uttered by me, he has seized that relating to the 8%. He himself has made no few errors in the current debate.

For example, the Prime Minister said that it was he who came into this House to repeal Acts that turned the rate of interest from being freed of a ceiling back into a fixed ceiling. I have before me the Act 1961-52, which was passed before the 2nd November, 1961. I have not got the signature of the former Speaker, but it came before us on the 9th; it was passed and the Governor's assent was given on the 2nd November, 1961, and to my knowledge would suggest that it was not the Prime Minister who repealed the 1958-59 Acts, but it was the old Government. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here, perhaps, to set me right because, as he has pointed out, I was not here at the time. I can only go by the facts, and the facts say that it was before the 1961 Elections that these two Bills, which the Prime Minister had opposed tooth and nail and twenty pages went into the Official Gazette, in 1958, were repealed. I have it here. The Act 1961-52, Clause 3, says:

"The Rate of Interest (Amendment) Acts 1958-59 are hereby repealed."

Clause 2 deals with changing the rate of interest from 6% to 8%. Mr. Speaker, as I say, it is a comedy of errors when we have to rush into things quickly, and when you have to go into your head and into your memory you can make mistakes. I know quite well that in the United Kingdom any rate of interest over 7% is regarded as a crisis rate, and anything at that level 7%, 7 1/2% or 8% is a well known temporary rate put on for banks and moneylenders, not to encourage them to make money, but to stop them from lending money. That is the purpose for these high bank rates. That even now is the purpose of the 8% bank rate introduced in England.

The relationship of devaluation to the rate of interest in Barbados is negligible, but the relationship of devaluation to the rate of interest in England, which is the original devaluer, is important. It is true: the immediate effect on devaluation is to cause domestic inflation. It can by increasing export earnings; it can revive employment, which in England undoubtedly needs reviving; it can increase consumption; and, if left unchecked by restrictive investment measures, such as raising the bank rate to a crisis level, you will soon lose the beneficial effects of devaluation because the cost will rise again.

8.25 p.m.

That part has no relevance to Barbados because I do not think our economy needed devaluation. It is un-

fortunate, as I said in the debate on the Exchange Control Bill, that the price we have to pay for guaranteeing the protection of our currency is subjection to devaluation in Britain whenever it occurs. It is unfortunate; but I am sure that the Prime Minister will agree with me, as I would agree with him, that that is the price which, at the moment, must be paid. We may be strong enough for a Central Bank in our own note issue and so on, but I do not think that we are strong enough for independent currency - independent, that is to say to have a dollar against a pound, the two currencies with which we mostly have to deal. Now, Mr. Speaker, at an early stage I should say that the Prime Minister has achieved what lawyers and politicians, I think, spend a lot of time in achieving, that is taking the wind out of their opponents' sails to some degree, because in the thought which I have been able to give to this Bill over the last two weeks, I have come to exactly the same conclusion that the proper amendment to the Rate of Interest Act, would be to give the Minister responsible for Finance power to make alterations in the Rate of Interest as the occasion seems fit. That is a conclusion which I think any sensible financial student - I am not going to use the words "financial expert" - looking at the situation of Barbados would see; that this particular Bill before the House is a clumsy instrument and that the correct instrument for the necessary adjustments in the rate of interest is a Central Bank, and failing that, power in the Minister of Finance to make alterations by instrument.

The Barbados Labour Party, I am glad to say, came to this conclusion quite independently of the Prime Minister. To tell the truth, Mr. Speaker, he surprised me somewhat, when he introduced this Bill, at the end of his speech in introduction. The other thing which we welcome is his assurance that this Bill will go through the door when there is a need for it, if there is a need for it, and that is going to be the main burden of my speech, "if there is a need for it", when that need is offered. There was something in the Prime Minister's speech which gave me the impression that he had never had anything to thank the Opposition more for than the two weeks' delay which he seized during the last session of the House until today. Nobody in his right senses would seriously believe that at my behest the Prime Minister, who so often tells us that the Opposition is not there to run the Government and will not run the Government, would put off a Bill, which he says was absolutely vital to Barbados, just like that. As he said, he could go on the political platform and tell the people that the Opposition has destroyed the economy of Barbados. He said so and we laughed, and our laughter proved to be the best comment on what he said. None of us, Mr. Speaker, even although we know the Prime Minister, none of us thought of him as being so irresponsible as to leave the economy of Barbados two weeks in which to collapse just so that he could blame the Opposition for it. But let that pass into the limbo of the comedy of errors of the last meeting of the House. It was a joke; it was always a joke; and it could only have convinced one or two of the more financially simple-minded members of the Cabinet who were taken, I believe, by what the Prime Minis-

ter told them before he first introduced the Bill, and after that they were still affected to think that that could have been a serious political manoeuvre. The Prime Minister, in our view, was panicked into introducing this Bill.

There is a history attaching to the particular Bill which is before the House in the form which has been chosen. Obviously, there was time enough only to revert to the 1958 Bill and copy it out practically *verbatim* but with a very significant alteration to which I will refer later - there was time enough only for that. Everything was panic station. The Prime Minister was running around; the ship perhaps was sinking beneath him; he was trying to get the water pumped out and he was running around and around and shouting: "Don't panic, don't panic, don't panic," but he was accepting all the results of panic, nonetheless.

This argument about the bank rate in England being 8% and therefore the bank rate in Barbados is to be more than 8% has certain specious plausibility that did appeal to certain financially simple-minded persons, members of the Cabinet. One particular member of the Cabinet told me that it is as simple as that; the people will send their money to England unless you raise the rate of interest to keep it here. I could not discuss it with him because anybody who sees something as complex as the interest rate, that greases the wheels of modern capitalist economy in simple Barbadian terms that "the English rate is 8%, and therefore we have to be more" - it is impossible to explain in ordinary conversation that nothing could be as simple as that, and, of course, it is not anything like that. I must take issue with the Prime Minister's statement that the interest rates go up one-half of one per cent more than the Bank rate. That really is an over-simplification that he could only introduce in his speech because the people with whom he has to talk finance for the main part are the people to whom perhaps, he has not got the patience to explain finance at length. The people whom he has to convince in his own Cabinet may not have patience with financial topics, but it just is not true that when the English Bank rate is 8%, any rate goes up to one-half of one per cent more. It just simply is not true. That is not the way that things work. Let us get this right into our heads. There are rates of interest in England of 40% and 50% per year. We had a party meeting about this; I had to point out - I do not say that the other Party members who were present did not know it - that in England you can get a money lender to lend you money on your expectancy under a Will. But he is not a true money-lender; he is a gambler. He is gambling that you father or auntie or grandfather who is going to leave you money under a Will is not going to change the Will, and therefore you may pay 30% per year on money borrowed on expectancy. He would charge you by the month; he would charge you 4% or 5% a month if he hears that you and whoever is leaving the money are likely to fall out. That has no connection at all in Barbados with the rate of interest being fixed at 8%. That is a transaction with which

we have never had any connection at all in Barbados. Our rates of interest being fixed at 8% rules out that type of transaction altogether, but I have mentioned it as being one extreme in the scale. Money-lenders who want to turn over their money every two years exist; but they cannot exist in an economy such as ours. Although I have not read the Prime Minister's speech in 1958, I would have expected that he was really treating the House then to twenty pages of explanation on the rate of interest to point out that while a fixed ceiling has disadvantages, it also has advantages in that it discourages the kind of money-lending speculation which has from time immemorial, prevailed in countries with a freer attitude towards interest rates.

8.35 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some facts relating to the rate of interest. I have checked and I have done my best to get all of the figures absolutely as up to date as I possibly can as to the rates of interest that are now prevailing in England with the eight per cent bank rate. This eight per cent bank rate, as I have said, is not interest for the purpose of encouraging money to be lent out. It was introduced for the purpose of stopping money from being lent out.

I have obtained a copy of a letter which was sent out by the Bank of England on the 19th November to all commercial banks in England. This letter made it clear that Banks - unless in a way - are not allowed at this present to deal directly with private borrowers at all.

Overdraft rates in England have in fact gone up to around nine to ten percent and bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that the Banks are hoping for.

All of us who have an overdraft, let us remember that the first thing to go up would be an overdraft. This is the highest rate of interest; but these overdraft rates in England have gone up to nine and ten percent, approximately. The English Banks have been restricted from lending anybody new money. Those people who have been previously paying eight per cent on overdraft, now have to pay nine or nine and a half per cent, but new overdrafts are not being granted.

The Bank of England in its letter has said in quite straightforward terms that lending for most purposes must be held down in aggregate to the current lending. Severe but very selective restrictions will need to be placed on the Banks lending in sterling to the Private sector and borrowers abroad. I am reading quotations.

The recent upward trend in lending the person should be held without delay. Therefore, it is no question of the Banks in England really holding out their hands for more money to lend out at a higher interest rate to anybody. In a pointing letter circulated to the English Bank, it also states what are the particular interest rates. They state that severe but selective restriction in lending out money are to be employed.

Now, this is the first of the interest rates which I am going to quote to the House just to show you that there is no question of interest going up to half per cent over the Bank rate. It particularly states that the one form of lending which would be generally permitted is overdrafts. It says that the clearing and Scottish banks may renew their facilities for immediate term export finance at the fixed rate of five and a half per cent so that people engaged in the export business in England, notwithstanding the bank rate is eight per cent, are still borrowing money at the rate of five and a half per cent. Now I have just mentioned that. That is one of the interest rates.

Now, we come down to the others. Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for the Prime Minister to say that this Bill does not apply to mortgages. A bank lends out money for security on house property, and land as well, and it can raise the interest rate, if this Bill is passed, on all loans which are secured by title deeds. It is a simple, straightforward matter.

We would think, bearing in mind what the Prime Minister has said, that mortgage loans in England would be going up. The Chairman of the Building Society in England has said that there is to be no alteration in the interest rates on houses and lands. The mortgage rates on home loans in England remain at 7 1/8 per cent, not even eight per cent, still less than what you can get if you lend your money out here. The interest paid to people who give their money to Building Societies to lend out for them remains at four and a half per cent.

Now, there is another point. Perhaps the most accessible means to the public to get interest on money is to put it into a savings account or deposit account. You carry it and put it in a fixed deposit or a demand deposit or whatever it is. That has gone up in England, but again not very near eight per cent. It has gone up to six percent because the English banks have a rough rule that their fixed deposit rate is also kept at two percent below the bank rate. It has gone up to six per cent.

The Banks in Barbados feel that the investors are going to send their money to an English deposit account and not lend to them because they can get six per cent in England. They are still open to pay the six per cent here in Barbados. They can still do it. If they want to attract deposit account money, they can pay people six per cent on their deposit account. If they want to attract deposit money, they do not need this Bill to do it.

A security mortgage is another thing. By far the greater amount of money loaned out in Britain or the United States of America or any other country is loaned out on what is called Treasury paper, Government paper, or whatever it is. You lend it on stocks, Consols. I do not want to bore the House on what Consols are at length, but there is a lot of English Government's financing done by issuing Consolidated Loan Bonds which bear a nominal face value of £100 and a nominal interest rate of either two and half per cent, three and a half per cent or four per cent. But

although they pay this nominal face value of £100, they are not sold for £100. What they are sold for in England and still tells you what the rate of interest is because a Consol Bond is an entitlement to call on the Government for £2.10 interest at the end of the year. That is all it is, and what you pay for it determines what that rate of interest represents.

Consols stocks, two and a half per cent loan Consols, except English Government bonds of this sort, are never redeemed. You can still pay to the Government, but they never have a closing date.

Two and a half per cent Consols closed last Friday at 34 7/8 and 35 1/8. I have worked that out when I was in the House this afternoon, and it is 7 1/8 per cent. Four per cent Consols closed at 56 5/8 to 56 7/8. That is seven per cent; so there is no Bank rate which is immediately available to a person with money to lend at more than eight per cent. The only people who can get more than eight percent in England at the moment are the expectancies - the money lenders that are lending out on expectancies and that sort of thing - and the Banks with overdrafts.

There is none of us here who actually sends out money to England to a Bank and looks for anything more than eight per cent. There is just no meaning in the Prime Minister's phrase that the rate of interest has gone up a half per cent more than eight per cent. It is meaningless. Mortgage rates are seven and one eighth percent; short terms Treasury paper seven and one eighth percent; medium term Treasury paper seven per cent; deposits account six percent and if you want to borrow to finance your exports, the only form the Banks of England is allowing particularly at the moment is five and one half percent.

If you really want to get down a little bit closer, the Prime Minister said here that the banks have to borrow from the English Banks. Well, I believe that my friend the hon. senior member for Christ Church, has some figures as to the position of loans and deposits in the banks here. The fact, as I understand it, is that deposits in the banks exceed loans. Therefore, there is no need to send to England for money. But the rate of interest at which the English Banks lend to Discount Houses in all their branches, the highest rate at which they lend to other financial institutions has been raised not by two per cent but by only one and three-eighth percent and it stands at six and one quarter per cent.

8.45 p.m.

A Discount House, Mr. Speaker, is a financial institution that exists to discount people's bills. Exporters and Importers carry their bills to a discount house and the discount gives them the money on discount for thirty days at 6 percent or whatever the matter may be. They have to get the money from somewhere, and they are getting their money from a Bank, and they get it at 6 1/4 percent. What the English Bank rate actually is, is that if the Discount Houses have the misfortune to run out of money and they have to get emergency money, the Bank rate

is the rediscount rate; they have to pay 8 percent for emergency money. If they actually want physical money in their hands a day and they have to go to the Bank for it, they have to pay 8 percent. I believe probably in the whole of 1967 no Discount House has found itself so embarrassed.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are not always easy to understand and indeed not always easy to read, but it is necessary to analyse them to realise that any talk about money flying into England, as a result of the 8 percent Bank rate, out of Barbados is absolute thorough-going nonsense. It just is not so. It just is not true that there is any simple answer to the problems to the Bank rate. It does not operate as easily as that.

As far as I can judge too, Mr. Speaker, even here in Barbados, although Solicitors are sitting very tight on their money these couple of weeks, because they did not know what was going to happen, it does not seem to worry the Banks. I have not observed any flight on capital from the Banks. I negotiated myself an overdraft last week, and it was granted in a morning. About 9 o'clock I started, and by 11 o'clock I had the money before the Banks were even closed. I did not see the slightest evidence that the Banks here are finding it difficult to get money to lend out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister finds himself in a bad position and I think perhaps we fired too many guns on the last occasion, because we may have made it very difficult, if not impossible, for the Prime Minister to retreat from the position he took up at the last meeting of the House. He has come a long way down with us in so far as he has given us the assurance that, when the crisis conditions are over, this Bill can be repealed. In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the Prime Minister the chance perhaps to frame a Bill along the lines which he indicated and to give even further consideration to the whole matter of this rate of interest.

The hour is later, Mr. Speaker, and the Prime Minister has invited me to listen to him on Rediffusion tonight explain what he is going to do to keep the cost of travel low when the IATA waiting period in respect of airline fares had expired. I would like to hear him. It is not often I can say that, but I really would like to hear him. I suppose all of us think about travelling in the long term, and in the very short term, I have formed the impression that all of us are thinking about eating.

I would therefore move that further consideration of this Bill be now postponed, and I must reserve the right to speak further.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member does not have to reserve it.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I beg to second the motion.

The question that further consideration of the Bill be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th December, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit, perhaps I might be permitted to draw the attention of the House to the fact that since last we met the Deputy Clerk of this House has passed and celebrated his thirtieth unbroken year of service as Deputy Clerk of this House. I think, Mr. Speaker, that congratulations to him through you would be in order. The Deputy Clerk is almost now a fixture of this House, and there is scarcely a member - except perhaps you yourself - who can remember the time in this House when he was not here, although I believe Your Honour arrived as a member in the same year that he did, or a few months before. I think hon. members certainly on all sides though they would wish to speak for themselves would certainly join me in congratulating him on his thirty years service to this House, service which he has rendered with patience and certainly with distinction, and to wish him thirty more years of service if he can stand up not only to this generation of hon. members, but to those who will certainly succeed us.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if I were permitted to associate myself with the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion for the adjournment?

Mr. ST. JOHN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If tonight I do not do so with any great degree of warmth, it is not because of the fact that we do not believe on this side that the congratulations are well merited, but because we on this side have a great urgency. Now, Sir, we do hope that the Deputy Clerk will be spared many more years with us, and we on this side particularly - the younger members - have always been impressed by his courtesy to all the members of this House, and his willingness to help the younger members and guide us through the path of the jungle of procedure as exists in these Chambers.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I too would like on behalf of my colleague and myself to join in the encomiums so well deserved by the Deputy Clerk of the House. Since coming to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I can say for myself how often our task has been greatly lightened by the wry humour of the

Deputy Clerk, and we have often been impressed by his willingness to assist new members of the House, and with that deft touch, which he has, to come right to the point of anything amusing in a debate. 8.55 p.m.

We do hope that he will be spared for many years to guide the younger members into the intricacies of Parliamentary procedure. We are fortunate in having such an official in the House of Assembly, and we do wish that he would, at this time, be assured of how much his work is appreciated on all sides of this House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am probably speaking out of turn, but as one who has been associated with the Deputy Clerk both inside of this Chamber and outside since 1932, a person for whom I hold very great respect in the professional field as a Solicitor, being one of the best Solicitors Barbados has produced, I rise to congratulate him and trust that he may be spared in order to assist us in our deliberations and procedures in this Chamber.

I know that he has been very efficient in his duties, and is courteous to all who walk into this Chamber. May he long be spared, and may he be granted the privilege of serving this Assembly for many a long year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to associate myself with the well deserved tribute which has been paid to Mr. Herbert Lisle Thomas, Deputy Clerk of this Chamber, for over 30 years. I preceded him by a few months and I have had, therefore, a very long opportunity of assessing his work. One of his greatest assets in his unfailing punctuality. He has set an example, but I am afraid it is not followed.

There is no question about his professional ability and his facility for getting on with all members of this Chamber, irrespective of Party and irrespective of office. I take this opportunity of expressing my high appreciation of the dedicated service which Mr. Herbert Lisle Thomas has rendered to this Chamber during my comparatively long tenure of office. I endorse what all hon. members have said, and I thank him for what he has done for the Parliament of Barbados.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th December, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.00 p.m.

