

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th December, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S.,
(Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. K. N. R.
HUSBANDS, J.P. Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, Hon. J. C.
TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN,
J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tour-
ism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES,
J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minis-
ter of Communications and Works); Sir G. H. ADAMS,
C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.) (Leader of the Oppo-
sition), His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker);
Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B.
SPRINGER; and Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B.,

Prayers were read.

Mr. HINDS, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS en-
tered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there are no Minutes
instantly available for confirmation. I have the hon-
our to inform the House that I have received a letter
from the Auditor General's Office dated 16th De-
cember, 1968.

"Sir,

In accordance with the provisions of Section 26
(3) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act,
1964 as amended by the Financial Administration
and Audit Act, 1967, I have the honour to submit my
report on the results of the examination of the ac-
counts of the Island for the year ended 31st March,
1967.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
G. B. Brandford,
Auditor General."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the business
of the day is proceeded with, I would like to draw to
your attention that I am in here without an Order
Paper, and I do not know what is to go on. I have no
Order Paper and no knowledge of what is to be dealt
with. What is the position?

Mr. SPEAKER: I much regret that Order Papers
were not sent out. I had thought that they might well
have been cyclostyled yesterday morning and sent
out by despatch rider yesterday afternoon. That was
not done. The printed Order Papers were ready only
this morning, I understand, and they have been, I am
informed, circulated to members. I very much re-
gret the delay, but members will bear in mind that
we met last Saturday and our Government Printery
does not seem able to break the speed limit.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of
the Opposition to be able to make some sort of con-
tribution, and if nothing is laid on the Table as an
Order Paper to tell you what you are to do today,
how can you make any valuable contribution to what
is to be done? This hustling and rushing of things is
just not good enough. I am now told that something
has been put on the Table in front of me. What am I?
I do not know how other members feel about it, but
this is how I feel, and I hope this will not happen again,
because you know that when you were Leader of the
Opposition, and the Leader of the House knows that
when he was in Opposition, you both would take a
strong stand against this. As a matter of fact, you
would refuse to do any business at all today. We met
last Saturday, it is true, and there was Sunday, and
yesterday, and today is Tuesday when something is
put before us. I do not know what Bills are on the
Order Paper. This is just not right. Hasty legisla-
tion is generally bad and inferior legislation.

Mr. LYNCH entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am
rather surprised at the hon. member who has just
sat down being so quiet. How in the name of heaven,
in Human Rights Week of all times, are we, a Minor-
ity group, to sit down and be prepared to open some-
thing which appears only after we got in the House
and take our seats and debate it? I have just opened
my parcel.

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

How in the name of Heaven could we possibly reasonably, sensibly take part in a debate when we have not even read what is put before us? I am going much farther than the hon. member who has just sat down. I am putting it to the Hon. Leader of the House that he cannot claim to be in a democratic Parliament and go on with any of these things today. Over and over again they seem to forget that it is not enough just to depend on their majority. What has just happened with the late Minister of Agriculture is only another instance of the fact that human nature will revolt. We have a Prime Minister who is an absolute South American dictator, and sooner or later he will get everybody against him, not only the ex-Minister of Agriculture. There is this attitude of "You talk as much as you like, we will out-vote you; therefore we do what we like." We come in here and before we have time even to read the Order Paper, business starts. This meeting should be adjourned. Over and over again these fantastic documents come to us saying that in the public interest it is necessary to have an earlier meeting before next Tuesday, and when we have the earlier meeting, what does it amount to? Take the Income Tax Bill. It was adjourned again and again although we were summoned here to a special meeting to be told we were going to do the Income Tax Act.

What I did a short time ago I will do, maybe, for the last time. I am going to say to the Leader of the House that he has visibly changed recently, and that he will listen to what the Opposition says. A couple of months ago he did not. Apparently he too has summoned up a little courage and is fighting his boss, his big chief, his South American dictator. I appeal to him now to see that the Opposition co-operate with him and help the Government to get through the business they have; but he should no longer adopt the attitude that because the Government have a majority, they need ignore the wishes of the Opposition. How in the name of Heaven can you put a man in the Law Court, charge him only after he is in the dock with an offence, and he has no means of knowing what you charge him with until he is put in the dock and told that on such-and-such a day he committed assault and battery or whatever it is? *A fortiori*, when it comes to Parliament, members of the House should come into this House knowing what the Government is asking them to debate or to agree to - not waiting until they sit down here! It was only after prayers had been finished that I even opened this parcel, and I must repeat - I go farther than the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and suggest to the Leader of the House that he knows that in the last month or so I could not be more affable with him, quite unlike what used to happen three or four months ago. He could not possibly wish for a more co-operative person than the Leader of the Opposition. We are co-operative with him; he must be co-operative with us. Forget today; forget these new things and let us go on with the things left over from last week.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on this side in making criticism as to how the Order

Paper has been received by members on this side. What I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, is that Item No. 5 under Government Business, which is the Third Reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund out of which prescribed benefits may be paid to sugar workers and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, is to be moved by the Hon. DaCosta Edwards and according to a broadcast last night, I understand that the Hon. DaCosta Edwards' portfolio has been removed from him. I can therefore only consider that this Order Paper is wrong, and I would like you to give me a Ruling on this before I can sit down here to carry out my duties to the people of Barbados. I cannot support anything on the Order Paper today unless you give me a Ruling on this, because to the best of my knowledge, as from 12 o'clock last night, the Hon. DaCosta Edwards can no longer move the Third Reading of a Bill, and I await Your Honour's Ruling.

12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a matter on which I have any Ruling to give or on which I have any official information. I would say in respect of the hon. members who have made their points - the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the Hon. Leader of the House - that I could not agree with them more as to the fact that copies of this Order Paper were not circulated yesterday afternoon. I said that to Mr. Clerk; I see no reason why they could not have been cyclostyled yesterday morning and circulated yesterday afternoon. I quite understand that the Government Printery could not have them printed before today because of the rate at which they do their work.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Could not they have printed them and got overtime for printing them and sent them around by a policeman to members of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: They certainly could have been sent out by despatch riders.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And you could pay them overtime for printing them. This just is not right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to hon. members, and in any event the Hon. Leader of the House has caught my eye, that he would explain his feeling about the matter and what business he proposes to do.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I share the indignation of hon. members at the fact that the Order Paper did not arrive when it should have arrived and that it has not been in the hands of hon. members. As a matter of fact, my own copy of the Order Paper has just come and I have not been able to look at it yet. It is, however, very strange that a matter which concerns the whole House and the conduct of the business of the House should be turned into an attack on the Government. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition must know that I do not print the Order Paper; the printing, publication and getting ready - the preparation of House documents does not rest in my responsibility; consequently, the question as to whether we have numbers or not could not be relevant

to this matter. It is interesting to hear now that we have numbers, when we used to hear that if he raises his little finger he can get four or five of us. He will have to lengthen his finger now; that is all.

The real point is this, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, if hon. members have not had the documents which should properly be discussed at today's meeting, the matters to which these documents refer cannot be discussed. (Hear, hear!) That is the situation in this House and there is no need to generate more indignation that we can conveniently contain over a trivial matter like this. If the several Orders or any of them have not been circulated to hon. members, they cannot be proceeded with; but lest people outside the House might read comments which we make and misunderstand the whole situation, I would like to say that some of the matters which are on today's Order Paper were given notice of as recently or as far back as last Tuesday and possibly the Tuesday before, while others of them have been circulated in cyclo-styled form to hon. members either on Friday or on Saturday, so that the charge that hon. members have not studied all of the matters or any of them is not strictly a valid charge. Some of them hon. members are familiar with, and the new ones will not be proceeded with.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All right; we will go on with those.

ILLNESS OF THE DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that I have received another letter from Mr. H. L. Thomas, Deputy Clerk, in connection with his health and he is not in a position to attend this House today. He includes a Certificate from Dr. Richard Haynes which states this: "This patient is unfit for work by reason of an acute bronchial neuritis, and I have recommended one week's leave for him as from 13.12.68."

I can certify that the signature is that of Dr. Richard G. Haynes, M.B., C.H.B.; M.R.C.P.E.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. H. L. Thomas, Deputy Clerk, be granted one week's leave of absence as from today.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. G. W. Allen, Solicitor, be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk during the absence of Mr. H. L. Thomas, Deputy Clerk.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will second that, but I hope that in future the words "during the absence" will be left out because sometimes the official may walk in.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$160 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I-Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 56 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910.

Also, a Bill to make provision for determining the valuation of land for taxation rating and other purposes and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

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

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, a Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910, was read a first time.

12.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to make provision for determining the valuation of land for taxation rating and other purposes and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto be now read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if the other side has no objection, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

There is a Parliamentary Reply which is ready and, if at the appropriate time hon. members wish to consider items of Private Members' Business, perhaps, they would like to indicate.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should like to second this, Sir, but the hon. Leader of the House should tell us why he is suspending the Standing Orders. What does he propose to do which could not normally be done if he did not suspend the Standing Orders?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, if we do not suspend the Standing Orders, we cannot do all of the items that we should do today, exclusive of the ones that have not been printed, because when the moment of interruption comes, if the House is at that time in a heated debate, it is open to hon. members opposite then to say that the matter is controversial and we cannot continue after half-past eight. I should think that hon. members would wish to finish what could be done today, so that we can go into the Christmas Recess with that concluded.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the House is an expert in the use of the English language. What does he propose to do? I am sure that since I have been back in the House there has never been any question of the Opposition saying that we are not going on with such-and-such a thing, or we are not going to allow something to be debated because it is controversial. I would suspend the Standing Orders tomorrow if it would help the business of the House. I am asking the Leader of the House to let us know what he proposes to do so that I can settle the motion for suspension. Let him tell us what he wants to do. It is a simple question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will notice that we have in Committee of Supply five items, at least four of which we will do today. Apart from the Committee of Supply, there are nine other items listed of which we should like to do six. This means a long stay in Committee of Supply and six other items. It does not seem that, with the meal adjournments, we can finish all of these by half-past eight. I do not know, and, as we all want to get away for the Christmas Recess, I think this is the most sensible thing to do.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I must repeat that the Opposition are more than anxious to co-operate with the Government, especially when the Government is now beginning to show sense. As far as I know, and I cannot answer for the hon. members for the City, every member of the Opposition is willing to sit here until midnight, so that we do not have to come back next week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit until midnight unless you suspend the Standing Orders.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will second the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders on the understanding that whatever business we can do tonight, we will do.

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service 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.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. HOPPIN in the Chair.

A Resolution for \$300,000 was called.

12.45 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 45

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, the Transport Board has been unable to pay its sundry creditors due to the fact that its operating expenditure has been exceeding its revenue.

I do not know if I need to go way back even past 1955, Mr. Chairman, on this Resolution. Those of us who were around in the early Twenties will remember that the first form of public transportation, as far as I know, was the tramcars. I remember that the depot for the tramcars was where the Electric Company now stores their poles. When the trams got near to the office of the Electric Company they used to attach two more mules - because the cars used to be pulled by mules - to get them over the Garrison Hill and as far as the triangle between the Drill Hall and the Police Post, and then they would disconnect these mules and carry them back. So Barbados apparently, before the United States, had mule power, whereas the latter decided to use horse power. After that, Mr. Chairman, we had the three-pedalled Ford, and some chap came here and started with the Fly buses, and these used to ply between Bridgetown and the Oistins route.

The reason why I am mentioning this is because there is a very pertinent point which I want to bring

out. During that time in the early Twenties, a man with a family used to work for as little as six shillings per week, and of this amount he had to pay four cents to get from the Drill Hall to Bethel Church, and if you pass there now you will see "Cars stop here." Afterwards, we had the Express buses, the National buses and the Lincoln, and everybody got into the business. If you went to Panama or the United States and came back with a few cents, you would put yourself in the bus business or open a rum shop. During that time, Mr. Chairman, a tyre used to cost in the vicinity of \$15 and \$16. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown says you could get some for \$10. I would not know because I could not buy a tyre then. Gasolene at that time was as low as 23 cents a gallon. As time went by, gasolene and accessories started to go up. Not only that, Mr. Chairman. The price paid to conductors and drivers also went up, because the standard of living was going up; but bus fares did not go up, and we on both sides of this Chamber remember the famous statement that "bus fares would be raised over my dead body". We have lived to see that a lot of people have died, and bus fares did eventually have to be raised. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Not until after the dead body went to Trinidad to live.)

As a result of that, in 1955, inadvertently in my opinion - and I still hold this opinion that the Government had absolutely no right to be running any bus service because the country is too small for it - Government took over the buses. The concessionaires then asked this Government for an increase in bus fares, and because it was 1955 and elections were in 1956, politics was played with the people's welfare. Immediately after the 1956 elections, things took a different turn. The buses were taken over, Mr. Chairman, from the various concessionaires. Some of the buses, in my opinion, were not even good for the scrap heap, but because it was Government, everything was thrown in and the then Government was not even geared at the time to run any bus service, because they took the buses, put them in the yard of the Department of Highways and Transport which was situated where the Bus Stand now is, and the only thing that was not stolen was a conductor. It was a real fiasco. Everybody put his hands in, and as a result we had to ask the House to write off \$2 million for the Transport Board.

The Transport Board has been "pinging" along in a kind of haphazard way. The trouble with the Transport Board, as I have said before, is that they have some Mercedes Benz buses which are over 20 years old, and some are not even fit to be on the road. They also have quite a number of gasolene buses that they have to keep patching up to keep on the road because the Board finds it difficult to make money. It is one of these paradoxical cases. The Transport Board is carrying passengers at a cheaper rate per mille to themselves than the other concessionaires, but I believe that one of the reasons for their difficulties is that we all know that these Statutory bodies have always been hot beds for hand-outs to political hangers-on. (Claps) I am glad to hear you clapping. 12.55 p.m.

The Transport Board with a fleet of 97 buses was employing over 500 people. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister continue his discourse?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Transport Board, with 97 buses when this Government came into power, discovered that they had something like over 500 people employed, whereas the private concessionaires, with far more buses, were only employing 200-odd people. But that is the kind of thing you get. We all know about the fiasco with the Federal buses - or, at least, what was claimed - and, as a result of a most lucrative route being given away, the Transport Board found itself operating in the red; and the only time that the Board has ever found itself operating in the black was sometime last year. For its 13 years, the first time that the Board has operated in the black was then, but we all know what happened. It had not well started to use the black ink before the Union made their demands; the Board had to meet the Union's demands, and gone was the black ink back to a heavy red ink. That has been the plague of the Transport Board from its inception.

I want also to remind hon. members of this Chamber that apart from this \$300,000 - this is only to pay off outstanding debts with sundry creditors, but that has absolutely nothing to do with the contract with the Union which will expire sometime this month; so it means that the Transport Board will be further in the red. We all know that transport in any country, no matter what size it may be, is a vital segment of the community. If you do not have transport, it means that the whole economy comes to a standstill; because, if people cannot get to work, the stores cannot be opened; and if the stores cannot be opened, then people cannot buy the necessary things. If the drivers do not drive, it means that quite a number of things, one related to the other, will go wrong; and the Government, and not only the Government, will find itself in a most invidious position. That is why we are asking this Chamber today to approve of this \$300,000 for the Transport Board, because some of these debts have been long outstanding, some of them are fairly enormous, and therefore I am appealing to hon. members on the opposite side of the House to give this Resolution their wholehearted support. If there is anything which they want to know and it is within my province dealing with the Transport Board, I am willing to answer; but I would not like hon. members to ask which conductor is on Route 10 or on Route 15, because I do not know. I do not even know the routes; I am the Minister and not the conductor. Mr. Chairman, with those few words I will sit down and allow hon. members on the opposite side to pose their various questions. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, from the lips of the Hon. Minister who has just sat down, one must readily appreciate the fact that under his Ministry there can be no hope for any improvement in the

transport system of this Island as far as the Transport Board is concerned. The Minister himself is certainly unfamiliar with the history of transport in this Island, very much so; and as such, if he expected to tread along that road, one can very well understand where he is going to lead us as he goes on. This is a Resolution for \$300,000, and as the Addendum sets out, and as the Minister affirms, it is merely for the settling of the bills of sundry creditors. The Minister went on to tell us or at least to warn us that there is an agreement with the Trade Union which expires shortly, and we must arm ourselves to have to battle with that situation when it is presented to us. Let us begin to concern ourselves with the facts as divulged by the Minister and what is presented in this Addendum, and put with them what we happen to know of the Transport Board in this Island. We have got to bear in mind that we might destroy some fortune merely for the purpose of making comparisons. The fact is that we have three concessionaires operating in this Island at this particular time. It is quite different from in years past when we had everybody running on every route, and everywhere, and from one thing to another. Transport was not controlled in those days. We have now the Elite Motor Bus Company, the Rocklyn Motor Bus Company and the Transport Board serving the people in transport in this Island. We have seen that, despite these three concessionaires, the travelling public has still got to depend on the assistance which is rendered by these pick-ups or vans or private buses, as they have been referred to in Transport Board Authority circles.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister was perhaps brave enough to draw to our attention the fact that the Transport Board had made a profit some time last year. I am willing to give the same Minister an opportunity to go back and examine the figures which were presented to him at that time as an operating profit, let him write off the depreciation and the amount which was referred to as indirect expenses, and let him get up and tell us then what really was the profit that he is claiming that the Board had made. We have got to turn our minds in the direction, perhaps, that the Minister has already had cause to turn his mind, but which, for very many reasons, it might not have suited him to bring before this Hon. House. I want to lay the first challenge to the Minister; let the Minister deny that persons who are presently in the employment of the Transport Board Authority have had tickets printed and circulated and sold to the school children. It is within the Minister's knowledge that that was happening; the school children were travelling on fake tickets; and persons still in the employment of the Transport Board - and when I say "persons in the employment of the Transport Board," I do not mean a conductor or a driver, but persons who are more highly placed in the Transport Authority - it is within the Minister's knowledge, and if the Minister.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: A point of order for what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister make his point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is saying that something is within my knowledge, which means that he is accusing me of condoning dishonesty. I categorically deny that; I know nothing about anybody selling or printing tickets. 1.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister may rise on another occasion to admit that he need not have information about anybody selling tickets, but he will tell us that it was brought to his attention that they were sold. The Minister has had ample opportunity, if he really wants to enlist the support of this side of the House for a Resolution of this sort - I feel that it is his bounden duty to put before this Hon. House all he knew that was good in support of the Transport Board and all he knew that was bad, because it was drawn to the Minister's attention that a situation like this had obtained.

We are willing to admit that the exercise had run its full round, so to speak. It might have been too late except to take such action as to prevent a recurrence. The Minister might have been able to do that at that particular time. Nevertheless, if the Minister had told this House what action he had taken, it would have been enough to let us on this side of the House feel that he is interested in protecting the poor taxpayers of this country.

We do not have to go further than the speech made by the hon. Minister. He told us about these hangers-on around the Transport Board and that type of person, but not about this. Neither the Elite Bus Company nor the Rocklyn Bus Company at any time can make an approach to the taxpayers of this country to bear their bad management. They do not do that. The Minister also made a speech that the Opposition should have made. As I stand here, I hope to make out a case in keeping with what the Minister said, and it is that the Government has absolutely no right running any bus service at a time such as this.

We have the Elite Bus Company and the Rocklyn Bus Company operating not by any Statutory Board, but by private individuals who must of necessity take an interest in seeing that their buses make money. In other words, at the end of any operating year they have to make sure that they are not so far in the red that they will have to close down the business. That is the situation.

You will find, Sir, that the Elite Bus Company have 68 units; they pay comprehensive insurance in the vicinity of \$31,000 per annum; they pay parochial taxes and for bus inspections at the rate of \$122.50 per unit. The Government is now getting back, as it got last year, almost \$7,000 by way of National Insurance. The Elite Bus Company alone paid income tax of almost \$12,500; they also had to pay trade tax

in the vicinity of \$7,000. In addition to all of this, they have to pay administrative staff and make some sort of profit.

Now, Sir, the Rocklyn Bus Company paid company's income tax last year of nearly \$4,000; they are operating 42 units and their parochial taxes are also in the vicinity of \$122.50 per unit, and the Government received last year more than \$3,000 for National Insurance; their licensing and inspection expenses were over \$2,044. You must remember that they had to operate their business in such a way as to show some sort of profit.

Let us, on the other hand, look at the route in which the Rocklyn Bus Company operate coming from Belleplaine, St. Andrew, and those hilly districts.

1.15 p.m.

One must know of the considerable depreciation in the value of those units at the end of each year - the considerable wear and tear which cannot be expected to such an extent in the case of the units operated on the level along the St. Michael and St. Lawrence/Christ Church road and the like, as against those in St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. Thomas. What we have got to look at is that despite the various sums which these two bus companies are throwing into the Treasury of this Island - I do not refer to the comprehensive insurance that is going into the Treasury - one has got to see some of the reasons why the operators of these two companies have got to be very careful.

Now the Minister went past the year 1955; but it is not necessary to go that far, because if one were to take from 1955 until today, one would see that there are persons who served the Transport Board for a period of 13 years as conductors, drivers, clerks, inspectors or whatever they may be, and the same Transport Board that has got to be subsidised every now and again - and today by \$300,000 - has made absolutely no provision by way of pension rights for any of the workers employed. If a conductor, driver or inspector who has served thirteen years with the Transport Board dies tonight, or if anything happens to him that he cannot work any longer, or if he reaches the age of 65 years, he cannot look for any pension benefits or anything. His relatives who may be living cannot look for a gratuity in the case of a deceased person, because the Transport Board is saying that they do not have the money. Mr. Chairman, would it not then be in the interest of the workers if these drivers, conductors and units and everything lock, stock and barrel were handed over to some private enterprise who could run it and pay at least into the Treasury the amount that the other two companies are paying? At least it would save the taxpayers \$300,000. This is the situation with which we are faced.

Mr. Chairman, one must look at the Transport Board in every respect. The complaints from the travelling public go unheard, and the public remains suffering on all of the routes served by the Trans-

port Board. I am not suggesting that there is not some suffering - although to a considerably less extent - on some of the other routes. If today a decision was taken to subsidise the other two concessionaires by \$300,000, I am to say it would be enough to remove any suffering by the travelling public for a considerable length of time, and we would be doing a real good job for the public's benefit if we did anything like that; but fortunately for us, Sir, the two private concessionaires, as far as I know, have not made any approach or request to Government for any such assistance. Perhaps the Minister will be rising on a point of order. He is quite entitled to, but it has also been drawn to the Minister's attention that buses wearing brand new tyres issued less than 24 hours earlier from the storage department were driven from the Transport Board yard and returned with second-hand tyres fitted in place of the new ones. If the Minister wants to rise on a point of order, I am willing to sit down. I am going to bait the Minister now.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. member to understand that he is not good enough to bait me; but what I would ask him now as a citizen of Barbados is to produce this evidence in the House so that I can act on it immediately.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I will do anything to assist the Minister. The Minister has it in his possession that fake tickets were sold to children. The Minister has not called in the Police up to today.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member because we want to get through with the Resolution. I want the hon. member to understand that it is a Statutory Board, and it would be the duty of the Chairman to call in the Police, not me. I am not a policeman.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is catching at trivialities. When I say the Minister has not called in the Police, I was not suggesting that he should drive in the Police Station or get on the telephone and call the Police. But the Minister must bear in mind that he is answerable to us, and not the Chairman of the Transport Board, and that is why I am suggesting to get rid of the Chairman, get rid of the Board and everybody else, and hand the buses to private enterprise; and if they do not comply with certain regulations and conditions and the public still suffers, we will get rid of them too. I am not suggesting that they should get rid of the buses in the same way that they got rid of some, because there is nothing in the last statement published by the Transport Board to show you exactly what was paid for which bus and which fleet, but we happen to know some of what went on, though the Minister tried to gloss over the situation. I know the Minister would like me to sit down; but I have nothing against the Minister except to say that when information comes to his knowledge, he should take prompt action. Do not merely come here and say to an hon. member that as a citizen of this and a citizen of that he should bring the information. The Minister has given us as much dynamite in his speech that hon. members

can take from now until this same time past Christmas.

I am sure the Minister would not deny that he has very good reasons for believing that small garages are being supported out of stock ordered for the Transport Board. He has some knowledge of it, and I believe he will take action when neither he nor the Board is functioning any longer. I do not expect the Minister to have engine numbers and things like that in his file, but the Minister must know that there has been an interchange of engines. If he were to check the inventory at the Transport Board, he would find that in places where there were original engine numbers, there have been erasures and other numbers have since been inserted. That came about, Mr. Chairman, consequent upon buses being fitted with engines and taken out of the Transport Board yard and reported to have broken down on the way or where somebody wanted them to breakdown. One engine was taken from a motor lorry which up to last crop season was used for freighting canes. The motor lorry belongs to a Government officer who is working for the Ministry of Communications and Works.

1.25 p.m.

You will understand, Mr. Chairman, with situations just as that I have stated and worse, is it fair, is it reasonable, is it just to expect the taxpayers of this country to be called upon every now and again to subsidise what? - Stealing? We find, if one were to look at the administrative staff employed at the Transport Board - I heard the Minister say that in 1955, in 1961 rather, when his Government took office they found that with a fleet of 97 buses, they were employing over 500 people; but we find that at the 31st August, 1967, his Government is supposed to have been employing 592 persons. I heard the Minister say that they have more buses; what I would like to hear the Minister say, out of the fleet of 117 buses which they have on paper, how many of them are road-worthy - and not only that, how many of them have been genuinely licensed and checked by the Parochial Authorities of this Island? Every other fellow with a little bus or pick-up or car or van, whatever it is, has got to go and pay his taxes. I wonder if the Minister could stand up on the floor of this House and produce documentary evidence to prove that each and every one of the 117 units operated by the Transport Board had been licensed by the Parochial Authorities of this Island. I would like to hear if that is so or not.

The Minister is a sensible man. He is no fool. The Minister knows quite well that, whatever might be said on this side of the House, he has got his numbers to carry this \$300,000 Resolution through; but the Minister out of his own mouth I understand to say that the buses operated by the Transport Board make lesser charges on some of their routes as compared with other buses. He said something about the Board carrying passengers at a cheaper rate. I do not pretend to grasp what the Minister means in that particular respect and therefore, I am not going to deal with it at any length.

We have heard this grand Report by the Transport Board, and there are one or two things about this Report which ought to be of considerable interest in a debate like this. In this Report dated 1st March, 1968, the Chairman, in one paragraph referring to the losses says this:-

"It is clear that the resulting loss has been caused mainly by the provision which has had to be made for backpay from the 1st January, 1967, due to the new negotiated agreement with the Union, and it was not completed until July, 1967."

Mr. Chairman, if the Chairman of the Board is telling us that the losses prior to January, 1967, resulted from having to pay backpay, is the Minister telling us now that having to pay backpay then results in their coming here for \$300,000 today? Is this a result of having to pay backpay at that time? The Minister must bear in mind that there are other figures in this same Annual Report by the Chairman which will not, in any way, bear out any such suggestions. The Minister goes further to tell us that this \$300,000 is only a drop in the bucket, because the agreement to which the same Chairman refers, expires in July, 1968, as we must expect, so that if the agreement expires, we should now set about preparing ourselves for this new onslaught on the taxpayers' purse. I am not, for a single moment, suggesting that bus drivers, conductors, inspectors, clerks and other persons concerned with the running of the Transport Board's fleet of buses must not be adequately paid; they must be adequately compensated for their labours. The high cost of living is one particularly about which the Government seems to be unable to do anything to bring it down, except, wherever possible, to tell you to try and grow what you eat or eat what you grow and import less. We have even had it better than this.

1.35 p.m.

When we look back to see the service that is rendered to the travelling public for what the taxpayers are called upon to pay out time and again, we ought to examine for ourselves what sums this House has been called upon to vote from time to time to get the Transport Board out of the red. This must be a Transport Russian Fleet, because it is always in the "red".

We feel that its administrative staff is definitely top heavy. They are employing people who know little or nothing about running buses. They are employing people to chart or map out what service these buses should render to the travelling public, and each person who sits around the Board table at meetings to make these decisions owns a motor car. They are the people who are planning for persons to travel by bus! Not one person who feels the pinch of the shoe, not one person who has had to spend hours at times at the various bus poles, not one person who has waited time and again to see two or three buses go by leaving him or her standing there - not one of those persons is ever asked to serve on the Board, or on a Committee of the Board, to give any sort of advice as to the true sufferings of the people who have to

depend on this bus service. But people up there, totally removed from the travelling public, can be found on the Committee. What do they do up there most of the time? They receive complaints from one inspector against the other, from one conductor against the driver, and all sorts of things.

What happens is this: one can find, Sir, as has happened time and again, that when something goes wrong with a bus that may be late with passengers to be taken to its terminus, a great difficulty is experienced. The passengers remain there for a considerable time suffering. Why? The conductor and driver have to war with each other as to whose duty it is to leave the bus to get a telephone message to notify the Transport Board that something is wrong with a bus. After a decision is arrived at, you will find that whoever decides to go and make the telephone call will say: "I am not going at that particular house: I am going up the road;" or something of the sort. When the telephone message goes through to the Transport Board, the first person who answers the telephone is only too glad to get into a jeep to go somewhere on his own. He gets into a jeep and he does not even listen to hear where the bus can be found. He drives around by some friend of his, stops and "fires one" and has a joke, and, when he finds where the bus is with those suffering passengers, he discovers that he has left his tool kit at the Transport Board. He then has to leave the jeep and telephone somebody else to ask him to bring the tools.

The suffering of the travelling public is so great, Mr. Chairman, that I am constrained to pray the Government this day to give active consideration to relieving the taxpayers of this burden that is thrust upon them time and again through no fault of their own. In other words, this bus service that is now operated by the Transport Board could well be given by the public to some private individual who would put money into the Treasury like the other concessionaires, and it would have been no headache to any hon. member in this Assembly today.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to protect the taxpayers. I cannot stop them from paying out this \$300,000 today; but I am begging, beseeching and asking that they be protected from future raids such as this. We need a complete overhaul of the administrative situation at the Transport Board. Things have gone from bad to worse over the years. When the rain falls, the people who travel in some of these buses usually get wet in the buses. Something has gone wrong; there is nobody who has an owner's interest in the Transport Board. The people who are working at the Transport Board do not consider themselves as taxpayers and part owners of the buses. The buses are no concern of theirs.

Again I must ask what will be the position if the Government goes on to run these buses. Some of the workers have already served 13 years, and they do not know whether they can expect a pension. I want to know what can be done to help these workers. I am asking the Minister to look into these matters and

lend what assistance he possibly can, so that, when the time comes for paying out these additional wages, the workers will receive some benefit. The Minister said that you had to pay 4¢ out of 6/- a week to go to Bethel Church. What the Minister, apparently, does not seem to appreciate is that, despite the fact that those people earned 6/- a week, they were still able to go to the grocery; they took home a basket heavily laden; the shopkeeper was able to give them a piece of meat, or something extra, for their patronage. I do not know what miracles some of them worked in those days, because they were still able to pay to educate their children. You can still see some of the children that those people who earned 6/- a week were able to educate.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister is saying what they had to pay 4¢ for as against what they have to pay 7¢ or 10¢ for nowadays, all of these things have to be taken into their true perspective. I am appealing to the Minister to do all he possibly can to relieve the taxpayers of this burden of having time and again to be financing the Transport Board. It is not fair and it is not sensible. I cannot do more than to agree with the Minister for the last time that Government has absolutely no right running a bus service in the year 1968.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the stand I have taken in this matter is well known. I never supported the idea of Government running a transport service in this country. It is recorded in the *Hansard* that I felt that private enterprise could do a better job, especially when we have the coming into being of the Public Utility Service.
1.45 p.m.

This is a public service, and as long as you can control by legislation the fares which people can charge and the routes they should run, and if you have private enterprise willing to operate them, I think you should allow them to be run by private enterprise. However, the Government of the day, now the Opposition, insisted and took over. Happily for us in this country, there were still a number of concessionaires remaining and they still operated at a profit at least to be able to pay taxes. Ever since then the Transport Board operating the fleets which they operate has been showing a loss and has been coming here to this House for money to make right that loss.

I think the Minister of Communications is very courageous to say that it appears that this Transport Department operating these buses, not comparable with private enterprise, seems to be a place for employing only Party hacks. This is very courageous of him because it is true; but how can he very well say this without making some attempt to enquire into the number of people they employ? When you compare them with the two other concessionaires, the Elite and the Rocklyn, who are still making a profit, still running a good service, hiring a lot of people less, and you still go on to hire these people knowing that it is only a place for Party hacks, I think it is shameful to come here for \$300,000. You

have the Elite and Rocklyn bus companies which operate a good service and pay their taxes, and you have a service which is not comparable with these two services, and all you can do is to say that they cannot pay their debts and we must pay them. This seems to me very wrong. I never voted for this many years ago on the floor of this House, and today I am not changing my view. Why is it that the Elite and the Rocklyn are running a service and they are not coming here to ask us to subsidise them with any money? The Public Utilities Board must decide whether you can increase the fares; they must decide the routes you must run on and what service you should give. This being so, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Minister needs to give us a further explanation as to how it is they cannot pay their debts, and why it is they are employing so many people.

As I said, the Minister had the courage to say that they were employing Party hacks, but this could not apply to any one Government. I did not support this in this House when they came to take over the buses and the Opposition members were then in power. If the Hon. Minister in charge had come here to tell us that by comparison these two other companies did not have the quality buses and have been called upon to have the same type of buses, if he had come here to tell us that they were not giving the service, that would be understandable. You can believe me, Sir, that the wear and tear is very great on the buses running to St. Andrew, St. Lucy and the other hilly districts; but it appears to me and to any sensible person that of the three companies operating the bus service, only the one run by the Government has to come here and ask for \$300,000 to subsidise it because it cannot pay its way.

When the salaries at the Transport Board were raised, the salaries of the conductors and drivers on the Rocklyn and Elite buses were carried to the same level. The Minister cannot tell me that they are not paying the same wages, or that they are paying more for tyres; so this is something which we cannot understand. When bus fares are fixed, they are fixed for the Rocklyn, the Elite and the Transport Board. Gasolene and oil for the Government cost no more than they do for the other two concessionaires; so what is the reasoning in coming to ask us for \$300,000? Is it because you have numbers to pass this \$300,000? I know the Socialist members of the Opposition are bound to sit down in here and vote for this, but I do not think it is right. It is absolutely dishonest. If the Transport Board cannot pay its way, there is simply one thing to do. There are people who can pay their way; let them take over the buses and run them.
1.55 p.m.

It is courageous to say that it is for Party hacks; it is courageous to say that you have the number of buses, that you are hiring 200 more people possibly than the other people are hiring; but that is not enough. However courageous that may be, you are still asking for \$300,000, and where is that \$300,000 to come from? It must come out of the taxpayers. I am very sorry, Sir, but the Minister has not convinced me that I should vote this \$300,000. Is he tell-

ing me that they are not able to replace buses? Reciting the fact that all of these buses were bought and that they strayed or were lost or stolen and the tops dropped off and all sorts of things - that is not for today. That is when you were buying buses, but today you have up-to-date buses; and with these buses which are similar to the ones which the two Companies have got, I think you should be able to tell us more about why you want this \$300,000. All you have told us is that they have not been able to pay their way; but why have they not been able to pay their way? Are you paying conductors and drivers more than what the Elite Bus Company and the Rocklyn Bus Company are paying? The answer is absolutely "No"; you are not paying any more. The Rocklyn Bus Company and the Elite Bus Company had to pay retroactive pay just like the Transport Board, and they are still operating. They have not come for any \$300,000; they have not come for any money.

Mr. Chairman, it is just not good enough to come in here and tell us that they cannot pay their way; you must tell us why they cannot pay their way and you must tell us what has happened. Has somebody carried away about five or six buses? Is this money to buy new buses? Is it necessary to put more buses on the route and therefore you have to buy more buses? - No, that is not the answer. The answer is that you cannot pay your way. *(Asides)* I am cursing you all because I know that you will sit down here and vote for this. You call yourselves Socialists, but this is not fair; it is dishonest. I did not vote for it when I was in the Opposition with them *(A MEMBER: Who told you that we will vote for it?) (Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member continue his speech without interruption, please.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think the Minister will have to make out a strong case in this House in order to get me to vote for this Resolution. Will the Minister say if they want new buses? Can the Minister tell us whom they owe this money to? You cannot pay your way and therefore you must owe away a lot of money. To whom do you owe it? Is it owed away for gasolene? Have you been checking up? Will the Minister tell us that he will have an investigation made into the whole Transport Board and see, as he says, they have 200 people too many employed? If you know that you have too many people employed at the Transport Board - this Transport Board is not a place like a Public Assistance Board. If you know you have too many people employed, you must re-organise your Department.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but unless the Minister can tell us to whom they owe this money - the Government said that the Trade Union had asked for an increase in wages and so on, but he does not tell us that today. It is not a question of paying increased wages because the other people also have to pay increased wages. What is the position? I hope that the Minister will be able to say something more, even although the Government can get this passed, as to whom they owe this money and whether they owe it for tyres. I think that in the last few years the

present Manager has been doing a very good job, judging from the reports we have been seeing. This is a strange thing now because, recently, some reports from the Transport Board showed that they were making a profit, but now they are telling us that they are not making a profit. They could not pay their way. I will let the hon. member tell us whom they owe this money to; if you owe away \$300,000 you must tell us whom you owe this money to. If you were going to buy buses, you would tell us that you are going to buy buses. I should like to hear the hon. Minister on this matter; otherwise I cannot vote for this Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, in all my life I have never liked pussy-footing. This is not really the instant Order of the Day; this is not so important today. There are other matters before this House today which we know are much more important than this. Do not let anybody fool us. Let us forget this juggling and let us get down to the real business. The business was 12 o'clock last night. (Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.) Do not forget; this Resolution here for \$300,000..... (Hon. E. W. BARROW: Order). Order what, Barrow man? Mr. Chairman - he is to call order: not you. You sit down, you nuisance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please take his seat?

Mr. CRAIG: Order what! Do you think I came in here on a wheel-barrow, you nuisance?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to conduct himself properly in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Prime Minister rose on a point of order and he also caught my eye before you. Will the hon. member please take his seat?

Mr. CRAIG: Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is my Ruling; that is the Ruling of the Chair. Is the hon. member going to abide by the Ruling of the Chair?

Mr. CRAIG: I am going to sit down, but don't you tell me anything about the Prime Minister having caught your eye first; you tell me that he is on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have made a Ruling, and if there is any further interruption I can act.

Mr. CRAIG: Suspension is an easy thing for me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please do not taunt me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point of order I was making is a point of order in every sense of the term. According to our Standing Orders, it is not competent for a member to say that he is not concerned

with this Resolution, because on order a person can only speak on the matter which is engaging the attention of the Chamber at the time. It is not in keeping with the Rules of this House for a member to say that he is not concerned with this, and that we should get on with something else. That is the point I am making; it is a simple, straightforward point of order. There is another point, too, on the other type of order which we expect, that when people are elected here they conform with certain standards of behaviour. Those are the two points.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. James continue his speech?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I endorse the last statement made by the Prime Minister. The Resolution which is before us is asking Parliament to support a Resolution for \$300,000 to offset certain debts which have been incurred by the Transport Board. What I am happy to know is that the Minister in charge of this Resolution has made one of the finest admissions today when he said that many of these Statutory Boards have on them a bunch of hangers-on. I am not prepared, however, to associate myself with such remarks, because I consider the hon. senior member for St. Michael no hanger-on. For many years we have had this problem of the Transport Board, and in the Minister's remarks when he was introducing this Resolution, he said that somebody, whoever it might be I do not know, would rather die than to see bus fares raised. I am going to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the incompetency of the Government since the Minister, only a few months ago, could come in here and say that the Transport Board made a profit. I am going by this Report which has been signed by Mr. Hill, it says: "The direct operating profit for the year was \$188,960.31. The provision for depreciation was \$151,966, and the indirect expenses were \$17,566.20." 2.05 p.m.

"Provision has also been made for back pay in the sum of \$96,104.90. The result shows a net loss of \$76,000".

Now, Sir, if the same Minister could have boasted of a profit earlier in the year, how can he come here today and say the reason why the Transport Board cannot pay its debts is due to the fact that people up there are stealing? That is what he said, and that is the point he made. According to the Manager's Report, "the Transport Board has failed to make a profit because of the back pay....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member has just said that I said that money has been stolen at the Transport Board. I never said anything so. I categorically deny the statement he has made.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is what the Minister said when he was introducing the

Resolution. He said that from the time there was a Transport Board there was a lot of stealing up there. Deny that.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I deny that statement.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: How many members would like to stand at the same time and address the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I do not know why he does not sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us conduct this meeting properly. Will the Hon. Minister, please, make his point.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have made my point; I have denied making that statement.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before that happens. On a point of order; really and truly on a point of order. If I have to do this 100 times in the course of this sitting, I will do it. A point of order is in respect of something which some hon. member has done against a Standing Order, and a member gets up merely to correct anything; he can rise on a point of elucidation, if the hon. member who is speaking sits down and gives way. To keep using the phrase "point of order" when it is no more a point of order than a point of anything else is..... (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. May I remind the Leader of the Opposition that the Standing Orders of this House are under revision. He will give way. Will the senior member for St. James continue.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that the only thing that was not stolen from the Transport Board was a conductor. He can deny that now. What he is actually saying is that the theft at the Transport Board is responsible for the Board not being able to pay its debts, while the Manager's Report states that it is due to the back pay. It took him from 1963 when he was appointed a Minister until 1968 to determine how much stealing was going on there. Just a few months ago he came here and said the Board had made a profit. Mr. Chairman, whom must I believe? The Minister or the Manager of the Transport Board? If the Manager of the Transport Board is wrong, then fire him, and if he is right, the Minister should resign.

Mr. Chairman, let me warn you that those who are bought can also be sold, and when members of Parliament call others drunkards and other members of Parliament call others lunatics, I am now pleased to see today that drunkards and lunatics are sitting around the same Table.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the hon. member that that has nothing to do with this Resolution. I have not seen the word "drunkards" in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, here is the Minister contradicting the Report by the Transport Board. All I am saying is that if the Minister is right, then fire the Transport Board's Manager. If the Manager is right, then the Minister should resign. It is as simple as that.

It is regrettable that such an unfortunate incident within the last 24 hours - I do not know who are the prospective Ministers, but what I know is that it is going to cost the country much more money appointing - not you, Sir, because you would not be in it - another Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not thought of being in anything.

Mr. CRAIG: They would have approached you much earlier, Sir. Any Government that knows there is stealing going on in a particular Department can only be a corrupt Government, and it has been emphasised within recent hours. They, for some financial reason or the other, can reduce a man, who has been in public life for almost 20 years, to what he has been reduced to today. You know what I mean, Sir. I have been in here the same time as you, Sir. All I am dealing with is the corruption in the Government as emphasised by the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am sticking to the Resolution. When a Government can bribe somebody, then somebody can bribe the Government, too. Get that straight. If you can bribe a person, somebody can bribe a whole Cabinet. All I can say is that they are a corrupt Government, and I call on them to resign. Let us face the polls; do not mind anybody; they should have come to me. When Harriman told them to go to a certain person they should have come to me first, because I came in with the Leader of the Opposition and I went out with him. Whenever I leave to come on your side, the Leader of the Opposition is also going to be by my side.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR rose.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am not giving way unless it is a point of order on which you must determine whether I am relevant or not.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the hon. member opposite to make it possible for me to move the customary adjournment.

Mr. CRAIG: I will second that and sit down, and reserve the right to speak immediately afterwards.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

2.15 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee. That it now resumes.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. James was addressing the Chair. He may continue to do so, if he desires.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I thought that after the suspension for lunch one might safely have considered that the business of this House as regards the Resolution which is before us might at least have changed the views of some members. It has changed my views a bit because I am much stronger in my views in not supporting this Resolution than I was before. If I recall, Sir, the Minister in charge of this Resolution drew to the attention of the House that some 500 people were employed when he took office. It is Government's policy, as is so often stated in here, to employ as many people as possible in any industry or in any way that they find it possible to employ them so as to provide for the citizens of this country jobs through which they can support their families; but what puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, is how Government can determine a policy of finding work for people, and the Minister can come here today and condemn the Transport Board's Annual Report when at the same time they were employing 592 people. Now I understand from the Minister's remarks that they should be employing less people. If the Minister is saying that it is because they have too many people employed at the Transport Board - at that time 500 people - and if it is the policy of Government to employ as many people as possible, how can Government come and condemn the additional 92 persons working at the Transport Board as of 1st October, 1966, to 31st August, 1967, as shown in the Annual Report signed by Mr. Hudson Haynes? I also must draw to the attention of this Committee that it is a reflection on the Minister when he can come here and criticise a Board which he has set up, especially when he made mention that there are hangers-on.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, I never criticised any Board that I set up. What I said in my remarks referred to 1955.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made. Let the hon. senior member for St. James continue.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would not argue with the Minister about 1955, because if I were to

ask him to call for the report from the Official Reporter, this would only embarrass him. I am here to help watch the finances of this country; and when Government comes here and asks for an additional \$300,000 to throw down the drain, since the Board has to follow the directions of the Ministry and the Minister can say that people on Statutory Boards are only hangers-on, I can only conclude that the Minister himself is a hanger-on, because he is the person who is responsible for the appointments to the Board. How can I come and support a Resolution for \$300,000 when there is no proper direction coming from the Minister to the Board?

Mr. Chairman, there is another very important point which I would like to make. Paragraph 2 of the Resolution reads as follows:

"So that the Board may be able to continue its day to day operations, it is proposed as an interim measure to provide a subsidy of \$300,000 to enable the Board to pay debts due to Trade Creditors for three months and over."

Paragraph 3 says: "When the proposal outlined above has been implemented it is considered that a closer look should be undertaken to determine whether the Board is operating as efficiently as possible".

I should like to know if the Minister was watching it all the time, or only now that they have come for \$300,000. I should like the Minister to tell me also how long he has been in charge of this portfolio, and how long he has realised that the Board has been working inefficiently and what he proposes to do about it. My suggestion would be to "fire" the Board and let the Minister resign. You cannot pick any more from over here. There is no more picking of plums from over here. (Mr. SPRINGER: Not yet!) "Not yet" says the hon. senior member for St. Michael; but we would understand his position. The West Indies Hospital Sweep will take care of him all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the West Indies Hospital Sweep.

Mr. CRAIG: And I was not addressing you either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are supposed to address me. What do you think?

Mr. CRAIG: I said "you", and according to the Speaker, if you preface your remarks with the word "you", you could not be addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. James continue without going astray?

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand from the Hon. Minister that Senator Frank Walcott, a person who was some half-baked Ambassador to the United Nations, can be condemned as a hanger-on?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the hon. member that that has nothing to do with the Resolution? We are here to deal with a Resolution for \$300,000.

Mr. CRAIG: That is what I am dealing with. I cannot support this \$300,000 if the Minister is prepared to have hangers-on the Board, of which Senator Walcott is one. Am I to understand that Mr. Firmstone-Williams, Director of C.D.C. is a hanger-on? And am I to understand that Senator Peter Morgan, whom we all know is a hanger-on, is a hanger-on? I do not believe it. He was unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, not to get a seat in this august Assembly, and I sincerely hope he will never get one. Sir, the price could not be \$300,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member just give me a chance? I have been hearing voices in the Gallery. I would like to hear only hon. members when they are addressing the Chair. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the whole problem with the Transport Board, I believe, is lack of proper direction. The Minister has admitted here that the only thing they did not steal at the Transport Board was a conductor. I am not speaking about the Barbados Marketing Corporation over which the former Minister of Agriculture had to resign because of theft there; and I am not concerned with whether Calvin Sides.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Resolution. Please stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am dealing with the Resolution and the Statutory Board that runs the Transport Board. Joe Lowe, you do not know what is happening in here! You are not 'with it'. You cannot spell "buck" in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please carry on.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I heard a voice from the other side, and I thought the person should have been on his feet, but I know the Parliamentary Secretary would never be a Minister..... I cannot support a Resolution of this nature that calls on the taxpayers of the country to vote \$300,000, unlike the \$96,000 which the Minister of Agriculture has got locked away in a plant and paying \$14,000 in interest per year from the taxpayers' money. I cannot associate myself with this corrupt type of Resolution which a corrupt Government is prepared to bring down, and I am making my views abundantly clear on this. Any Government which sets about to give a member of Parliament a Ministry because of his financial problems I cannot support, because if you can be bought, you can also be sold, and I warn the Prime Minister that without fear he is going to have a constitutional crisis on his hands.
3.40 p.m.

Let the hon. junior member for St. Andrew sit down in his Nehru shirt and big brass chain, and a lot of funny things will happen from time to time. I sincerely hope that you are not going to be the prospective Minister as from January 31, because you have a lot of convictions. I know that very well. I

have talked to you on too many occasions. You are a proud man; nobody in the world can buy you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: I am not saying that anybody is going to buy you. I know that that could not be, because you are too proud. I believe that those persons who have been bought or who might have been bought - not in here; in any other part of the entire world - will only go down in the eyes of the public as political degenerates, and it is a gift to this country. It is unfortunate, Sir; do not let us pussy-foot again around the idea about any Resolution today. Today is no Resolution day; today is a cross-the-floor day, and let us get that straightened out once and for all. I am counselling the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution - this is what is set out in the Addendum: "When the proposal outlined above has been implemented" - he is assuming that it is going to get the full support of this Committee - "it is considered that a closer look".... What closer look can the Minister of Communications and Works have at the Transport Board? Do you mean that it is almost five years now and he cannot find out what is going wrong? He came in here and boasted that there was a profit, that they were employing too many people, they were stealing and the Board is corrupt, while the Manager of the same Board has said that it is because they had to pay backpay that they did not make the profit which they expected to make. That is what Mr. Haynes has signed here, but the Minister is contradicting Mr. Haynes and the Auditors, for that matter. This is it: "The direct operating profit for the year was \$188,960.31. The provision for depreciation was \$151,966.60 and the indirect expenses" that is the stolen business; they carried away \$17,000 - "was \$17,566.20. Provision has also been made for backpay in the sum of \$96,140.90." The result shows a net loss of \$76,707.39. Now the Minister is telling me that this Report came out on the 31st October, 1967, but he is saying that he is going to have a closer look at it after we have voted this \$300,000. It is only after we have voted for this amount of \$300,000 to put the Transport Board on a proper footing that he will have a closer look at it. I thought that he would have had a closer look at it and then ask for this \$300,000. Apparently, he knows what is the position with it. I believe that if he knows what is the position and he has failed to do anything about it before, then the same corruption which goes on at the Transport Board has only been handed down from the Government benches and the Cabinet. The Minister admits that there is corruption at the Transport Board; they are in a position to 'fire' the Board which is under their direction, but it is only after we have voted this \$300,000. Mr. Chairman, do you know what is \$300,000? I do not believe that the Averill Harriman of my Party would even like to boast and say that this \$300,000 is no money. We have a Averill Harriman in our Party, the chief negotiator; that is the Averill Harriman of any Party. When he moves, the Heavens will declare the glory of God. He is all right; he is their belief. How can we accept the confidence of the Minister if he is going to tell us that it

is only after we put \$300,000 in a corrupt Board - we are asking the taxpayers of this country to put \$300,000 in the hands of a Board, and I am not going to associate myself with the Minister that all the members of all Boards are corrupt. I do not believe that the hon. senior member for St. Michael is a corrupt person even although he has something to do with the West Indies Hospital Sweep, which is a corrupt body. Nobody could tell me that the Minister of Communications and Works is corrupt, but he is condoning corruption because he says here that he realises that there was a lot of stealing going on there and now he is asking us to vote \$300,000 to put in more thieves' hands. What sort of ignorance can this be?

It is true that when you appoint "Brugga" Tom over Mr. Baird, after having 30 years as an Inspector, you can expect to have any kind of corruption because Brother Tom is one of the Inspectors there, and he has been reported on several occasions for carrying away money. Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister is quite anxious to reply, but may I remind him that we are in Committee; so he must be careful how he steps down the wicket. It might be turning today and he might get stumped. Therefore, he should bat a good hand, keep pushing to mid-on and call for one and do not play any pretty strokes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you still discussing this Resolution?

Mr. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, I am dealing with the Minister's reply because the Minister is going to reply. Even if I have to break with my Party - this is a challenge to my Party - I am sure that they cannot buy me. They were not going to attempt to come to me because when they decide to buy me, I am moving with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I came in here with him, I was suspended with him and whenever the Government come to me, they have to make two Ministries - one for me and one for the Leader of the Opposition. That is how I am moving. Even if I have to break with my Party, I am voting "No", and ask for a division, so that my vote can be recorded that I am not prepared to support a Resolution for \$300,000 to put into the hands of a corrupt Board where corrupt people are working.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened a lot of some of the criticisms of this Resolution around the table. It is all very well for young members of Parliament, with little or no experience yet, to get up here and just for the fun of making a speech.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order. The half-baked - I am sorry; the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke about young members of Parliament with little or no experience. I have two years' experience in Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the hon. senior member for St. James that the last speaker did not make any mention of him? He was making a general statement. Will the Hon. Minister please continue?

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is addressing the Committee.

3.50 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order. He is no Hon. Minister in here to the best of my knowledge, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as you know; but as far as I know, as Chairman of this Hon. House, today he is the Minister of Agriculture. Will the Hon. Minister of Agriculture continue to address the House, please.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, it is very well for any very young and inexperienced Member of Parliament to get up here and declaim a Resolution of this nature. This Resolution is for public transport, and I know that if some of the present members of Parliament had been in here as long as I have been, they would not dare to get up here and tell the then Leader of the Government that they would not vote on it. First, they would have had an essay on the commitment of a Socialist Government on public transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I remember an occasion that took place at least twelve or more years ago in this Chamber when a certain Minister of the then Government was introducing a similar - and a very similar - Resolution, and the then Opposition took him to task. As a matter of fact, he did lose his very nerve and he left the Chamber to be rescued by the then Chief Minister or Premier - I do not remember what was the title in those days. It is something known; it is something that is elementary in politics that a Socialist Government regards public transportation as something to which they are committed. If there is now a proposed change in that policy, then let us hear the announcement of that proposed change. As far as I know, there has been no such redeclaration of policy.

Let me now, unlike certain hon. members who said - they really want to talk about something else if they get the chance to. I do not think that this Resolution is as great in importance as certain things they would like divested off their chests. If they want to have certain things divested off their chests they can do so, but remember that somebody will reply. There is no doubt about that. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sit down, you old idiot.) I am sorry to interrupt certain hon. members on that side. I apologise for that, Mr. Chairman. (ASIDES) The Leader of the Opposition is no longer in any position to give me a warning.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I never doubled-crossed you, but you doubled-crossed me. Get that straight. You go to the country, and I can go to the country; Do you forget the scene in here years ago when you caused me to be changed? (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, do not mind irresponsible youths; they cannot help you. I refer to the hon. senior member for St. James. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister continue with the Resolution, please.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; I will proceed. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let there be some order, please.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, a voice has suggested that I should deal with the Resolution. It is a voice which said some time ago that there were certain things more important than the Resolution, I am going to deal with the Resolution now, Mr. Chairman. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let there be some order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. senior member for St. James; he has been trained elsewhere than in here, wherever that elsewhere is. Now, every member so far has told the Minister just what he knew. As a matter of fact, every member told the Minister just what he said. Those hon. members have not given the Minister any new point to assist him. There are times when the Opposition, a healthy-minded Opposition, can be very effective and very helpful to their country. If I get up and just rehash what he said, I am making no individual contribution; I am just wasting time. The Minister has learnt absolutely nothing. He divulged certain things, and then he got the retort from the other side that he was a bold man to make such a declaration. Admittedly, the Minister might have been a bold man, but he also is an honest man. A lot of us like to pass on our prestige, but we forget that honour is greater than prestige.

Now, if we read the last part of the Resolution it states:

"When the proposal outlined above has been implemented, it is considered that a closer look should be undertaken to determine whether the Board is operating as efficiently as possible."

Let me re-read that. (ASIDES.) I do not want to interrupt those hon. members; they do not matter so much. It states:

"When the proposal outlined above has been implemented it is considered that a closer look should be undertaken to determine whether the Board is operating as efficiently as possible."

The Minister himself sees the need for a further inquiry. All members have been served with this Addendum, and the last part of the Addendum tells Parliament that after this matter has been seen to - I mean the voting of the money to serve this particular purpose.

4.00 p.m.

Mark you, Mr. Chairman, this money is for a specific purpose. It is not for starting some new capital outlay in favour of the Transport Board services. It is to pay debts. The Government has to pay its debts, and do you mean to say that we are going to stall today to prevent the Government from paying a debt? Tell the country this. This is a debt to sundry creditors. You go to the country and tell them that the Government wants to pay.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that a division was taken in here in which he voted "No" when the Barbados Marketing Corporation wanted \$1.2 million to pay its debts.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Now when was that? Would the hon. member quote the year? Somebody told him so, maybe, earlier. Bring the debates.

Mr. CRAIG: 1968. You were not drunk then.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I am outlining the facts. A Socialist Government is committed to public transport. If there are new Socialist theories being put forward by the Twentieth Century exponents in this Chamber assembled on the other side, let us hear them; but the fact is that this money is to pay debts. Is that true or not? Who can get around that? (Interruptions)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 29 (6) which states: "While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones and shall not make unseemly interruptions." Please let that Order be carried out.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, it is always a patent weakness of the weak to interrupt. They have not got an argument and they will never have one. If you are cosy in your seat now, be happy, because I am cosy here and I am happy. (Laughter) I rather like this turn of levity. Now to continue, Mr. Chairman, I never intended to make a speech today at all; I was taking a day off from parliamentary debate; but listening to the replies being offered by the hon. members on the other side, I thought at this stage I should say something, because I know that aback of it all, Her Majesty's Official Opposition on the other side really did not want to get into this. They want to get into something else. The time will come when they will have ample opportunity for doing so. They need not try to be too precipitant in this measure. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You were precipitant.) I can wait. You have never learned that. (Laughter) There was a lot of talk today and, really, double-talk about the Government being committed to the employment of the greatest number. There is nothing wrong with that in theory, but a business is a business. We have got a Post Office; we have got a Customs, and we have got the Waterworks, all revenue earning Departments. Who would be so bold.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, may I ask what the hon. member is speaking on? I have no idea.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you would pay a little attention, I think you would follow. I am the Chairman and I am following him quite clearly. Let the hon. member continue.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. James, a former colleague of mine of the other side, is quite a showman. I was about to tell the House that a certain hon. member was just dishing out double-talk when he made reference to a Government being committed to employing as many people as possible, and then I said we have the Post Office, the Waterworks and Her Majesty's Customs - three Departments earning revenue for Government, and I asked who would be so stupid as to go to the Postmaster General or the Comptroller of Customs or the Director or however else he is titled as the Chief Executive of the Waterworks and suggest to any one of those Heads that they should employ more people than are necessary. Tell me: who would do that? Not even the hon. senior member for St. James who has just addressed the Committee. So that was double-talk. It was childish suggesting to a Minister that he is committed to employing as many people as possible. If the Minister now realises that he has hangers-on, as I understand it, he has inherited something. The Minister has not yet replied. He will soon have the privilege and the opportunity to reply, and I trust and hope and believe that he will equip himself manfully in the exercise. But I am saying this: if it is discovered that there is redundancy at the Transport Board, and the Minister has promised that after we pass this proposal outlined above a closer view will be gone into, what will we be cavilling about? It is ridiculous at this stage to say you are not going to vote this money, because it is to pay debts. These are not my words; these are the words of the Resolution.

You know, I have never had to depend on being cantankerous and personal to take care of myself in or outside of Parliament, and even outside of Parliament it could never be said of me that I have to be nasty to my opponents. I always prefer my opponents to be nasty to me, because as soon as I get them doing that, they are building me up, and you can always trust a fool to do that. And I can wait on a fool. I have for many years.

As regards the setting up of the Board, only inexperience could mention that. On every Statutory Board the members serve for a certain time limit - three or four years. I do not have to know. I only have to know those that will concern me in my portfolio. Every Minister will know his own business. Once I had been promised a spurious Ministry that was never intended to materialise, Now I have a hard, firm and concrete offer which I have accepted. That should not worry anybody. I have not stabbed anybody in the back. I have been more than loyal, more than true, more than firm and more than honest and decent, and I will continue, and will let those who

would decry and would be my detractors to commit suicide; and they will.

Mr. Chairman, I think as one who was not in charge of this Resolution, I have made certain aspects clear enough; I have pinpointed certain things, and I do hope that the Committee will feel disposed to vote for this Resolution.

4.10 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in a long life, private, professional, at the Bar and political, I never thought that it would fall to my lot to say something with the utmost regret, to say that I can think now of no human being whom I despise more than the hon. member who has just sat down. I am not going to say everything now, but if the hon. member persists in the sort of speech he has just made, he will get everything on the floor of this House.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: If the hon. member is going to be permitted to indulge in the personal abuse of a member, I will say that he is breaking the Rules of this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please take their seats?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS took their seats.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no need to generate this heat. I understand what has taken place. I am controlling this Committee as efficiently as I can. Please let us conduct this session peacefully.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was once Speaker of this House, and all of these things make my position terrible to contemplate. To think that the hon. member has been (A MEMBER: What is happening now?). He has been Speaker of the House and he knows when there is a point of order and when there is not a point of order. He just got up not on a point of order, but just on a point of interruption.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is indulging in the abuse of a Rule of this House by making personal references to me which are far from complimentary. It is an abuse of one of the Standing Rules not only of this House but of every democratic Chamber or House within the British Commonwealth of Nations and he, at least, ought to know it.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He not only ought to know it, but if the hon. member only realised it, I could not be controlling myself more.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speak on the Resolution?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am speaking on the Resolution and I will say this about the Resolution. Four days ago the hon. member would have attacked this because he told me so. (*Asides*) (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Repeat that). (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Calm yourselves, gentlemen; I know that someone is hurt, but please take it easy.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister take his seat? Let us have it quiet in the Gallery also, please. If the Hon. Minister so desires, he may make his point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I thank you, Sir. If the hon. member on that side makes any reference to me and I do not hear it, I expect that he will be decent enough to repeat it so that I may have a suitable reply. That is all I expect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition continue to speak on the Resolution?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I will repeat anything I have to say at any time in any place. When I was engaged as a professional man in the law of libel, I have been plaintiff in some cases, and nobody has ever suggested that I libelled him. If I say anything about the hon. member, I will go down to Speights-town and repeat it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution has nothing about libel in it. Although the hon. member is or was an efficient lawyer, please let us deal with the Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir, but I misunderstood the hon. member. I thought he was saying that I will say something in here and will not repeat it outside. I am now told that what he was saying is that he may not hear properly and therefore I should repeat it. Well, I will shout it if necessary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You need not, please.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: We act in accordance with ordinary routine and commonsense and I presume the Government does it. We, the members of the Labour Party Opposition, discuss measures before they come in here. That is one of the reasons why we are bound to be very indignant when we get something thrust on us at the last moment when we have no opportunity of discussing it. In discussing this in the usual way with the hon. member - is he getting up? I am sorry if I used the word "honourable".

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. The hon. member on that side of the House has never discussed this Resolution with me. I categorically deny that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I can well understand him forgetting.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Last Friday I did not go to the Labour Party Headquarters. I have not indulged in a conversation with the hon. member on this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please sit and do not get up without addressing the Chair? I have not been put here by guess; let there be some order in the Gallery.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The childish dodging of an issue. The hon. member has just said that he has not been to the Labour Party's Headquarters. You do not have to go to the Labour Party's Headquarters necessarily to discuss something.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. I added that I have never discussed this Resolution for \$300,000 appertaining to the Transport Board or any other similar Resolution appertaining to transport. Not more than a year ago.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. That is a point of explanation.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: The hon. member says that what he says here he will go elsewhere and say. That does not mean that he is going to say the truth.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I do not know how I could control myself so much. Outside of this House, if he wants the pleasure of hearing what I have to say about him, I will say it. On Friday, four days ago, as my wife and I were about to sit down to lunch, the hon. member - I am sorry I have to call him "honourable" - came to my house and we invited him to come and have lunch with us. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: So what?) You will hear "so what".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. I visited the hon. member's house last Friday. That is perfectly true; but we never discussed this Resolution. I can tell you what the hon. senior member for St. Peter told him, that is, that it was perfectly wrong not to add to the possibility of a quorum on the Friday. That is what I told him.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I hear the hon. senior member for St. James on a point of order?

Mr. CRAIG: The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that he did not discuss this Resolution. I agree with him; Sir; he went to have a drink.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. We are having too many interruptions on points of order which I do not deem to be points of order. Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition continue?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I, with great respect, congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for what you have just said? Even in the House of Commons the

Chairman of Committees, the Speaker of the House and the Deputy Speaker, find that it is very difficult to control fraudulent points of order. I use the word "fraudulent" because of the controversy which arose once in the House of Commons when Sir Winston Churchill spoke of fraudulent points of order and the Speaker had to agree with him. Hon. members get up sometimes not on a point of order, but they just want to interrupt.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Anyhow, let us continue with the Resolution.
4.20 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is perfectly true that when the hon. member came to my house he began to say: "You and the Member for St. Peter did wrong in not forming a quorum; there will be propaganda against the Labour Party; they will use it against us, and it is absolutely essential for us to show unity, especially at this time when the DEMS are cracking up."

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: That is untrue; I never had to add that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Will the Hon. Minister please hear!

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am on the floor. Am I so short that you cannot see me? Let there be some order in here, please. The Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chair. If he so desires, he can continue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The same hon. member said the same thing about 'unity at this time' the same night at Speightstown Boys' School in my presence and in front of a full meeting of the St. Peter's Constituency Branch.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On Friday night at Speightstown we never mentioned anything about this Resolution. I am perfectly sure about that.

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

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of explanation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am on my feet again. Please take your seats. I need order in the House. Mr. Marshal, there is some unrest. I can ask that the Gallery be cleared. There seems to be some misunderstanding in here today.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I repeat that it is with great regret that I have spoken this afternoon. I thought the hon. member would have sense enough to keep quiet today.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: You cannot keep me quiet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I ask the Hon. Minister to keep quiet.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member came to my home and he said that the hon. member for St. Peter and myself were not doing the right thing in failing to form a quorum, and it would be used as propaganda against the Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt the Leader of the Opposition. That, in my opinion, has nothing to do with the Resolution. I am not here to hear anything that is happening at the Barbados Labour Party, the Democratic Labour Party, or any other Party; I am here strictly to hear the debate on the Resolution for \$300,000 for the Transport Board. Will the Leader of the Opposition please deal with that and leave out the irrelevancy that has been cropping up too much!

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I have been in politics for at least 40 years, and I have been in this House for nearly 30 years. I have studied the procedure of this House as I would study the laws when I was a practising barrister. I have done nothing against the Standing Orders; I have done nothing irrelevant.

The hon. member contradicted me when I said that he had a different opinion a few days ago. I am saying now the circumstances in which he told me that. I said he came to my house. He did say that we were doing wrong not to form a quorum; that propaganda would be used against us, and it would be essential for us to stick together in unity when the DEMS were breaking up. He interrupted me and, therefore, I will continue. He sat down at luncheon, or just after luncheon, for two hours, and we discussed the Labour Party and its future.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to the Resolution, please.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sticking to the Resolution. Do not think that I am a village idiot.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not care if you feel so of yourself. I have not called you so, neither do I intend to call you so. I am here to see that the Standing Orders are carried out. I am not listening to anything that took place at your home. (ASIDES.) I am addressing this House. Will you please take your seat. Do not lose your temper. Let there be some order in this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It happened at "Tyrol Cot". We discussed what was before the House and we agreed. Now Your Honour tells me that you are nothing to do with "Tyrol Cot"!

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am not giving way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members take their seats?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am not giving way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have just heard you say you are not giving way. Please calm yourself.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Your Honour must know.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still standing, and I have not given you permission to speak. You have been in here longer than most of us, and I expect you should know what to do. Let us have this debate carried out properly. You have the privilege to speak.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If an hon. member rises on a point of elucidation, the Standing Order is as clear as the noonday sun. Standing Order 26 deals with interruption. If the member speaking does not give way, the member must sit down and the Speaker or the Chairman must call on him to sit down. It is only on a point of order - a point of order means breaking a Standing Order. (ASIDES.) Are you going to teach him the alphabet?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member then agreed that because of his distance away he could not always find it possible to come to Labour Party Headquarters for our general discussion. If hon. members who do not know the Greek alphabet, want to discuss the Greek iambics with somebody who knows, they must keep quiet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to the Resolution, please.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member's attitude then was the attitude of this part of the Opposition to be opposed to this because - and I am sticking very closely to the Resolution in this, and not any of the rambling stupidity with which the hon. member ended up.

The point that we made and are making now as something very strong against the Government is this: "When we have paid the debts, then we will give a closer look to see if things are being run properly." The hon. member knows that we discussed that. We said: Can anything be more fantastic than to say that "we have not investigated carefully to see whether the Bus Service is run properly, but we are asking you to pay these debts and then we will investigate to see if the Service is run efficiently"? That is the point on which the hon. member agreed with me; that is the point on which we are voting.

What surprises me is that the hon. member on Friday at my house was in a less emotional - I use the word "emotional" rather than "inebriated" - condition than he is today. He was as sober on Friday as a Judge. His constant interruption shows that he is not now as he was on Friday; but when a man sells himself for a \$1,000 a month he will do anything. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
4.30 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, the hon. member said 'when a man sells himself'. I was never one of those.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind hon. members that there is some bad behaviour which I am observing, and I would not like to use the law. I know what to do.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I rose on a point of elucidation. The hon. member said 'when a man sells himself for \$1,000 a month'. He sold himself for more than that, because he has been called a Colonial stooge.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members take their seats.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: For the hon. member's benefit, Mr. Chairman, not for yours, because obviously Your Honour has just referred to it, "No-Member shall interrupt another Member except to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech, provided that the Member speaking is willing to give way and resumes his seat and that the Member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair."

I hope the hon. member will remember that. Last Friday afternoon he would have remembered that; I can well understand him not remembering it now. Do you think it gives me any pleasure to say what I am saying now about a man that I worked with for years, a man that is a friend, a man whose place I visit and who visits my place, a man who last week was on this side of the House and would have voted against this Resolution, and now is so silly as to get up this afternoon, when all of us would have been quiet and would not have embarrassed him, and to attack us and to vote against his conscience because he is paid to vote against his conscience.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: You are dirty! You cannot help it!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am hearing a voice from the Government Bench.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: How can I mind that? If the hon. member will sell himself, he will abuse other people too. He has sold himself. If he has not sold himself, he is double-crossing the other side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Resolution. I have seen nothing about selling.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member, having been sworn in this morning, I am told, resigns tomorrow, he will still get his pension; therefore he is selling them out too. Do not interfere with me because I do not normally interfere with anybody.

My chief point in this matter is really what I have just said, that a Government should not say it owes a lot of money: "It may be inefficiency; it may not be inefficiency; pay this money and then we

will discover that it is inefficiency." That is wrong. Who could vote for a Resolution like that? (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: You do not want to talk about that. You want to talk about me.) If the hon. member continues, he will get a pre-public platform speech from me keeping within the Standing Orders. He talked about warning. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: I do not want to hear you anywhere; not even in here.) I am not giving him any warning; I am giving him a bit of advice. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: You can't warn me; warn Tom.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution should have been finished long ago if it were not for these silly remarks being passed.

The question is that this Resolution do now pass.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am surprised at the Leader of the House. I have been doing my best trying to show friendship to the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition sat.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Only because Your Honour rose. The Hon. Minister - the Minister for today because we do not know how long he is going to be a Minister - spoke about a warning. I am not giving the hon. member a warning; I am giving him a little bit of advice. Judas after betrayal went out and hanged himself. Go thou and do likewise. Nobody is going to shed a tear if you follow the example of Judas.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, this Committee will remember that when I addressed it, I addressed it and kept myself from matters that were personal; but everyone in Committee has seen and heard the demonstration of the last hon. member who spoke, and as I had formerly hinted, I knew somebody over there wanted to divest some matter off his chest. Well, it has been done. Something has happened which has proved very irksome which has nothing to do with this Resolution. But I am going to say this, dealing with the same last paragraph; when certain references were made about Judas, I have never been a Judas to him; he has been a Judas to me when for no reason he removed me from the Speaker's Chair. I have not forgotten it nor has Barbados forgotten it. He has been a Judas to me, and if he can face me, I can more than face him and his colleagues over there. So if there is a Judas, he has been a Judas to me and not I to him. My friends, my relatives, my political associates, my comrades have told me how long I have been a fool for him. That is a fact, and he does not own Barbados. He does not own me. Does he think he does? He is so presumptuous in his old age!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are no Judases in the Transport Board.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Oh, silly old man, behave yourself! Now I am not one of the people who

say you are approaching senile decay or mental decay. I am too decent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Nor did the Judas that I was purported to be have anything to do with it. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that debts are things you have to pay. When I say "you", it depends on whom you are talking to. Some people have to pay their debts. Some people can thrive on what may be prestige and they need not ever pay debts; but Government must be an example. I have to pay debts because I do not have all that prestige yet; but if I get as much prestige as my hon. friend over there, I would not have to pay my debts either. But I would not say that is an honourable estate. I can give my rapier thrust too, you know, and I do not have to be nasty! Whatever dirt has been done to me, I have tried to forget. This day you have resurrected it and this day I will reply; and if you can go at any hamlet in Barbados, so can your humble servant follow thee.

As far as this Resolution is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the last paragraph tells us that the Government is hoping to go into the matter and have a closer look. After all, the debt has got to be paid. You cannot put off that. Right now we are holding back people from the right to have their money. Well let us continue to do that. The Government is responsible for having an investigation again into this matter. That satisfies me, but I will say this: in any mud-slinging from anyone on that side, I am not going to turn one cheek and then turn the other. I am going to take a punch and try to give at least two.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would not have risen again except for the comic gestures and comic utterances; but the hon. member accuses me of being dishonest and being a Judas to him when he was Speaker. I said - and I say again - that it is regrettable to be provoked into making disclosures. I did not put up the hon. member as Speaker because the Chaplain resigned because he said the Speaker was a disgrace and was constantly drunk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the Leader of the Opposition that this has nothing to do with the Resolution? We are not entertaining the Gallery or other hon. members here. We have come here to do the Resolution; so we do not have to know who was going to be Speaker or not.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the only reason I said it is because he accused me of letting him down. In fact, he said I was a Judas in not proposing him as Speaker after he had been Speaker; and, I repeat, things were so bad that the Chaplain resigned. Drunk and having a girl in there to eat lunch with him! (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am allowing the Hon. Leader of the House to speak.

Mr. HINDS: Before the hon. senior member for St. James?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He will have his opportunity too.

Mr. HINDS: He has no more privilege than anybody else in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has no more privilege, but I am ruling. Will you please take your seat?

Mr. HINDS: There are two hon. members on their feet. Let both sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please take their seats? May I now hear the Leader of the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I only rose to suggest to hon. members that they might wish to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let there be some order. Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas address the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Peace and love, Mr. Chairman. Let us reduce the emotional temperature in here. Let us just get down to this question of the Resolution.
4.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, when I first saw this Resolution, I cannot say that I fancied it. It seemed very much to be the pattern of recent Resolutions brought down by the Government to bale out statutory authorities from the very political hangers-on, so that I thought it was a very good speech by my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas when he explained that these same hangers-on involve these Statutory Boards in expenditures which are not reasonable. To some extent, I came here today waiting to hear the speeches which would be made on this Resolution and, truthfully, I did not imagine that this Resolution would have given rise to the exhibition which we have seen from the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I came in here waiting to hear from hon. members how they thought; and I must say that, after hearing the Minister in charge, good speech though it was, I felt that I could not vote for this Resolution. After hearing the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I knew that I would have to drop down dead, knowing that in the last week or so, I have had my views changed about the hon. senior member for St. Peter, knowing his attitude up to Sunday to the Barbados Labour Party, and now hearing him defend this Resolution. Mr. Chairman, if the Minister had not spoken, or if he had spoken differently or less candidly, if the hon. senior member for St. James had not spoken and the hon. senior member

for St. Peter alone had made his speech, on the basis of that speech alone, I could not vote for this Resolution. I am going to move, and I hereby move, that this sum of \$300,000 be reduced by \$3.00. My reason for moving that is this; the smallest piece of silver (A MEMBER: Judas) and it is to mark the Judas-like tactics which we have witnessed in the political spectrum of Barbados within the last two days. Why I am moving the reduction by this particular amount is that I intended to bring to the House 30 pieces of silver to hand to the Prime Minister to give to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, because that should be an addition to the \$1,100..... (*Laughter and Cheers*) I was persuaded not to do that by certain persons who said: "Oh! Have some sympathy with him; he is only scratching." I was reminded of a letter which the hon. senior member for St. Peter wrote to me only in October this year. Let me quote from it and I will make it a document of the House, if necessary. "My loyalty and respect to the Labour Party....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No letter or anything like that will be read. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It can be read.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am the Chairman, I am not permitting any letter to be read in here today. (*Asides*) I am ruling that no letter will be read in here today.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. Is Your Honour saying that you are giving a Ruling although there is no precedent, no Standing Order, no nothing to support it? Every day it is done in the House of Commons. I have been trotting around with some of these things because I know that this sort of thing might happen. Mr. Speaker has pointed out as clearly as possible that where the Standing Orders are silent you go by "May's", and you read "May's". Anything whatever can be read provided that the Standing Order does not prohibit it, but you make it a document of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No personal letter will be allowed to be read in here. (*Asides*) Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. CRAIG: This is no personal letter; he is going to make it a document of the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: This is not a personal letter; this is an official letter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: How many hon. members are addressing the Chair?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hope I am addressing the Chair. I want to say something; I am not necessarily going to read a letter, but there are certain words that I want the House to hear. I am not reading a letter from anybody, although you may speculate where I have got these words from. These are the words: "My loyalty....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member starts, if those words which you would like hon. members to hear pertain to the Resolution, I will permit you to read them.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: They have to do with money.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, I will hear the hon. member afterwards; but I want the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to understand clearly what I have said. I hope that he has grasped it. I can hear the hon. member now on his point of order.

Mr. HINDS: I am just drawing to Your Honour's attention that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, before he began his address, prefaced his remarks with the words "Peace and love." It might be taken that if he is going to quote from a letter now, you might find that it is a love letter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas please continue his remarks?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I want the House to think of the Transport Board and bear these words in mind, because the Transport Board has been one of the sick men of the public life of Barbados for many years. The Transport Board could well have said: "I am, and has been since 1961, the victim of financial....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate. Does the substance of the paper from which the hon. member is reading contain the substance under debate? (Asides)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What I am saying.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear the Minister's point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, you are about to be misled as to the Standing Orders, and the point is this. When I was the Speaker of this Hon. Chamber, on one occasion a personal letter came to me. I dared and attempted to read it to the House and the hon. gentleman over there was mad with me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made. (A MEMBER: I remember.)

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: An hon. member here remembers. It is time to remember. The man who says that there are Judases.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: And, by the way, I have no objection to the letter being read.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Transport Board may well find itself saying this to the Government: "I am and have been since 1961....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Mr. Chairman, let me make my speech. An hon. member must be allowed to make his speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will be allowed to make your speech, but you prefaced your remarks by saying that the Transport Board may be allowed to speak. It is impossible for a Transport Board to speak. You can use different phraseology and I will accept it, but what you started with just now did not suit me.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Transport Board has a Secretary who can sign letters and will direct them. You may imagine that the Transport Board has been in financial difficulties. It might have found itself through its Secretary, who can sign letters, or through its Director, who can speak to the Minister, in a position to say: "I am and have been since 1961 the victim of unfortunate financial circumstances."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Transport Board would not be able to make that statement. (ASIDES.)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Mr. Chairman, do not mind the Leader of the House. The Transport Board could easily write that letter; it would have to come out some time, and the Leader of the House knows what I mean. Either the Resolution is going to be dealt with, or we will have constant interruptions. The Transport Board, or the Minister in charge of the Transport Board, might find itself or himself in a position where it has-or he has-to express sentiments similar, perhaps, to these. The Minister may find himself in a position where he has to say: "I am and have been since 1961 the victim of unfortunate financial circumstances." (INTERRUPTION)

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You are there to rule and not to argue with members. If you are going to rule, you must rule. I am not going to sit down here and let a lot of foolishness go on around this Table the whole afternoon. It is for the Chairman to rule and stop arguing with members and members arguing with him. Rule, or leave the Chair. (ASIDES.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I should like to hear the hon. senior member for St. Thomas alone in this Chamber.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we are hearing things to right and left. Persons, who are not concerned about the part of the speech that I am trying to make, at the head of the Table and on both

sides of the House, seem to be trying to tell you how to rule, when to rule, what to say, and whom to permit to speak. The person principally concerned with what I am trying to say has actually invited me to say it, but the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, less vociferously but more pointedly, perhaps, seem to be trying to suppress something.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am not trying to suppress anything. I want you to rule and to keep the standard of this Chamber up. That is what I want you to do, but I do not want to suppress anything. If the hon. senior member for St. Thomas wants to fly on me, I am ready for him now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not the place for that. If there are going to be battles, do not let them take place in here. You can have them outside, if you care to.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is still peace and love, so far as I am concerned, in this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I hope it will continue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not stab anybody on this side in the back: I am not a negotiator or a traitor: and, therefore, if the senior member for St. Joseph is aggrieved by what I have said, clearly, I misunderstood him. When he got up to tell you to rule, I could not take him other than to mean that he was trying to tell you to keep me quiet. If I have misunderstood him, I apologise to him. I am not going to cut anybody's throat on this side; I have never jumped from one side to the other like a jack-in-the-box, carrying information and negotiating for anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not a traitor to any of my colleagues here.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the senior member for St. Thomas says that he will not be a negotiator or a traitor, but I would not be seen with a gambler. Let him get up and let us have it out here and now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Calm your tempers; I am on my feet. (ASIDES.)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am serious about trying to talk about this in an atmosphere of quiet. I do not know who is here concerned to put an umbrella over the hon. senior member for St. Peter's head to save him from embarrassment. I do not know if anybody is here, but I do not wish to quarrel with any of my colleagues here. I repeat to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that if I have misunderstood him, I apologise. He is a member of the same Party as I am, and I have no intention of stabbing him in the back. I am only sorry that I misunderstood him, perhaps, through suspicions for one

reason or another. (Mr. SMITH: You were a boy when I was a man.) When I am a man you will be.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. We have sometimes to go to some trouble to keep our tempers but, nevertheless, I intend to keep mine. Now, the burden of my speech, Mr. Chairman, as you may recall, deals with the fact that I have heard this Resolution defended by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Will the hon. member tell the Committee where he and I discussed this Resolution in any form or in any place? He or his father?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not himself today. In other words, the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not know what is going on. I heard him defending it in here. What did he do but defend it in here today? What is he getting up on? Tell him to behave himself, Mr. Chairman. He is old enough now to know better. He made a speech in here defending the Resolution, and that is the speech about which I am talking.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member said he heard me defending the Resolution in here. I thought he was taking up the strain of his father and was saying that I was defending it at "Tyrol Cot". I apologise to the hon. member. That would have been an untruth. I apologise to the hon. member; I misunderstood him.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would get another bottle of gin and let the hon. senior member for St. Joseph carry the hon. senior member for St. Peter outside.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is saying that I must carry the hon. senior member for St. Peter outside. He is more suitable to carry him outside, because I like the female sex.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph may well be right, because last Friday night the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I were arm in arm into Cadogan's rum shop in Chapel Street, Speightstown, talking about unity of the Barbados Labour Party and discussing the forthcoming programme of the St. Peter Constituency Branch of the Party for 1969 and making arrangements for the next meeting. (Mr. SMITH: And at the same time cutting the junior member for St. Peter's throat.)

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. My throat is not cut anywhere!
5.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is becoming too much of a joke. If there is no more debate I shall put the question.

Mr. HINDS: You mentioned putting the question, but I want to intimate that I intend to speak again.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, nobody is cutting the throat of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. He would be the first to tell you that he very unselfishly over a year ago volunteered to step down from the seat in St. Peter should there be single member constituencies, and he and I have had conversations about it. Let us get things straight.

Mr. Chairman, the one part of the argument which I appreciated when I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter speaking was when he talked about paying debts. I really could understand his argument at that stage. I could appreciate what he was saying. I could relate it to when he said to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph: "You are cosy in your seat; I am cosy in mine"; and I know he is being consistent when he supports this Resolution on the grounds of getting money from something to pay debts, because again, Mr. Chairman, I am going to urge this on hon. members: if that part of the new Minister's argument found any favour with them, they can believe that the Minister was sincere, because the Minister rang me yesterday over the telephone and told me that it was for money he was crossing the floor.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, that is a lie. I categorically deny that. I told the hon. member that I had made my decision, and his interest in it was whether I would pay arrears to the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad he said that, because he said that when he gets a few months of the Minister's salary, he will pay the Barbados Labour Party the money he owes it. In fact, he believes in paying his debts. He said: "Tom, you understand why! You know my circumstances." I said: "Do you mean money?" and he said "Yes".

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: That is a deliberate lie.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture is constantly jumping up. He is not saying "On a point of order" or addressing the Chair. I feel a man of his experience should know better and set an example.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I would not have insulted the Chair in that manner. I telephoned the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and told him I had made a decision. It is not for me to ask him or any other member on that side to make a decision for me. The only interest he had in it was what part of the Party's subscriptions I would pay back to him. The telephone conversation did not last two minutes.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am not prepared to obstruct the business of the House, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter said he did not cross the floor for money. Would he be able to tell us if he crossed the floor on policy?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with crossing the floor. We are dealing with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, may I draw to your attention that you must take advice from the Clerk and not from the Marshal? You would be a stupid man if you took advice from anybody except the Clerk of the House. Every minute one sees the Marshal telling you to sit down and telling somebody what to do. It is the Clerk of the House who must advise you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat? You are going too far. Please do not let me enforce the law. You are not in a position to say what the Marshal is saying to me. You are only imagining things. I am asking you to take your seat and let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas speak.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I said, let us keep it at a low level. But before the hon. senior member for St. Peter in the face of his new colleagues makes any denials, I should advise him that the Treasurer of the Barbados Labour Party was present sitting down next to the telephone listening while he rang me; so do not let him continue his denial thinking it is only my word against his. The Treasurer of the Barbados Labour Party heard when I asked him if it was for money.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, such cantankerous behaviour that suits him does not come within the Resolution; so I would ask hon. members to confine themselves to this Resolution, as they are not speaking the truth.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, I am appealing to the Leader of the House, on the question of adjournment and so on, whether he does not think it is a convenient opportunity to adjourn until the third week in January if this heat is going on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the whole Committee, I did suggest that hon. members might wish to have a cooling-off period a few minutes ago when I was prepared to report progress so that after ten or fifteen minutes hon. members might resume in a different frame of mind. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition assured me that he was willing to finish the Resolution then, and therefore I desisted.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If perhaps ten or fifteen minutes will lead to more refreshment in the heads of people, perhaps it is a good thing to adjourn now.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, while the Leader of the House is considering that.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Message from his Excellency the Governor-General:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that under the provisions of section 66 of the Constitution of Barbados, the appointment of Mr. A. DaC. Edwards, M.P., as Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance has been revoked with effect from the 17th December, 1968.

His Excellency further has the honour to inform the Honourable House that under the provisions of section 65 of the said Constitution Mr. K. N. R. Husbands, M.P., has been appointed to be Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance with effect from the 17th December, 1968.

(Sgd.) A. Winston Scott,
Governor-General.

Government House
Barbados
17th December, 1968.
5.10 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in connection with this Message, I have been informed by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that he wishes henceforth to be known and considered as a Government backbencher, and, consequently, the numbers of the Majority Party have been increased by one.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for fifteen minutes.

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

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

5.15 p.m.

On re-assembling,

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. Automatically, it resumes Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the suspension of the sitting, we were considering a Resolution for the sum of \$300,000.

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

AYES: Hon'bles G. G. FERGUSON, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, CORBIN, SPRINGER, SARGEANT AND WEEKES - 7.

NOES: Messrs. LYNCH and J. M. G.M. ADAMS - 2.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 53

CASUAL LABOUR - SPECIAL RESERVE FOR
EXTRAORDINARY ROAD DAMAGE

A Resolution for the sum of \$95,949 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I must thank hon. members opposite for agreeing to deal with this Resolution, but if they had given any indication that they were not willing to deal with it. I would have had to leave it off. The sum of \$95,000, as the Addendum sets out, was provided in the current Estimates under Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works, Item 44 - Casual Labour - \$45,000.00, and Item 82 - Special Reserve for Extraordinary Road Damage, \$50,000.00 to continue work on the roadways and bridges damaged in December 1966. This provision is almost exhausted and the sum of \$95,949 is required to complete the work for the remainder of the financial year as follows:-

Item 44 - Casual Labour - \$26,692: Item 82 - Special Reserve for Extraordinary Road Damage - \$69,257. Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I will give hon. members a rundown as to how this money is going to be spent, but one of the main reasons why I would like hon. members to approve this Resolution is that it would help people to get their Christmas dinner - Newcastle in St. John, Springvale in St.

Joseph, Parks Road in St. Joseph, Spa Hill, St. Joseph, Rock Hall in St. Andrew, Coggins Bridge in St. Andrew, Springvale in St. Andrew, Foster Hall, Friendship and Trio Path in St. Andrew, Boscobel in St. Andrew, Foster Hall, St. Joseph, King Street in St. Andrew, Cherry Tree Hill, St. Andrew and Consett Bay in St. John.

This is in the Scotland District, as hon. members will realise, and we know what usually happens, as happened in 1966 when I was out of the island. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the next Resolution, I should like to thank hon. members on the opposite side for their co-operation in this measure.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 55

GRATUITIES TO FORMER MEMBERS RESOLUTION POSTPONED

A Resolution for the sum of \$35,000.00 was called.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw this to the attention of hon. members. We could not sit here and vote for gratuities for past members of the House without knowing what the Bill is. The Bill should be dealt with first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, we are in Committee dealing with a Money Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know, but we will have to come out of Committee and go back in. I could not sit down and vote for this money. The Hon. Leader of the House knows that he should not do this. You should not put this Resolution up until you have the Bill. We should know the substance of what is happening before we can do this; we could not very well do this.

The consideration of the Resolution was postponed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 54

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPENSATION

A Resolution for the sum of \$2,547 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this sum of money is required to supplement Item 13 - Local Government Compensation. It is required as an award of compensation to Mr. Pearson Scott in respect of, as the Addendum states, the diminution of emoluments suffered by him resulting from his transfer from the office of Vestry Clerk and Parochial Treasurer to the office of the Clerk of the

Southern District Council. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it would be of interest to learn from the hon. Leader of the House if there are any other officers who are in a similar position to Mr. Scott, and, if so, why did not the Government find it necessary to attend to all such matters at one and the same time. I think this is an opportunity for me, too, Sir, to draw to the attention of this Hon. House the plight of some workers who have served the old Vestries and the old Local Government Councils. I speak with particular reference to some of them in the Northern Districts.

You will find that there are quite a number of these people who have served for periods of well over thirty years. I can speak of one particular worker who served in the old Road Board; he served in the Vestry; he served in the Local Government Council, and he then went over to the Ministry of Communications and Works. He rose from a cantonnier to supervisor. He put in something like thirty-two years, and when he retired he was still a casual worker. The situation is, as it obtains in this particular case to which I refer, that he is not entitled to a pension after working for 32 years. He has climbed every possible staircase that he could. He lives in my constituency, and his son wrote me from England asking me to go and see his father and see what I can do for him in this case. His name is Newsam from the Castle.

Since then I have found that, in other Departments of Government, there are a number of people who have served for periods of over 30 years; but because they have worked in various Departments they have to get people to swear to affidavits that they served at the Central Road Board for a certain period and served at the Vestry for another period and so on. In spite of the fact that they have been able to have the affidavits sworn to by people who have retired - and, in some case, some of them have gone abroad - they still find difficulty in getting a pension. No proper records, apparently, have been kept during the past years. I am hoping that something will be done not only for Mr. Scott because he happens to be the Clerk of the Council, but for every class of worker.

I am asking the Government if it can advertise and make it known that all of the people who served for a number of years can submit claims, and let us deal with all of them at one time. If it is necessary to summon a Special Meeting of the House to deal with them, I am willing to come out at any hour. I am sure any hon. member from this side would be willing to attend such a meeting. After all, we know that many of these people worked for wages in those days that cannot be compared with the wages paid today. I am appealing to the Government to do what it can to help these poor workers.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I should like to set the hon. member's mind at ease. Mr. Newsam's problem is simply this. He was to have been appointed, but in the Government Service, like any other Service, when you are going to be appointed as a Civil Servant you have to produce a medical certificate in order to get into the Service. Apparently, when Mr. Newsam went to get his medical certificate, it was discovered that he had sugar or diabetes - something was wrong, and he could not have been appointed. There was a snag, and I took up the matter some time ago. I do not think I will go after it again to find out what was wrong.

It is true that Mr. Newsam might have been working for several years, but what the hon. member must also remember is that sometimes people work spasmodically and they do not serve the stipulated time in order to qualify for a pension. I do not think that is what really happened in Mr. Newsam's case. His case was that he could not have been appointed when he should have been appointed. I still feel that he should have been able to get something as a casual worker. There was some snag in the matter, but it was an Establishment matter. I do not know anything about Establishment matters. I will promise the hon. member that I will take up the matter tomorrow to find out how far they have got with Mr. Newsam's case.

Mr. HINDS: I thank the hon. member for his promise, but in Mr. Newsam's case he will find that he was debarred from being appointed on the Establishment. Undoubtedly, after working for 32 years, if he is not entitled to a pension, then consideration should be given to his receiving a gratuity or some *ex gratia* grant.

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

RECOMMITTAL OF RESOLUTION FOR \$300,000

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make it clear that back benchers of the Government - and even Ministers of the Government - do not know all of the procedures of this House. I beg to move that the Resolution for \$300,000 be recommitted and that it be recommitted for the simple reason that you cannot sit here and pass it without giving us a breakdown. The Minister says that they owe this money. Is it for gasoline, tyres, new buses or what? (ASIDES.) I am perfectly in order, and I move that the Resolution be recommitted. If it is seconded and not recommitted, then the Government will have passed the Resolution without telling us to whom the Transport Board owed this \$300,000.

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I did not speak on the last occasion on the Resolution. I intended to speak, but as we were entering the Chamber the motion was put to the Committee.

5.55 p.m.

Now the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I am today still far from satisfied with the service that the people from Silver Sands to Bridgetown are getting from the Transport Board, in spite of the fact that we have to come here periodically and pass money to subsidise the Transport Board. I would also like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention, and to ask him if he can have a specific investigation of it, if it is a fact, that tickets from one of their agents in the Christ Church area were sent back. The agent had a receipt for them, and these tickets were not in the office, but were being sold at the booth in Fairchild Street bus stand. It is no use your denying the fact that there is inefficiency, incompetence, double-crossing and plain, straightforward stealing going along at the Transport Board in some respects. I want to make it clear that I am not including the Manager in this, because I happen to know in that particular instance that he did his best to investigate it, but he was frustrated by a number of channels through which the matters come to his notice.

I would also point out that the situation at the Transport Board must have deteriorated to a considerable extent since the last financial report which was laid on the Table of this House for the year ended 30th September, because if you look at Schedule 2 of that report, you will see under Creditors and Credit Balances at 30th September, 1967, Trade Creditors at that period of time were \$169,373.51. The total for creditors at that time was \$280,412.41. Now this Resolution states that the sum needed is \$300,000; so that in the last financial year of your Transport Board, it is obvious and ought to be very obvious to anyone with any knowledge of accountancy that your situation has deteriorated to the extent that you have not made sufficient revenue or genuine profit in this last financial year to cover your liabilities. You made a loss at least to the extent of another \$20,000, and further, you have not made a sufficient profit to cover any of the outstanding liabilities as at 30th September, 1967.

I think that the time has come when all Statutory Boards should have stock-taking. I think that we have got to examine the general attitude of all Governments and potential Governments on the question of the Statutory Board as an instrument of management in relation to territories like ours, with their resources of management and with the attitude of mind, I believe, towards Government-owned institutions. I believe it would be a good thing for these Statutory Boards if the Government were to see the wisdom of appointing some members of the other side as members of these Boards. This is no revolutionary policy doctrine. I do not think the Government could feel that the policy directives of the Government would not be carried out, because they would have to appoint people, with a majority whom they feel would carry out their objectives; but my experience of this has been that, removed from the glare of publicity, within the confines of the Board room it is possible to get a large measure of agreement and help from people of different political Parties when they sit around a table where there is no

question of the glare of publicity and no gallery to play to. I think it would help also to ensure that employees in the Statutory Boards recognise that there must be first of all a sense of loyalty to the organisation that employees have, and not loyalty to any particular political Party.

I hear a lot of talk about Black Power and various things. But, Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that the people who are in control of the Government and the Government institutions in this country and even since adult suffrage have been black people. There is no doubt about that. What we have got to recognise in this country is that if you place a man in a particular position, that position entails the exercise of power and authority, and people have got to respect that fact. They used to respect people before when they were of different complexion; they do not like to respect people today because they happen to be black. (Cheers) We have got also to remember that every cent we spend in subsidising the operations of an organisation like this is depriving our social security, our housing and other necessary social services from getting that money to make improvements for the general benefit of the mass of people in this country.

I would really like to see an enquiry by an inter-Party Committee of the House into the operations of the Transport Board, not in the same sense in which you would have an enquiry by an accounting body, but an enquiry whereby you would see the operations, whereby the public and the employees would know and understand that Parliament as a whole is concerned about the standard of efficiency at the Transport Board. I think it would do a tremendous amount of good, and I really feel that it would tend to increase the efficiency of the Board.

Now there was a lot of theoretical talk on the other side about transferring to private enterprise and that sort of thing. I believe that the service rendered by the Transport Board is better than the one run by private enterprise in this country; and what is more, there will always be areas of economic activity which Government in any society, even in the United States, has decided in its mind it is in the public interest for Government to run, whether it is Socialist, Capitalist or otherwise. What has become a problem in the 20th Century has been that the machinery of Government and the Governmental method of dealing with things is not as efficient as the one dealt with by private enterprise. It may be that private enterprise is more ruthless in its employer/employee relationships. I notice that in England lately they have decided to change the Post Office from a Government Department and established it somewhat in the nature of a Statutory Board. Our record with Statutory Boards is not something that any of us can be proud of. I submit to the Leader of the House on the other side that there has been in Parliament in Britain an inter-Parliamentary Committee set up by Parliament to report on the structure of Statutory Boards and such authorities with a view to making recommendations as to how parliamentary control can be assumed over the financial

operations of the organisations. We have a Public Accounts Committee here, and I do feel that the time is ripe now, particularly when we are revising our Standing Orders, for this inter-Governmental Committee to be appointed not only to deal with the Transport Board, but with all other Statutory Boards in Barbados.

I am not going to speak, Mr. Chairman, on this occasion on other matters which arose. I do not think it is necessary, because hearing so much Scripture today made me look back at my Scripture, and I always remember this: the betrayal of one man has never affected the profound faith of human beings in the Christian faith. The behaviour of one man will never affect the profound and deep belief in the Barbados Labour Party in Barbados. (Cheers)

6.05 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, my motion, which you might call the Judas amendment, not having been seconded at the appropriate time, I will not, at this stage, pursue it. The umbrella which was held out over the hon. senior member for St. Peter succeeded all too well in its effect; but had it not succeeded, we still have to be grateful for its success. Had it not succeeded, the demolition job done by the hon. member who has just sat down, those words which will ring around Barbados as long as the hon. senior member for St. Peter is a member - it will not be long - those words might not have been uttered. Therefore, I am glad that, at least, they should be uttered in that atmosphere. I very much hope that this issue of the *Official Gazette* will get into print early. Truthfully, Mr. Chairman, a number of us came here prepared to speak on the Resolution and nothing else; I do not believe that we would have had any of the confusion, were it not for the intervention of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who really would have done well to have sat down and kept quiet, realising that, although we cannot forgive and although we may have feelings of contempt, nevertheless feelings of sympathy might have been allowed to prevail, at least on the opening day of play. We have our feelings; we know what we think of him; but we would have been prepared to say: "Enough for a little time; keep that for Speights-town."

What I cannot understand about the Transport Board is this. Although the speech of the hon. senior member for Christ Church has perhaps given me a little elucidation, I do not catch buses and therefore I do not know. As far as I can recall, it is 17 years since I have been on a bus in Barbados, except for going to an excursion. I regret it sometimes. I do not even get the opportunity to catch buses because where I live, I would not even know how to go about catching buses because I do not see them. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has indicated that he thinks that the service run by the Transport Board is a better service than that run by the private concessionaires. Certainly they have better buses. I will give you an example. The buses which are now painted in yellow and which run up and down Spooner's Hill - I recognise three of them, and I have even

told the Minister when they were bought. They were imported by Mr. Jones in 1947 - M-737; M-749, I think it is; I cannot remember the third number, but I remember when they were imported. I remember M-737 being one of the school buses which took me to school when I was first in Sixth Form. What I cannot understand is this. If those buses can make a profit, why can't the Transport Board make a profit? The Transport Board has had new buses, and it has not got to worry about the capital cost of the fleet of new buses, because the cost of that fleet has been paid off entirely. It was agreed by the House to scrap the old buses, and yet with a fleet of modern buses, with good routes and flat routes in Christ Church - the old General Motor Bus routes which were always flatter - more densely populated, wider routes, easier to operate than the buses which have to go uphill and downhill in the northern parts of the island - why with this network of good routes that formerly belonged to, definitely, the largest of the private concessionaires, the Transport Board cannot make a profit?

This figure of \$300,000 looks very shaky, anyhow. I find it impossible to believe that the debts of the Transport Board add up to a round figure. It was \$280,412. I gather, Mr. Chairman, that they want \$300,000 to round it off. Backpay only amounts to \$65,000 out of this amount. I daresay that the Minister will go into all of this in due course.

As to this talk about political hangers-on, in whose hands was the advertising, which is a patent source of money-making for the Transport Board? In whose hands was the contract for advertising the Transport Board's buses? - Mr. Tony Vanterpool. How can you expect, when things are shared out by means of favours in that way, anything but these debts? The hon. senior member for St. Michael is in his seat. There is nothing in the law which prevents him from being a member of the Transport Board now. He, apparently, was induced to resign his position at the Transport Board in the mistaken belief that it was one of those Boards on which no member of the House of Assembly could sit; but there is no reason really why he should not be there now. If the hon. member has been there now, at least he might be able to tell us things that never reached the Minister because if certain abuses do not reach the General Manager, they certainly cannot reach the Minister. I would hope, however, that the hon. member's contact with the political hangers-on would be a little closer than the Minister's or the General Manager's. I do not know if, when the Minister talks about political hangers-on, he has in mind the name-sake of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and myself. This gentleman's principal contribution to transport affairs recently has been to hold a meeting in Bush Hall yard and mistakenly tell the public that I took 11 years to pass a Bar Examination, or some such figure. It should be known - I have heard it said in James Street in circles very close to the office which the Prime Minister formerly used to occupy: "Why, if you don't give Michael something to do, he will carry away all the Party's money all over again." I have heard that said in James Street. You must

give Adams something, and I do not mean either the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or myself. With that attitude that a certain Party hack is going to carry away the money of the Democratic Labour Party unless you give him a job at the Transport Board, who could wonder that there are burdens on the Minister's back?

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to embarrass the Minister; so I am not going to ask him to say that he means Mr. Michael Adams when he talks about the political hangers-on who dip their hands in the till. I am not going to ask him to say that; I am not even going to ask him to deny it. I am not associating him with that; but whomever he meant, we can feel that the Transport Board has persons like that working for it. As long as you have somebody of the calibre of Adams working at the Transport Board, you will get accusations like this, and you are going to get them from within your own Party because it is within your own Party that the propensities and proclivities of Mr. Michael Adams are best known.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I have already voted against this Resolution, and I will vote against it a second time. There must be a stage at which we in the Opposition have to cry "No". We cannot go on and on with the B.M.C., the C.B.C.; we will soon hear about the Housing Authority and so on. We cannot go on with these things and have the Public Treasury regarded as a milch cow for a pack of incompetents and racketeers in the Government. There are people who get up and say that we must pay these debts and you must have the money to pay these debts. I refer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but I am not scandalising him now. What is wrong with that argument is not only the person who put it forward, but the nature of the argument itself. (ASIDES.)

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House is provoking me. He should know that you can scandalise a man by saying something that is true just as you can say something that is false. I could scandalise him by telling the truth about him, but I would not be so rude. Mr. Chairman, do not let the Leader of the House wind up the engine again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Leader of the House is capable of handling himself with you.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sure he is capable of 'handling himself', although I would not have said 'with me', Mr. Chairman. Anyhow, what is wrong with the new Minister's argument is this. We in the Opposition are not here only to say that the Transport Board has debts and they must be paid. The financial nexus, however important it may be to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, is not the only nexus upon which we must estimate our votes. We have to vote against a Resolution as a matter of policy. If we feel, as a matter of principle, that the administration of the Transport Board has been bad, and that it has been bad because a wrong approach has been made to the problems of staffing or to any of its problems, then the only means we have of ex-

pressing our feelings is by voting against the Resolution.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter's argument would be appropriate only if he were on this side and was urging us, as one of us, to vote for the Resolution on the grounds that some harm would result if we did not vote for it. When, after one day in the Ministry, he sits on the other side and urges that this must be done because debts are to be paid, the argument carries no weight because it is not a meaningful argument. The only meaning to the argument is that, joined to the \$2 1/4 million in C.B.C., the \$1 1/2 million in the B.M.C., the racketeering in the Housing Authority, there is now at least \$2 million in the Transport Board, but we will not go into that. It is now \$300,000 at the Transport Board which has to be paid for. That is the way we in the Opposition have to look at it, and that is why we cannot vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I am not quarrelling with the Minister of Communications and Works. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I invite the Minister to quarrel with me as much as he likes, but I am still not quarrelling with him because he was candid in this business. (ASIDES) He still has to tell us for what he owes the money, but I took it that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown had already dealt with that. The Minister still has to tell us exactly how this money is going to be paid out. How you can keep people waiting, from what I see from the last Transport Board's Report, for debts of that sort, I do not know.

The Prime Minister talks about getting a discount and the paying of all bills within thirty days, but the same people who deal with the Transport Board in the matter of supplying raw materials are the same people who deal with the Government, and they do not make a distinction between the Transport Board and the Government. They feel it is the Government they are dealing with. That is the way they look at it. Looking at the principle of the matter, we feel that the place is badly run. It is badly run for the very reason that the Minister gives - political interference. The entire Government is responsible and we want to show the Government that we feel it is responsible by voting against this Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I recommitted this Head not because I have any fear of anybody. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You recommitted it?) We have the numbers and we could have stopped it. Before I answer any question, let me make one point clear because the junior member for St. Joseph once said that the memories of the people in Barbados are short and, apparently, it is so with some people, but not with me.

We came into this House in 1961, and I can remember in 1962 when the Prime Minister was presenting his first Budget, the Transport Board then

had an estimate of \$150,000 as a deficit. They said this is what we would lose and this is what has been going on from 1955. When hon. members on the opposite side get up and try to make out a case, do not let anybody fool you. I have been around here too long, Mr. Chairman; the amount was \$150,000, and the Prime Minister said to the Manager, who was an ex-policeman: "Go and have your head examined. Are you telling me about throwing away \$150,000 before you have made a cent?" We never gave the Transport Board one cent, and it kept itself going for a considerable time. The first time the Government is going to vote money for the Transport Board is today. (ASIDES.) Hon. members over there, who are trying to make out a case, can only make out a case with idiots like themselves. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot call anybody in here an idiot! You are an ass.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, better words.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Why cannot I call you - the hon. senior member for Bridgetown - an idiot? You have got up in here and used the most offensive language to me. You are now telling me that I cannot call you an idiot. You are a village idiot!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not like those words used in here. There is a complaint about the word "idiot", and now you have emphasised it by using the words "village idiot". Please refrain from using such words.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, if you want me to refrain from using such words, then you must tell.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have no one to tell anything to.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I will abide by the Ruling of the Chair. Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to point out, and the hon. senior member for the City knows this as well as anybody in here, if he has any memory. This is something that used to be in the Estimates from 1955, and in 1962 the sum of \$150,000 was put into the Estimates as something to be thrown away. I did not hear one word from anybody on the opposite side then, Sir.
6.25 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is eating out members on the opposite side is that they thought they had a Government. Well, it is not done like that. You have to go to the electorate and let the people decide. It is not because somebody went that side. Somebody went that side and somebody came this side. As a matter of fact, nobody has gone that side; so I know they have found out their mistake.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, would he admit that we did not have \$1,100 a month to offer?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That does not come within the Resolution. Let the hon. junior member for St. Thomas continue.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not going to say that is not a point of order, but "like father, like son." You are talking about \$1,100 to offer, but I will say this on the floor of this House now. After they heard what was taking place, they called up one of their yard-fowls and asked him to see if he could collect enough money to buy somebody. I did not know that negroes were for sale. I thought negroes were sold out in 1948. I did not know there was an auction down here. It is unknown to me because I did not hear the bell ringing.

When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up today, he never said one word on the Resolution, but started to attack the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am not surprised about this, Mr. Chairman, because I know that the same hon. junior member for St. Joseph attacked the hon. junior member for St. James' father and called him Al Capone, and all of us know who Al Capone was - a vicious criminal; so when you can look at your colleague and call his father Al Capone, that is carrying things a bit too far. But he went further than that, Mr. Chairman. I also remember that some time in 1938 the same hon. junior member for St. Joseph, when he wanted to impress the masses that he was with them, gave out a rumour.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, do I understand the Transport Board owes money to the father of the hon. junior member for St. James?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. Thomas please address the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He wanted to impress people at the time that he was so much on their side that he accused the hon. senior member for Bridgetown of attempting to murder him and burn down his house. This is the kind of thing you get going on. I am not surprised at the attack that was made on the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but I was telling the hon. member not to get up, but to leave them to me. My skin is thick. I can handle anybody in here, and you will notice that I do not withdraw much. (A VOICE: Why not give the information?) I am going to come to that, but not until I have finished viscerating somebody. Hon. members must learn to keep the debates on a high level. If they want to go down on the ground, I can walk under a snake with my hands up. They can send somebody to shoot me, because I live by violence, and I can always die by violence. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That would be a waste of a shot.)

I am not going to go out and make any claims to anybody to get anybody's sympathy. Politics makes some of the strangest bedfellows in the world. No wonder people think that politicians are dishonest.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, that is the most profound political statement ever made, looking and seeing who is next to the hon. member who is speaking.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You see what I tell you about points of order? The hon. junior member for St.

Joseph does not know points of order any more. I believe his feet are soft now, and when he gets up they hurt him.

Now you want to know to whom the Transport Board owes this money. They owe \$516 to one person, \$459 to another..... (Mr. MOTTLEY: Whom?) I thought you told me I did not have to call names. Do you think I am lying then? Gardiner Austin & Co. Ltd. - \$516; (Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that for tyres?) I do not believe it would be for tyres, because tyres are bought by contract at the Transport Board. The Advocate Co. Ltd. - \$459.

Before I go further I would like to clarify a point. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter say that I know something about somebody printing tickets and the rest of it. I am going to make a statement on the floor of this House though I have made it more than once. The hon. junior member for St. Peter rang me at my office and asked me what was the amount of money we voted to lend the Transport Board. He had all the information he wanted, because he said he tried to get it out of the Transport Board and they would not give him. I gave him willingly. Here it is: the hon. junior member for St. Peter knows of somebody robbing the revenue. He is a taxpayer and is supposed to be here representing other people's money, and he knows this and has not told me one word, but comes in here with this. I do not read the *Truth*. (Mr. MOTTLEY: The Prime Minister said he knew people stealing bungalows. He did not lock them up.) Do you think you can lock up everybody so? You have good lawyers now. It is true you have some hungry ones, but you have good ones, and you have to bring a lot of evidence to get a man behind bars.

To continue: Barbados Co-operative Cotton Factory - \$691.27; the Barbados Foundry Ltd. - \$874.52; Barbados Hardware Co. Ltd. - \$6.00; Barbados Import and Export Co. Ltd. - \$132.21; Acme Engineering Works - \$175.40; The Barbados Tyre Remoulding Co. - \$1,274.55; Barbados Tyre Remoulding Co. - \$62,928.57; Brake Lining Ltd. - \$42.70; Bradshaw & Co. - \$25.61; Mobile Oil (Barbados) Ltd. - \$27,889.26; A. S. Bryden & Co. Ltd. - \$2,466.59; British Paints (Barbados) Ltd. - \$50.00; Central Foundry Ltd. - \$992.94; Chandler's Hardware - \$563.32. (A VOICE: Fire bug?) Ask the hon. member sitting down next to you if he is a fire bug or not. He would know better than I would. I came lately. City Garage Trading Co. - \$44.68; DaCosta & Musson Ltd. - \$332.15; DaCosta & Musson Ltd. - \$19,901.50; Eckstein Brothers - \$4,347.78. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is that for?) I do not work at the Transport Board. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You are the Minister.) Do you see what I mean? I am the Minister now; so I have to know everything, including who is conducting the bus that has gone on Route 1. But when I as Minister tell somebody not to waste water, hon. members come in here saying that I run down people. They want to blow hot and cold at the same time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Surely when you get a list like this before you and you are coming to the House to

ask for money, you are going to have the Executive Officer in front of you and ask him what this is for and why it is overdue for so long. You are the Minister and they have to tell you.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am not saying they do not have to tell me. I do not have anything to hide.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair. Let there be some order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Esso Service Centre - \$176.01; Esso Standard Oil (South American Ltd.) - \$40.98; William Fogarty Ltd. - \$56. Fix-it-Right Garage - \$440.62; T. Geddes Grant Ltd. - \$328; Government Printing Office - \$1,144.50.

6.35 p.m.

C. F. Harrison & Co., Barbados Ltd., \$110.01; T. Herbert Ltd., \$1,215.46; W. B. Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., \$150.20; Plantations Ltd., \$129,614.40; (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is this for?) That is for fuel. City Garage, \$6,892.76; Tropical Batteries, \$1,323.57. Does that satisfy the hon. member?

Mr. MOTTLEY: From the figures which the hon. member has called out here, the amount is over \$200,000. They do not come to \$280,000 and we have to be careful.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am glad to hear the figure of \$60,000 for tyres. I want to know if the Minister is aware of this fact; if not, I can make him aware of it. Last year a tender was put in to the Transport Board in excess of what Springer used to do the re-capping for. The tender was from A. S. Joseph. (Asides) The Board did not award it; how did you revoke it?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Springer's tender was for \$108,000 and Joseph's tender was for \$27,000 less. (Mr. MOTTLEY: No.) Do not shake your head; I am the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is it true that the Development Board wanted the money back? There is a lot of racketeering going on there, you know; you must get these facts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet. (Mr. MOTTLEY took his seat.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member should understand that I would not know what transpired at the Development Board. I am the Minister of Communications and Works; I am nothing to do with the Development Board. (Asides) How would I know what transpired between Joseph and the money going back? I do not even know that Joseph owes somebody money. (Asides) It is true that I know a lot, but I do not know everything I do not read the Truth; I do not go in for pornography. (Mr. HINDS: He cannot spell that; let him spell it without looking in his dictionary.) I do not have any dictionary (Mr. HINDS: You have a dictionary in your pocket.) (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not tolerate this behaviour in here. Will the Hon. Minister take his seat? This is getting out of order; I do not consider this to be the proper behaviour in this Chamber. We do not want to know about pornography or any other "ography" in here. (Laughter)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, what I was saying is this. When the hon. member knows these things, it is his duty to tell me what is going on. I have never refused to answer the telephone when he calls. Let him get up at the Transport Board and see everything, but he feels that this is something big. It is not my Transport Board; it belongs to the people. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Did you know that somebody stole two buses?) I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Peter in all seriousness. You are not going to lose anything when you call me and tell me: "I hear that so-and-so is going on up there. Have an investigation or look into so-and-so." I would like to say here, on behalf of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, that I appreciate what he has said very much. As to the buses in Christ Church, you get people standing at stop poles all over the world. We all know the position with the Transport Board. It is an inheritance that this Government came into. When hon. members on the other side said that I talked about hangers-on, I never said anything about hangers-on in relation to any Board. I said that that was a political hot-bed for hangers-on, which is true. The former Government would just come and say that if you vote for somebody you can get a little note and you are sent up there for a job. We have come and inherited this, and we cannot come in now and lay off people like this because the people are Unionised and here is where you will run into a flaw with the Union.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there are just one or two points which I want to raise. I do not want to make any reference whatsoever to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. What I am concerned about is this: there are some school children who live in the area of The Risk, Upper Graveyard and Date Tree Hill. They assemble at a point which is known as Crawley's Gap and the children suffer very, very badly because when the bus reaches there on mornings, it is always full.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we want the Resolution passed, but it is my duty to point out the suffering of the people in the parish of St. Peter. The time will come when the Minister will say that if the representative of St. Peter had drawn it to his attention, he would have done something about it. I want it to go on record, because the time will come when we will have to put it before the people. I want to be able to say that the people who assemble at Crawley's Gap, and particularly the school children, are suffering very badly. It has happened time and again that these children reach their schools in Bridgetown very late. When the children reach school late, some of the teachers, knowing that the children have established the fact that they cannot possibly arrive at school early, do

not expect any excuse from them. When they reach the school, they are told to take their seats. I am asking the Minister to see what he can do about that.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point and it goes in favour of the Transport Board: it is the only Bus Company that is making money inside of the Bus and outside of the bus. How is it that the Transport Board is losing money when it is making money inside of the bus and outside of the bus? Mr. Chairman, I will not be voting for this Resolution, and I am sure that the Minister does not expect any support from this side.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Please ring the bell.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was called for.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I pointed out that the bell must be rung if a division is called for, and members should have an opportunity to come into the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Division

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: (Seated): It is accepted as an established convention that on matters in which Standing Orders are silent, the procedure of the United Kingdom Parliament shall prevail. And then there is a specific direction of the duties of the Clerk. (ASIDES) I ask Your Honour to rule whether that is not binding on us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to read to hon. members in this House Standing Order 37 (4):

"No Member is entitled to vote in any division unless he was present in the House when the question was put."

The Clerk has informed me that if he had rung the bell, he would be calling in Members to vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY: (Seated); I asked you to ring the bell before the question was put. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture can help us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The bell is only rung when there is no quorum; so there is no need to ring the bell now. A division has been called for, and let us proceed with it.

A division was as follows:

AYES: Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. SARGEANT - 9.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; Mr. HOLDER and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 5.
6.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of three

Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION *re* LOAN FOR NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation of an amount not exceeding \$250,000 from a Commercial Bank to carry out extensions and improvements to its distribution system.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament for the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation of a sum not exceeding \$250,000 from a Commercial Bank. This money is not required, Mr. Speaker, only for the purpose of putting in services, but we feel that if extensions are put in with a loop-line, the present services can be better facilitated. Only last week, Mr. Speaker, the Seventeenth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the period 1st April, 1967 to 31st March, 1968, was laid, and I think hon. members on the other side will see from this Statement where the Natural Gas Corporation is quite a viable Corporation and is in a position to pay back its finances. According to the Act, however, it is required that the borrowing of this money be guaranteed by this Chamber.

I do not think there will be much argument if hon. members have looked at this. I would also like to state here that the Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas has drawn to the attention of Government the remaining resources to existing consumers owing to declining well-head pressure at Turner Hall No. 19 Well. He further advised that in the existing circumstances, the Corporation might be unable to meet its demands for the supply of gas after perhaps December, 1968, unless remedial action was taken to counteract the decline in pressure.

The Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas proposes one of two measures that can be taken; first, the laying of a four-inch loop-line in two stages from the Lazaretto to the well-head. This has been estimated to cost approximately \$200,000.

He continued to say that the line from the Lazaretto to Lancaster would be laid below ground, and that the rapid development of the coast line would yield a profitable return in three years or less. The section from Lancaster to the well-head could be laid above ground and could be recovered for profitable use in the distribution system after No. 19 Well had been exhausted. The loop-line, he said, would allow expansion to continue for a year or two if no further supplies of natural gas were available. The system would then have to be augmented by the installation of a L.P.G. air-mix plant. Another advantage of the loop-line was that the Corporation would be able to send out the same amount of gas at a reduced well-head pressure.

The second method would be the installation of well-head boosters. The operating and maintenance costs of boosters were very high, and additional boosters would have to be installed in order to maintain a steady pressure in the system. These boosters would have an immediate salvage value if the well had been exhausted. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, method No. 1 with a loop-line would be the best method, and as stated, this is quite a financial proposition. There is no doubt from this year's Statement that the Natural Gas Corporation is quite viable and can pay its expenses.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Corporation in contrast to the Resolution which we were dealing with in Committee, is a Corporation which from its inception has not had to call upon the taxpayers for subsidies. I have read the last Report of the Natural Gas Corporation, and the only criticism I have of it is that it appears to me to repeat the fears which every year's Report repeats, namely, that the supplies of natural gas available at the present moment if the expansion rate continues, will have a relatively short period of lifetime left.

7.05 p.m.

I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister is not in a position to inform the House whether, as a result of the drilling which is taking place in Barbados on a number of sites by the Gulf Oil Corporation who is the licensee now under the Petroleum Act, no new sources of natural gas that are commercially feasible have been discovered.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, no gas has been found in any commercial quantities at any of the wells which have been drilled. It has been showing, but it has been reduced in a very short space of time. These wells will have to be tested for a reasonable period in order to see if the pressure would remain at all of the wells which have been discovered; but there is not sufficient for commercial purposes. With the present spending of this money, even with expansions it would be easier - in other words, rather than take up the pipelines, if the wells ever became exhausted they could put in a booster

and import gas into the country, and instead of having the distribution in bottles as it is at present done by some of the companies, it could be distributed with a booster along the same services. It could come in by ships, be stored in gas tanks with a booster and you could salvage your pipe lines by leaving them under the ground and have distribution on the same service rather than have a heavy capital invested as it is at present done with bottled gas. There would be no need for the tanks for distribution because the pipe lines could be used in the same manner and it could continue. Therefore, Sir, there is actually no dread in investing this money even if the wells did go dry.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I was not questioning the wisdom of the investment in this matter. I think that the Report makes it quite clear that if and when the supplies from the wells are exhausted, it is possible to import machinery and use your existing distribution set-up, and it would still be an economic proposition. I was just trying to get some information as to the drilling for oil which has been taking place in Barbados for some period of time.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I should like at this stage to speak under Standing Order No. 17.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to make a personal explanation?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may do so by the indulgence of the House unless there is any objection.

Mr. St. JOHN: As I understand it, Sir, Your Honour is asking the indulgence of the House for the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to make a personal explanation. I have not seen this done since I have been in here, but I have no doubt that it is possible, seeing the heading "Personal Explanation" under the Rules; but is it customary, after a personal explanation is made, for a debate to take place?

Mr. SPEAKER: No; no controversial matter may be brought forward nor may any debate arise upon the explanation.

Mr. St. JOHN: I take it that Your Honour rules whether it is controversial or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is none other to rule.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Hon. Leader of the House read a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General in connection with the revocation of my appointment as Minister of Agriculture. Following this Statement,

the Hon. Leader of the House advised the House that I would remain as a Government backbencher. It is on this point that I would like to make my position clear. I am still a member of the Democratic Labour Party; I have not resigned from the Democratic Labour Party; I have not reported the matter to my constituents yet and it is for my constituents to decide where I should be an Independent or be with any other Party; but until I report the matter to my constituents, I will remain a member of the Democratic Labour Party. If they advise that I remain a member of the Democratic Labour Party, I will choose the course that my constituents, who have sent me here, have chosen for me. If they feel that I should be Independent, I will go Independent; or I will go with any other Party that my constituents choose for me. Until then I would like to make this abundantly clear, that I reserve the right to speak, to criticise vehemently or support any action brought by the Democratic Labour Party in this Chamber.

Mr. St. JOHN: Are there any more personal explanations?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church seek the indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation?

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT)
(NO. 7) ORDER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister:—To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Civil Establishment Order, which is the General Amendment Order No. 7, 1968, makes certain adjustments in the Establishments Structure.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not been circulated with a copy of this Order to which the Hon. Leader of the House is addressing the attention of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was circulated about two or three weeks ago. This is an old Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I very much regret; I will ask the Clerk to supply the hon. member with a duplicate copy of this Order if one is available. I understand that copies of this Order have been circulated some weeks ago. They were circulated on 10th December.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think that this one was circulated earlier than that, last week at any rate. Anyhow, this Order seeks to make certain adjustments to the Establishments structure in certain departments, namely, Port Management, the Establishments Division of the Prime Minister's Office, the Accountant General's Department and, of course, in the Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

7.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to incorporate the Caribbean Meteorological Council.

CARRIBEAN METEOROLOGICAL COUNCIL
(INCORPORATION) BILL, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to take charge of Order No. 3 standing in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is given to the hon. Leader of the House to move the Second Reading of a Bill to incorporate the Caribbean Meteorological Council.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Bill speaks for itself. It is really the consequence of an agreement reached at a meeting of the Caribbean Meteorological Council which was held in Guyana in 1967. There the Council agreed that the Caribbean Meteorological Council should be incorporated as it had no corporate status. The Institute, of course, was subsequently sited in Barbados in the parish of St. James, and it now has to be vested with a legal personality. This Bill will give it this legal personality.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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 Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. HOPPIN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: 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 this Bill do now pass.

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

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

EVIDENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to take charge of this Bill. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. Leader of the House to proceed to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Evidence Act, 1905.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, some members of the Law Society have approached the hon. Attorney-General and, in their submissions to him, they pointed out that under the provisions of the existing law, the execution or proof of execution of deeds and other documents under the Evidence Act of 1905 was required to be done (a) in the United Kingdom, as previously; (b) in any part of the Com-

monwealth outside the United Kingdom before a High Commissioner for Barbados, a Judge of any superior Court, a Justice of the Peace, a Mayor of any City, or a Notary Public, and in a foreign country they had to be executed before an acknowledged diplomatic or consular representative for Barbados, or before any person empowered to administer oaths or affirmations.

But it was pointed out by the Law Society that in the United States of America where the consular representative for Barbados has jurisdiction only in New York, and where there are no consular representatives of this country in other parts of the United States certain difficulty has arisen in getting signatures authenticated to documents, particularly in cases where Barbadians, or non-Barbadians, who were resident in the United States, happen to be carrying on transactions in real estate in the Island.

This difficulty was appreciated by the hon. Attorney-General, and the hon. Chief Justice, as well as by the Law Society and the Bar Association. In consequence of their appreciation of this difficulty this Bill has been drafted. It remedies the situation which has been complained of, so that in a foreign country all deeds, wills, or other documents, may be sworn and proved not only before a consular representative for Barbados, but also before a Judge or any superior Court certified as such by our diplomatic or consular representatives.

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

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

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

7.25 p.m.

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, so far as I can see, the only things that would be left on the Order Paper to be done, apart from the matters which we have decided not to do because hon. members did not receive their Order Papers early enough, are the second reading of a Bill to provide retiring allowances, etc., and the Resolution for

\$35,000 which of course would have to be done in Committee of Supply, in respect of gratuities for former members. This would be a convenient point for hon. members to indicate whether they wish to take the dinner adjournment and do these two things after, or to tell the House whether they think they can get them done in a reasonable time. I would like some indication from the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I think the general feeling on this side of the House, at least so far as the Barbados Labour Party is concerned, is to take dinner first.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for one hour.

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

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

On Resumption:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I had intimated when we recessed that perhaps the House may wish to do the Retiring Allowances Bill and go back in Committee of Supply on the Resolution which we had not done. Since then, it seems as if hon. members, or at least the majority of them, would not wish to proceed with either of those Measures, and consequently would wish them to be left over until after the Christmas recess. In such a situation, I am entirely in the hands of the House, and if we do not proceed with these, there is nothing further in Government Business. I would like some indication from hon. members opposite of their feelings.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member says he is in the hands of the House. He suggested at the beginning of the day that we would proceed with this. It does not matter what anybody thinks about my being in a hurry to proceed with something. I am certainly not. You met at 12 o'clock and decided to be here tonight, and you said that the majority of hon. members seem not to be in favour of proceeding with them. I do not know how you got that. All I said was that the Resolution for former members should come after the Retiring Allowances Bill so that hon. members could equate one with the other. We know what the gratuities are. Is there any special reason for not proceeding?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I understand - I hope I did not misinterpret them - from at least two hon. members on the other side, that they regard one of these Bills as controversial. They probably regard both Pensions Bills, but certainly this one, I think, is controversial, and the majority of members on this side - I may tell the House that I do not share the view of either side on this matter - feel that we should not proceed with this Bill and this Resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the House has said that the majority of

members feel that the Bills are controversial. Now, as far as I am aware, the Standing Orders were suspended, which makes it in order for anything, whether it is controversial or not, to be discussed. As far as I am aware, I think hon. members, at least those over there, are interested in dealing with the Bill. If it is not dealt with, whenever the motion for the adjournment is moved, I am going to talk for two hours on matters affecting the same Bill; so he could as well go ahead. If he has something to hide, do not hide it, because I intend to speak tonight at any cost, if I speak until 3 o'clock tomorrow morning, and I can do it on the adjournment of the House, and nobody is going to close my mouth. I was quiet the whole day, but I will be speaking on a matter of public interest which affects this Bill and affects the youth of the country. If you try to shield it now that the heat is in the air, you can do so; but I will be speaking on the motion for adjournment and saying what I have to say.

8.35 p.m.

If you are afraid of what I have to say, do not deal with the Bill; I will still talk.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there are two Pension Bills before the House, as I understand it. I really feel that both of them should be dealt with tonight, but, in particular, I feel that the Provident Fund Bill which is a Bill in respect of which since 1956 the people have been promised - old people - and all of your Social Security and all of your legislation dealing with the provision for security and old age does not cover it. There could be no possible excuse for not dealing with the Sugar Workers Provident Fund Bill tonight. The only question in that Bill is whether the rate should be higher or not, and the other side has had an opportunity in Select Committee to get all the facts and figures before them in order to look at the present state of the investment and decide in their minds whether they should concede the point that the justice of the situation demands a higher rate. There could be no possible excuse for that. I am certainly opposing an adjournment at this stage, particularly when we have to deal with that Bill which should have been dealt with from 1956 and it is now 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it has always astonished me that hon. members can expend indignation on matters which are really trivial. The point, so far as this Provident Fund Bill is concerned, is that it is not my intention to proceed with it tonight because I believe that the Select Committee will have to meet again. Certain issues were raised in Committee, some of them by the hon. junior member for St. Peter who was a member of the Committee, and some of them raised by another hon. member, which points would not have to be further considered but upon which certain other deliberations would depend. It could well be that a delay in that might work to the advantage of the same points which certain hon. members were urging upon the House. In addition to this, it would be proper to hon. members, if they see these things in a general light, for the new Minister of Agriculture to make himself fa-

miliar with the background of this matter before the Committee meets again and before the matter is brought back to the House.

With respect to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, I think that all he has said proves my point, that if he feels so strongly on the Bill that he would wish to speak for three hours on it, this would be an indication to the House that it is regarded as a controversial matter. I cannot quarrel with him if he wishes to express his views on it. I certainly take the point made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the Provident Fund Bill is important, but since we cannot do this tonight, it might be as well not to proceed to deal with our Pensions Bill before we have dealt with the Provident Fund Bill. This, to me, would be a reasonable attitude to take. That is how I feel about it.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, if we may recall, the basis of the justification put forward by the Hon. Leader of the House earlier today for the suspension of the Standing Orders was that if the Standing Orders were not suspended, at 8.30 o'clock, the Moment of Interruption would come, there would be controversial matters, and unless we suspended these Standing Orders, the House would not be in a position to debate these matters tonight. If we take our Order Paper seriously, we will find that the Select Committee's Report was laid on the Table of the House on 14th December, 1968. I have a copy in my hand signed by the Chairman, Mr. Lloyd Smith - (Mr. SPEAKER: Signed by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.) - signed by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I was only adverting to the signature and I was trying to be accurate, truthful and factual and so I saw the signature here. "Lloyd E. Smith, Chairman."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am seeking information as to whether copies of this Report have yet been circulated. I understand that copies are in the Clerk's office.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I want to know - and I think that this is a very serious matter - if when you are going to put forward an excuse earlier in the day in the House, it is going to be founded on bad faith and on inaccurate information. What possible justification could the Hon. Leader of the House have had today to have misled this House when he said that he wanted the Standing Orders suspended because of the fact that these matters would come up later, and if we did not suspend the Standing Orders of the House, the matters would be controversial? Therefore, that was the basis of his application. The truth of this matter is that some time between then and now the Government feels - and the hon. Leader of the House, no doubt, with his capacity for receiving backdoor information, with his capacity for manoeuvring, with his well-known other capacities, has now got something in his mind, something up his sleeve. We were told today by the Hon. Leader of the House that these matters would have been done today. The Report has been circulated; if the Clerk has not circulated it, it is criminal negligence on his

part, and the time for dealing with these matters is now. We have reached a stage in this country where tolerance to attempts at immorality, incompetence, inefficiency and dishonesty has got to be stopped. You should either raise your political morality now, or this House of Assembly will be a House of Assembly that is known for anything being tolerated. I am not going to participate in, or be a party to, any such organization, and I have the courage that I will get up and say so. I am asking Your Honour to enquire whether this Report has been circulated, because somebody's head should roll if it has not been circulated.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not reply unless I am very roused to personal attacks. I do not think that I need reply now. I have already told the hon. senior member for Christ Church that there is not point in generating more anger on a matter than is necessary. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I did ask the House to do away with the customary Standing Orders which would have made us stop at 8.30 o'clock, because at 12 o'clock I anticipated that the debate on the Transport Board, and possibly other matters, might detain the House long enough; but I also said a few minutes ago, that I, personally, dissent from the point of view which states that these Bills should not be proceeded with.

8.45 p.m.

My own personal point of view is that we should proceed with them. I think the hon. senior member for St. Andrew misinterpreted what I had said. I am willing to proceed with the Pensions Bills, but I am only one member of the House. I get the feeling both on this side and on that side of the House that the Bills are regarded as controversial, and that the House will be detained for a considerable time on them.

I took the point of the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the Provident Fund Bill was important enough to be done. Well, this Bill will have to go back to the Select Committee. The Select Committee will have to look at it again, because some of the points raised in the Committee which could not be accommodated at the time when they were raised may well be accommodated now; therefore, the Committee should have a chance to look at the Bill again. I am, therefore, not wilfully preventing the House from doing the Provident Fund Bill or the Pensions Bills. I have a personal point of view on the Pensions Bills, and I think they ought to be done.

But I got the feeling that some of the members over there regard them as controversial and likely to detain the House and, unless I misinterpret the point of view of most of my colleagues over here, there is a feeling that we should not proceed to these Measures until we had concluded the Provident Fund Bill. From that point of view, I would not wish to proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the House said that I seem to have misunderstood him, or he seems to misunderstand me in respect

of my attitude to this matter. What I want to make abundantly clear is that at ten minutes to nine last night I received a letter from the Prime Minister revoking my appointment as Minister of Agriculture, and the reason given is the fact that I disagreed with certain provisions, or lack of provisions, in one of these Bills.

The Prime Minister gave a broadcast to the Nation, and I thought that today when the Bill was being dealt with it would only be fair for me to put my case to the people of my country. This is what I intend to do, Mr. Speaker. Now, this sort of muzzling has been going on for too long. (ASIDES.) I encouraged it today because I am decent, and more decent than a lot of people. I have always been a gentleman, and I will be a gentleman until I die. I do not even know if the Governor-General has money; I borrow money from the banks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member can discuss the matter now.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, nobody told the hon. Leader of the House that he had made his point. The hon. Leader of the House made his point, and I will continue to make mine. I think I was elected in here like anybody else, and I should be given an opportunity to make my point, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has earlier made his point on a personal explanation.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am speaking on the same issue that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has spoken at length on; I am speaking on the same issue that the senior member for Christ Church has spoken on, and I demand my rights, Mr. Speaker, to speak as lengthily as any of the others who have spoken on this same matter; nobody is stifling me tonight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members on both sides have spoken on matters which they feel should or should not be dealt with.

Mr. EDWARDS rose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I speak?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, and I will get back up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members on both sides have spoken merely on one theme, that is, whether we should not proceed, or whether we should proceed, with certain matters now without on either side going into details of either or any of those matters. There is no Motion before the House. I allowed the hon. Leader of the House, and the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition as well as other members to state their feelings about whether we should proceed, or should not proceed, with certain matters, but we may not discuss those matters unless and until we decide to initiate a discussion on them.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the same matters spoken on by the hon. junior mem-

ber for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and the matter I am speaking on is the question of proceeding with the business of the House: to wit, the Pensions Bill for Ministers and legislators in here as well as those who are holding office in the Other Place. I am also speaking, Mr. Speaker, on the question, when I come to it, of the Provident Fund Bill. I have a lot to say on that. Why it should be done, and why I should clear the air on it is that certain actions taken recently emanated from the fact that I said the people in this country should have \$5.00 a week from the Provident Fund. I was denied, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member, please, desist.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about my rights.

Mr. SPEAKER: So am I acting well within my rights. Let us get the air quite clear about this matter. It is for us to decide, and the Leader of the House to say, whether he proposes proceeding with Order this, that or the other.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is no dictatorship around here any longer. This is a democracy and I demand my rights. Mr. Speaker, are you willing to hear me now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is well aware that at this stage we are not speaking on any matter before the House. It is merely a question of whether we should adjourn the House, or suspend the sitting, or whether we should proceed with No. A, B or C, as the case may be, without going into details on any of those matters.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from going into any of those matters; I will state my point, and state why I feel that these matters should be dealt with. The same right that hon. members on either side of the House has been given to speak I should be given. I went to my constituents in St. Andrew; I asked them to elect me and send me to the Chamber to represent them and the people in this country.
8.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That point does not arise at this stage.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will show you, Mr. Speaker, how it has arisen.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wants to move that No. So-and-So be the next Order of the Day.....

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move that Order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On the other hand, the hon. member cannot move that a Government Measure be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I can get up and move that this be the next Order of the Day and speak on the motion which I move whether it be carried or not. It is not a Money Resolution. I am moving that a particular Order be the next Order of the Day, and in doing so I can speak on why I feel it should be the next Order of the Day; and it is in my name, Mr. Speaker.

I am moving that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day, and in doing so, I am saying why I feel it should be the next Order of the Day, Let anybody stop me now.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, 10th instant, I introduced this Bill in the House and had the second reading of it. It was referred to a Select Committee. Mr. Speaker, I was then the Minister. It seems as though at that time the sack was hanging over my head, which I am very proud of; and although I was the Minister responsible for this Bill, I have not received any notification of the time at which the Select Committee would meet. I was invited to sit on the Select Committee, but I was not notified of the time and hour of the meeting. I remember suggesting that the Committee meet the next day. As far as I am concerned, that was the end of it. Hence I did not attend the meeting. On Friday or Saturday a Report of the Select Committee was put in my hands. Now I can very well see, Mr. Speaker, the reason behind my not being invited to the Committee meeting. One hon. member over here, it was reported to me, who got up and advocated an increase to \$5.00 and also advocated a funeral grant, went and joined with other people not to stick to his guns for \$5.00. They want to be nasty; they lied on me, they libelled me, they did everything to me, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to tell the world; I am going to tell it to the people.

I am speaking on the motion which I moved, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is proposing that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day, and that is the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund. I am informed that a Report was presented on the 14th December, 1968. A motion will first have to be agreed to that that be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not completed my reason for moving that motion, and neither you nor anybody will stifle me. The hon. Leader of the House told me that the Select Committee had met. He can deny this if he likes, but I am not lying on him. I do not believe in going around lying on people. People can lie on me, but when they are finished, I know where I am going. I live somewhere and it is not the Government's house either; I bought it, I worked for it. They can tell as many lies on me as possible; they can say that I am this, I have done this, I have attempted to overthrow them, but they do not have any proof. They can say what they like, Mr. Speaker; but whenever they are finished, I am going to "Melbourne" which is mine.

Mr. SPEAKER: But irrespective of that, the hon. member may only speak in support of his motion that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day, and let him confine his remarks to the motion that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, every paragraph I will begin by saying "Order No. 5".

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not help the situation.

Mr. EDWARDS: But I said nobody is stifling me tonight. I am going to say what I have to say, and I am making it abundantly clear that I was elected in this Chamber. I can be "fired" from a Ministry, but I will not be "fired" from representing the people of my constituency. They can form all sorts of plans. Those in high office whose wives I had to tell what I thought of them, those in high office who represented the parish before and feel they have the right to represent the parish again, tell them to come. Let them discriminate against me. I am going to make them lose their deposits. Mr. Speaker, Order No. 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should make it very clear that repeating "Order No. 5" may be regarded as funny, but it has no bearing on the particular matter. The hon. member is moving that Order No. 5 which happens to stand in his name be the next Order of the Day. He may in so doing only adduce argument why Order No. 5 is preference, say, to Order No. X, Y or Z should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to point out why I think Order No. 5 ought to be the next Order of the Day. It involves provision of benefits for people, some of whom are my constituents, because I represent an agricultural community; people who are suffering; people who are every minute looking to see when this legislation will pass for them to receive \$5.00 a week that the then Minister recommended for them; people who are concerned over the fact that this benefit which they should receive is remaining so long to reach them; people who have been coming to me day in and day out; people who were employed at Scotland Factory and had to go home ill. My colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, can tell you that there is a man living in Lakes who four or five years ago had to go home suffering from a heart ailment after working at Scotland Factory. There is another old man who came out, unfortunately, the year before Scotland Factory closed, and is today living on wind-pies. I can go all through my constituency and tell you that people there are suffering as a result of the delay in establishing this Provident Fund scheme; so why come tonight and tell me that this Bill must wait for another week? When it waits for another week, it will wait for another month.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are suffering, and my first duty is to them until they "fire" me. When they "fire" me, I will not be with them again. In fact, I am sure when my constituents "fire" me,

they are not going to lie on me; and they will only "fire" me if I was not doing a good job; but as long as I am doing a good job and doing my duty to my constituents and the people of my country, my constituents will not "fire" me. The only time that you "fire" a man who is doing a good job is if you want to bring down the country.

9.05 p.m.

It is not I who would be trying to bring down anybody; it is the other people who have objects in bringing down other people. There are people who are trying to bring down me, but I know that my constituents are depending on this Bill which is Order No. 5. My constituents are depending on it. I am saying that Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day, and it is for me to convince this House that Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day, because my constituents want it to be the next Order of the Day. They can team up on me and I can tell them that as long as I come here and tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day, my constituents are not going to "fire" me, because I am doing a good job; I am doing the job which they have sent me here to do. The only time that my constituents will "fire" me if I am doing a fine job and if everybody knows that I am doing a fine job in the interest of the country, is if they themselves want to pull down the country, I am not saying that anybody wants to pull down the country; they may want to pull me down.

Some people who have run from the people who have elected them to this House without giving them notice, may have their eyes on the seat which I have in St. Andrew. Therefore, they will introduce legislation and put Clauses in legislation which they know I will not agree with. Do you know why, Sir? It is because they came back here and wanted a split to be the Leader of a Party; they wanted to be the Deputy Leader of a Party. (Mr. HINDS: Are you sleeping? Wake up.) No, I am not sleeping; I do not sleep. If you want to do something, you pull down the barrier which is in your way and some nit-wits cannot see that when they pull down others, they themselves are going to be pulled down. You can imagine a man who is running away from the people. I have not run away from the people of St. Andrew yet; I have no intention of doing so. They have sent me here to represent them on this Provident Fund and I am speaking on it because I feel that it should be done. You can hide up whatever you like, but I am putting the blame where it should go. As to talking about coming and discussing matters, discussing what? The people who were forced into taking action on certain matters even if it is Order No. 5, were forced into taking this action because they were blinded; they cannot see what is happening. But let them come to St. Andrew; they will lose their deposit. I am waiting for them. You ran away from the people already and do you expect them to take you again? I feel that Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day because my constituents have sent me here to represent them on these matters. I do not feel that my constituents should wait for: 50 years after they have worked and done a good job in the sugar industry, before they receive benefits. I feel that every man

is entitled to what is his. I feel that even every young person and not only the old people in this country who have already made their contributions - I feel that if a young man has made his contribution or if young men have made their contributions which are measurable to any, even if it is their contribution to the Sugar Industry Provident Fund, which is Order No. 5 on this Order Paper, they are entitled to what is theirs. I feel that if that contribution is made, whether a man is old or young, whether somebody likes him or not, whether he gets up and tells a man what he thinks of him when he feels that he ought to do so, whether he lets everybody know that he is fearless, afraid of no man, young, strong, vigorous, intelligent and a lot more intelligent than a lot of them, fears no man in town - don't worry your head over him because he must get through - he should be given what is his, whether he lets them know that or not.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I reserve the right to speak on any matter in here. My constituents, some of whom are entitled to benefits under the provisions of this Bill which is Order No. 5 on which I am speaking, have given me the right to make constructive criticism on any issue which comes up in this country. If I belong to a Party I am going to vote with that Party, but that cannot stop me from saying how I feel. If my conviction is such, after having made my speech, that I should not vote for a Measure, I will go outside; but as long as I am with a Party, I will vote with it. If the Party to which I belong and from which I have not yet resigned - they will have to resign me because my constituents have sent me here on a ticket and I have no intention of resigning from that ticket unless they tell me to resign. If people victimise me for talking on this Bill or on any matter, and for saying how I feel about it, they will tell my constituents why have they done so. Victimise me and go in St. Andrew! I fought it amongst my constituents almost single-handedly, especially in 1966, and despite fearful odds, I was elected as senior member for the constituency.

9.15 p.m.

I shall be senior member again as long as I represent the cause of my people. Especially when I speak on a matter like the provision and establishment of the Provident Fund, which is Order No. 5, I should like to see it done. They are not going to "fire" me without a cause, because they know that I have done a good job. They know that I have been doing an honest job, and agriculturists throughout this country, even yesterday, went on record with their comments that it was a job well done. I mean a job well done in respect of the provision of the Provident Fund legislation. I was the man who pressed it home for the people of this country. I refer to the provision of Provident Fund legislation for the poor, hungry, starving people who do not have a dollar to buy bread, who do not have the next dress to wear, who cannot wear mini-skirts or shorty shorts - people who cannot do that sent me here.

I like to oppose, but sometimes when people oppose certain things they have to suffer. One thing I am not going to oppose, and it is the provision or

the establishment of the Provident Fund for sugar workers, which is Order No. 5, which I should like to see done. Mr. Speaker, some people do not like you to oppose them. Some people cannot appreciate constructive criticism; they can appreciate dummies; they can appreciate "Yes-men", I was never a "Yes-man". If I feel that you are a fool, by any epithet with which it can be qualified, I will tell you so straight.

I feel it is stupid, Mr. Speaker, not to do Order No. 5 tonight. I feel it is an act of grave indifference. I feel that it is an action taken which is not in the interest of the poor agricultural workers who have been dying since 1956. The Attorney-General can tell you, if he would like to be truthful for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that I implored him to let me get this legislation before the House before Christmas for the poor people. Can you imagine somebody coming in here to tell me that it cannot be done? They cannot kick me from "Melbourne" nor can they kick me from St. Andrew. If they bring guns, I have guns, too. If they want to fight, I can fight. If they bring dogs, I have eight dogs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking and every other member must remain silent. I am merely reminding the hon. member of Standing Order 26(9):

"The conduct of Members of either House of the Legislature shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion."

I just want to remind the hon. member that he referred to the Attorney-General, and that the Attorney-General is a member of the Other Place.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, are you telling me that I should not tell the House how co-operative the Attorney-General was in letting me get this legislation before the House before Christmas? The Committee reported late, and the Bill went to the Attorney-General, and he co-operated with me in order to get it down here before Christmas. I am saying that anybody who suggests that this should not be done tonight can only be a traitor to his country and to the poor agricultural workers who are suffering in this country today. (ASIDES)

I do not care who reports me; I have a big mouth and I can report myself to my constituents. You can look for a lot of fire in here. Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that Order No. 5 which affects all agricultural workers in this country who have reached a certain age - (ASIDES) Let them curse me; I do not beg them for anything. Order No. 5 is in my name, Mr. Speaker, and I can speak on it and I feel that it should be the next Order of the Day. How in the name of Heaven Order No. 5 is standing in my name on this Order Paper today and somebody is going to tell me, without even consulting me, that it ought not to be done? If you want fire, you will get fire and brimstone. I do not interfere with anybody; so do not interfere or do not trouble me.

I have made my point. Mr. Speaker, I feel that, in the interest of my constituents and the agricul-

tural workers in this entire Island and my constituency in particular, it should be done tonight. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it should be done, and I also feel that anybody who would like to delay legislation - if you are going to give them the \$5.00 that I have asked for them, you may do so. (ASIDES) I am not saying what caused the row. I know that I was not to get back the seat in St. Andrew, because other people feel that they should get it when they ran away from the people in St. Andrew.

Mr. Speaker, I have an issue to deal with for the people in my constituency, and it is the Provident Fund Bill at Order No. 5. Before I took any action I had to go to my constituency. I never ran away from my constituents yet. I do not get up against anybody. They had to talk to my wife straight and tell her what the business was. I bear a lot. Do not trouble me; I do not trouble anybody. (ASIDES) I could not care less; I live at "Melbourne", at Joy Edwards. I do not beg for anything, and they cannot stop me from living.

I will tell the world that I am interested in the Provident Fund legislation, and I am interested in its being introduced in the House tonight for the people of Barbados in general, and the people of my constituency in particular. You spite me without a cause, and you spite my constituents. I have a lot more to talk about on this Order No. 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of speaking on Order No. 5, but whether or not Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day. You must give the reason why it should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be the next Order of the Day. As Minister of Labour I introduced it, and I asked the hon. Attorney-General to assist me in getting legislation ready because I wanted it on our Statute Books in this country before Christmas.
9.25 p.m.

I called him on the telephone and told him that I did not want the House to go on recess before it was introduced. They were promised it for too long, and it would hurt my heart, Mr. Speaker, if it were not done tonight. I do not have any ability; I am too young to deserve what more elderly ones should have; but I am young and strong enough to represent the sugar workers in this country, and to say that I would like this legislation passed today so that these sugar workers can get what is theirs. A lot of us will be receiving heavy pay cheques and can buy ourselves a good Christmas meal, but what can these people buy themselves? Some of us do not even remember them. All my life I have been making contributions to people like these, making them feel they are alive, making them feel they have a place in society. I am too young to let my voice be heard; I am a junior. The fact that I fought for these people; the fact that I have done a job which I can challenge any to better; the fact that I feel that my people are entitled to the benefits of a Provident

Fund Scheme should be a glaring example that if a man can do these things, he cannot do better. Our Lord died for this world when he was at the age of thirty-three. There were outstanding Prime Ministers in their twenties.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that I am not too young, and no young man in this country is too young, having adult suffrage or having reduced the voting age to eighteen years, making it possible for a boy to leave school and come to represent agricultural workers through a Provident Fund at the age of twenty-one, since you have made it possible for him to enter the Legislature at that age. He has had to make very unfavourable decisions, decisions which incurred on him the wrath of the mercantile community in this country. This is what a young man in politics suffers, especially when he is representing agricultural workers who should have a Provident Fund. He has incurred the wrath of many people, and he has put himself out of the way because he has the youth and energy to do it. The electorate did not say that that boy at 21 years was too young to represent agricultural workers.

Mr. SPEAKER: What we are concerned with now is whether Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am dealing with the need to deal with Order No. 5 which deals with agricultural workers, and these can be represented by the youth of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Irrespective of whether it is by the youth or otherwise, it is a question of whether Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day, and whether one really wants it to be the next Order of the Day. It can only be decided on a vote of this House.

Mr. EDWARDS: But the vote can only come after the person moving the motion shall have completed what he has to say on the motion. I have told you already that nobody is going to stifle me in here tonight.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intention of attempting to stifle anyone, but it is my duty to see that the Standing Orders are complied with, and that there is no attempt at filibustering or being repetitive. I am merely reminding the hon. member that he may urge every possible argument which he thinks fit why Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: This is exactly what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. I have great respect for you. I know that you would never attempt to stifle me, but I cannot say it of a lot of other people. People try to stifle others in many forms. One hears: "You are too young and giddy-headed; you have got too big for your boots; therefore let me legislate against you and the youth of your country." I am saying here that nobody is going to detain legislation which looks after the people in the sugar industry. As I said, anybody doing that is a traitor to his country.

I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion, I hope that if I speak and say anything which the Hon. Mover of this motion thinks has introduced fresh matter, he will not hesitate to reply, because of necessity, some of the facts which I am going to mention in my speech are derived second-hand. Why I think that Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day is this, Mr. Speaker: when the second reading of this Bill was being debated in this House, the hon. member who has just sat down, the former Minister of Agriculture, indicated on that occasion that he thought that a figure of \$5.00 was more suitable than a figure of \$3.60 which is found in the original Bill as the weekly payment. I understand on that occasion that this had been put up by a member of Cabinet, and Cabinet had not accepted it. I now understand from the Leader of the House with whom I had a conversation a moment ago that if the Minister, the hon. member who has just sat down, who is now leaving the House, had been at the Select Committee whose Report was circulated to me, there was a possibility that they may have accepted this figure of \$5.00. I did not in fact see in the Report of the Select Committee which was signed "L. E. Smith, Chairman" - I take that to mean the hon. senior member for St. Joseph - any reference to that, but if the Leader of the House was waiting for the opinion of the former Minister of Agriculture before he allowed this Bill to come forward, as far as I am concerned he had the opinion of the former Minister. If the Select Committee, having discussed and debated this matter, was waiting only to hear whether the hon. senior member for St. Andrew agreed with \$3.60 or \$5.00, then the Select Committee could not be waiting for very much, because it has been clear - and it is clearer even now from the burden of the speech of the Mover of this motion that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day - that he does not consider the lower figure appropriate.

9.35 p.m.

I mention that, Mr. Speaker, because I would urge on the House that the reasons for the postponement are wholly specious. The Hon. Leader of the House has suggested that we should give the hon. senior member for St. Peter some time to acquaint himself with the background of the Bill before proceeding with it. Well, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter sought no time before getting up and making the longest speech from that side on a Resolution dealing with transport. No matter how long he is in the Government, as long as he is Minister of Agriculture, I daresay that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas will not give him the opportunity of acquainting himself with the details of the Transport Board Resolution. If he is so brave in dealing with another Minister's portfolio, why can't he be brave and deal with this matter? Why is it that the Hon. Leader of the House has to speak for him? He got up today and made a long speech about a Resolution for \$300,000 on the Transport Board, and, in fact, nobody in this Hon. House can doubt that the

only discussions which the hon. senior member for St. Peter had on that Resolution at all were with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The only acquaintance with the details came from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Nobody can doubt that, and yet he could speak on transport; well, why can't he speak on this Bill now? If he has such an approach to the problems of Government that, on the first day he turns his coat, he finds himself able to represent a line - it is true not very successfully, but he still finds himself able to make a speech on it - why can't he go on and make a speech on this Bill? The argument that we must give the new Minister of Agriculture an opportunity to understand the Bill, in my humble opinion, falls to the ground.

More than that, the Minister of Agriculture has made remarks about the experience of, I gather, the hon. senior member for St. James and the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Well, I can say that I have had a few years' experience of him, and I do not believe that in six months he would understand the details of this Bill any better than he understands them today. As far as that argument is concerned, he can do it now, and he would do it as well as he ever would do it, as well as he will ever be able to do it, as well as he did the Transport Resolution and as well as, perhaps, he addressed a meeting of the St. Peter constituency branch of the Barbados Labour Party, urging them to unity and Party loyalty last Friday night.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot see how that affects the issue of Order No. 5 being the next Order of the Day and seconding that motion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments used by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is that we should not deal with Order No. 5 because we should give the hon. senior member for St. Peter some time to acquaint himself with it. I am suggesting (a) that to give him time he still will not understand anything better than he understands it today or (b) he has already demonstrated his willingness to jump in with both his feet. It is that aspect of the argument of the Hon. Leader of the House with which I am dealing. After all, this is a debating Chamber and we do not just put forward points in obstruction. We have to use illustrations in order to further what we mean and we have to answer points made by other persons. If there is one of the facts which emerged from Oxford in that period of fantasy 1943 - 44 - 45, if there is one fact surrounding the person of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, it is that he was really the President of the Oxford Union. I read his speech myself in the debating book at the Union. I turned it up and I cannot say that it enthralled me or had any magical words in it; certainly it was not so thrilling as the article written by his friend, Mr. Stanley Barker.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I am sure that neither the speech nor the article refer to Order No. 5 being the next Order of the Day.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Mr. Speaker, but I am mentioning that to indicate that whatever his understanding of a Measure arising out of a file may be or whatever his capacity for administering the Ministry of Education may be, I leave the Prime Minister to be the best judge of that; nevertheless he has credentials which should cause us to regard him as a skilled debater. Those of us who see through him perhaps do not see him in that light, but there are hon. members of this House who may think that the Hon. Leader of the House made a point and therefore I want to answer the point. That is what speeches are about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member would proceed to answer the point.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it, but I had better go over it again.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the hon. member's concise and non-repetitive manner.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It deals with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. One of the arguments - in fact he rang me yesterday and told me that he was a Minister because of his difficult financial circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has no connection at all with Order No. 5 being the next Order of the Day, which motion I understand the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas to be seconding.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I heard so loud an interruption on my left - I was not looking, but I assume that no hon. member would break Standing Order No. 29(5) - which deals with the behaviour of members not speaking - with so loud a voice, especially a member with the experience of my junior colleague, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not realise that that hon. member was on the left of the hon. member who is now standing. I thought that he was in another direction.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not so good at navigation perhaps, but I would say that he is slightly over to my left. I would say South by South-west. I gather that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is giving you directions as to how you should direct me to conduct my speech. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You should make him sit down or name him!) Shall I sit down while he instructs you, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Thomas bear in mind the relevant Standing Order in connection with the conduct of members not speaking? Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas proceed with his speech in seconding the motion that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am reading from Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition. This is what it says here on page 295:-

"A Bill is a draft of a legislative proposal and when it has passed through its various stages in both Houses and received the Royal Assent, becomes an Act of Parliament. Bills are subdivided into public, private and hybrid". Then it goes on to say, and this is the point I am trying to make, "public Bills are so-called because they deal with matters of public general interest. In most cases they are introduced and piloted through a by a member of the Government."

This Bill was not piloted through the House by a member of the Government, because the senior member for St. Andrew is no longer a Government Minister and therefore he cannot pilot the Bill through the House. I do not see why we should be here wasting time diluting and getting on with this kind of nonsense any longer. I am asking Your Honour to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. I am well aware of the passage to which he refers and he himself read that it deals, in most cases, with a Bill piloted by a member of the Government. We have not yet reached the stage of deciding that we will deal with this Bill.

9.45 p.m.

The only motion before the House is that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day. If that motion were passed, then other considerations will arise.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I trust that you enjoyed the instructions being given to you by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as much as I did. Were they relevant, Mr. Speaker, I would have been surprised; that they were well read surprised me even more. I think we should really invite the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to start giving us all lectures in constitutional law even though, perhaps, he would have to have the dictionary at his side to define for him what are Bills and what are Motions. Mr. Speaker, without being so presumptuous as he, might I happily add as a postscript to your Ruling that in any case this is a Bill which has already partly been piloted through the House by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have not got to that stage yet. We are now considering a motion that No. 5 be the next Order of the Day. We have not even reached a stage to say what No. 5 is.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I hope that that is not a suggestion to me to debate the mystic qualities of the number "5", because I find myself quite unable to separate the motion which was moved by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day from the fact that it is an Order to provide for the Third Reading of a Bill called a Provident Fund for agricultural labourers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in a way I wish the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was here, because I have been persecuting him over a number of months over this matter of the Provident Fund for agricultural workers in my own constituency, St. Thomas, which is shared by the Minister of Communications and Works. I speak for myself and, I believe, the Minister. We have to face constant requests from people, many of them poor widows and ladies unable to work any longer, or who feel they are unable to work; persons who have been injured, perhaps, at work, or persons, indeed, who are in a worse position still, who have been injured away from work and can no longer work; persons who have passed retiring age; persons who have reached a late age and have fallen out with the manager. That is the most tragic case of all, because you have to advise them that after 60 years in a plantation you can be sent home with a week's pay. Like the bearer of bad tidings, Mr. Speaker, all too often you feel yourself being politically put to the sword when you tell them that there is nothing you can do, and that if Mr. Mahon says he is not going to give them the money they cannot put him in Court for it. They then feel you are in league with Mr. Mahon, or the owner, or the manager, as the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, these tragic cases come before our attention all the time. For some years, I believe, the smaller plantation, or the more recalcitrant plantation managers or owners have been saying to persons to whom they do not feel like giving an *ex gratia* pension: "Every year we pay our money into the Provident Fund, and that is the Fund out of which you must get your pension." Mr. Speaker, this must be within the experience of everybody who represents an agricultural constituency, and everybody who has lived or worked on a plantation in the country that there is this feeling that there should be pensions, that the pensions offered by the plantations are too small or in some cases non-existent, and that people get turned off from work without adequate compensation.

There in Redman's Village, Mr. Speaker, is an old blind man living. He fell out with Lion Castle Plantation some years ago - about four or five years ago. I believe that the hon. member would know Mr. Leacock. He went to the plantation and had an argument over boundaries; he cut some bananas; the plantation put him in Court for stealing bananas; they brought expensive Counsel instructed by expensive Solicitors in Bridgetown; he represented himself, won the case, and they put him off the land, and he had to go and get a Government house in Redman's Village with no pension. Because he fought the plantation through the Courts and won a case involving a few hands of bananas, he was thrown off. He has no pension and he is blind, Mr. Speaker. He has talked about this for a long time. He has worked and his family has never lived, as far as one can judge, other than on Lion Castle Plantation. I dare say if you will trace back you will find that his family was emancipated as slaves on Lion Castle Plantation, but he has now been turned off after generations with no pension at all.

Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of person for whom we are urging that the Provident Fund be made law before Christmas, so that if he cannot get the money in his hand before Christmas, at least he has a Christmas present of knowing that the people he sent to the House of Assembly fought for it and got that passed into law.

Earlier this year, when I mentioned another very tragic case to the ex-Minister, he indicated that he hoped by the end of this year to have the legislation. Mr. Speaker, can we doubt that the main-spring behind bringing this Provident Fund legislation to the House is the ex-Minister, when the minute he is out of office the Leader of the House says he does not want it to go any further? The very day that the Minister is fired from office, after promising and to my knowledge fighting to get this legislation through, they do not want to give him credit for it. They want to hold it up.

Mr. Speaker, I welcomed the Provident Fund legislation when it was first circulated to members. I told a number of people in St. Thomas that I could not promise them anything, but I understood that the Bill would be passed before Christmas. It took time actually to reach here to be debated; I know nothing of the Select Committee's deliberations except what I see here cyclostyled. In the Report, Mr. Speaker, I observe that the only positive recommendation that is made is to give \$100.00 to defray funeral expenses for undertakers. That is the only positive recommendation in the Report of the Select Committee chaired by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. More benefit for undertakers; but I understand that the question of \$5.00 per week was also canvassed there.

Mr. Speaker, I urge again that hon. members support this. This has been going on for years. For years the Provident Fund has been there. We levelled in 1964 against the Government a charge that it was hypocrisy to talk about putting a windfall into Mr. Frank Walcott's hands to provide funds for the workers when the Government itself had much more money along with the windfall money and could not work out a scheme for distributing the money. That was as long ago as 1964. When at long last the wheels have turned and a Provident Fund Bill comes before the House - nobody can doubt, after what happened to Mr. Frank Walcott, the potency of the windfall issue.
9.55 p.m.

The Government took four years to bring it here from the time of the windfall, although the argument was before their eyes, and now there is a wish to postpone it yet again; and postponing it into whose hands? The hands of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, a member who once occupied that dignified seat in which you sit, Mr. Speaker, but not with the dignity with which Your Honour occupies the Chair; the hon. member for St. Peter who forced the Chaplain to resign due to his behaviour. Now the poor agricultural workers of this country have to wait.....

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is making personal reference to me, and I do not think he should be allowed to do so under the Standing Orders of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. Thomas proceed to give any further reasons he may have to adduce as to why No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. senior member for St. Peter objects to personal references, I withdraw them, because truthfully they are only matters of hearsay. I stood in England and heard about the gin and the woman in the Chamber, and I could not personally know about it. Therefore I withdraw these references. Nevertheless I can say that I have had some experience with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and I have not found him to be a person of such competence in my personal dealings with him or probity after what he told me yesterday on the telephone that would permit me to feel that this House will gain anything by postponing this Resolution for his further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the senior member for St. Thomas has used the word "probity" in reference to an hon. member of the House. I regard the word "probity" and the suggestion that an hon. member of this House lacks probity as offensive or insulting, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I really am very sorry. I did not appreciate that when I said 'in my opinion after what he told me yesterday he has not got probity' it was offensive, and therefore I withdraw the word "probity".

Mr. SPEAKER: Obviously in the connection in which it was used.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What I should say is this: in my personal dealings with the member, I have never found that he had application or competence. I do not believe they are offensive, and hence I am to say, Sir, that yesterday on the telephone when indicating to me that the Prime Minister had invited him to become a Minister and he had accepted, he told me it was due to his financial circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that personal conversations or alleged personal conversations between hon. members come in bad taste, and particularly from a member like the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas. It is bad taste and I ask the hon. member to desist.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It was not only a conversation. He wrote a letter and said how bad his financial circumstances were.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot arise in this connection as to whether Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day. Another opportunity may arise for these matters to be dealt with.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thought the hon. senior member for St. Peter was rising. I can send him a copy of the letter if he has forgotten. He may have written it in the sort of condition he was in in the middle of this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am entitled to presume that that letter has no reference to the order of proceedings.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is entitled to some opportunity to defend himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order, but I quite appreciate.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is no point of order; this is a point of commonsense. Now I am making this appeal. Poverty is no crime. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas was a Barbados Scholar, and a man of his position should not be referring to personal things between himself and the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I do not agree with it, and I do not give a damn who thinks it is right. Personal things between the two of them, with letters passing, should not be referred to.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a point of commonsense and a point of decency. I would not do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said I regard it as being in bad taste. I am afraid conditions are becoming difficult and I may have to refer to the Gallery. If I do, automatically it has to be cleared. I may have to.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, just let us get this quite clear. You, Sir, referred to bad taste and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown talked about personal letters. The hon. senior member for St. Peter rang me in my connection as Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party giving me information to be passed on - not anything personal; and the letter was written to the Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party for the information of those to whom it had to be drawn. This is not a personal letter begging me for money.

Mr. SPEAKER: A letter for the information of members of the Barbados Labour Party is a letter for the information of them, and not for members of the Barbados House of Assembly.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member has instructed me to publish it, I have no alternative but to publish the letter in the Press or wherever I am instructed to publish it. It is a part of the archives in Roebuck Street that was taken out and copied for a certain purpose; so do not tell me about personal letters or bad taste. I have some idea about taste.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and it may differ from other hon. member's or my own. It is a matter en-

tirely for the hon. member how and where and when he publishes these letters.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: At least, Mr. Speaker, I have not falsely reported the personal conversation I had with the Governor-General, or the Governor-General has not had to say so to anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has no relation to whether Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day. The hon. member must recall that there is a Standing Order which says that the conduct of the Governor-General shall not be called in question.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am praising the conduct of the Governor-General in contacting the persons relevant to contradict certain things that were said on television last night. I am not calling his conduct in question; I am congratulating him in not allowing certain persons to get away with certain things.

Mr. Speaker, what better Christmas present can you give these people but a Provident Fund? Just look at it that way. What political manoeuvre is at the back of this refusal to deal with it? Is it a desire somehow to accommodate the Chairman of the Select Committee? Again truthfully I doubt that. I have no impression on that matter. What is the possible reason for adjourning it? When I asked the Leader of the House, all he told me was that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew had not been to the Select Committee and he did not know what his views were on the \$5.00. I am glad the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is back here now. I believe he can tell us what his views on the \$5.00 are, and if that is the hold-up and the only serious hold-up that the Leader of the House can suggest to me, let us hear from him and let him satisfy the Leader of the House. Let us give the people their money, Mr. Speaker.
10.05 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the importance of this Bill is so great, that we should approach it in a calm and unemotional manner. We are dealing with a provision to permit the payment of a sum of money to people for whom everybody in all Parties on both sides of the House must have pity and consideration for their plight, people who have devoted years of their life to contribute to the economic welfare of this country. I heard someone say that poverty is no crime. It has been visibly brought to my mind very lately that to be in a financial strait is to be in such a condition in which one is forced to throw considerations of honour, integrity and decency to the wind. That is the position in which, Mr. Speaker, circumstances can throw people. If that is so with people who are educated, if that is so with people who, for years, have tried their best to maintain an appearance of honour and integrity, what is the position with the sugar workers who have retired, who are ill and who can only get \$3.00 a week by way of old age pension - and if they live in a constituency like mine in Christ Church and they go to get National Assistance, they can only get 50 cents a week?

Sir, I remember, and politics is really a remarkable thing, that it was the Hon. Leader of the House who, some years ago, came in here with his basket. The pension was \$ 1.80 a week then. It is \$3.00 a week now, but the cost of living has risen considerably since the pension was \$1.80 a week. I am not trying to say that \$3.00 a week today is going to buy the same as what \$1.80 per week would have bought in those days. I have my great doubts about that, because since November last year, the impact of devaluation on the cost of living in this country has been great and I have always said, not only in here but on public platforms many times, that I think that one of the greatest means of preventing social unrest and discord in your country is for the Government to ensure that there is a basic minimum living wage in your country. There can be no doubt about that. To be under economic pressure is to be a slave, and nobody knows that better than the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Nobody knows that better than he. Pity from other people cannot give you bread and butter, it cannot pay your bills and the hon. member says one of these feeble years Christmas is coming around the corner, next year is coming in and you cannot even go to the shopkeeper and trust upon the contingent right to receive in the future a well-known form of security, as Your Honour will no doubt remember in law. There are some people who would give you advances on credit on the basis and on the fact that you have an expectation. There is no expectation in this. This is a Bill which has passed its second reading, and the only thing which is before the House now is a motion for the third reading. That is the stage which we have reached and it is the height of - I want to use parliamentary language - specious reasoning to come in here and say that the Bill has become controversial when it was known that it was going to be controversial, and that was the reason given for the suspension of the Standing Orders today.

In the next place, to say that the Select Committee had not reported when the Select Committee had reported and, thirdly, to say that there were certain recommendations which have to go back in Select Committee - I am going to expose the hypocrisy of that statement because, if that were so, earlier today when it was suggested that the Standing Orders should be suspended, surely then it was known that the Bill had to go back in Select Committee. The whole thing is an attempt to postpone this matter tonight in order to give an appearance. I do not care what the appearance is; people should not think that you can make political capital out of \$3.00 or \$5.00 a week. If you think so, it is only an indication of your contempt for the people, the poor people who have to receive it. If you think that the holding up of a promise of the difference between \$3.60 and \$5.00 is such a great thing, you could as well go to the rum shop and buy that. I am beginning to believe that there are a number of people on that side of the House who believe that the power of money is the greatest manipulator and the greatest thing in the world that you can use and you can buy everybody with. I can only say this. When we think

that tonight is the last session, how do we look in the eyes of the agricultural workers and in the eyes of reasonable people in Barbados in relation to a Provident Fund which, for 12 years, the various legislators in Barbados were thinking of passing for the agricultural workers? A Committee was set up and in the newspapers all around Barbados it was given front-page treatment; the agricultural workers looked forward to it and we come in here now and decide that we are not going to deal with it today, we are going to postpone it until the new year! That is a serious thing. I hope that hon. members tonight will remember that this Bill was introduced on this side of the House and it could never be controversial. It was welcomed by an all-Party agreement. You look at the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. It is set out there that from 1956 moneys have been allocated from the Labour Welfare Fund because it was decided and it was known that whether you bring in a Social Security Scheme or not, there would be a number of people in the agricultural industry who, by reason of their age, would not qualify for a pension, a grant or anything under the Social Security Scheme and therefore special provision by a special Bill had to be made for them. We have it here now. 10.15 p.m.

The Fund is there; the money is there; it is only the unwillingness of the men in the Legislature at the present moment that prevents it from being passed tonight. If they have hearts of stone, Mr. Speaker, God in Heaven will deal with them as He dealt with Judas previously.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is really regrettable, I think, that hon. members on that side of the House should misinterpret my motives in suggesting that we ought not to proceed with this Bill this evening. I do not know of any hon. member, and I emphasize "hon. member" on either side of this House who should need to be told or lectured about the necessity of having this Bill enacted into law as soon as possible; but there are certain facts I think that the hon. House and hon. members should know, if they do not know already.

First of all, this Bill was introduced and had its second reading last week. It was agreed on all sides, in view of certain issues which were raised on the second reading, that it should go to a Select Committee so that these issues which were raised could be examined and dealt with and the appropriate recommendations made. I was a member of that Select Committee, and I do not think that I have received a summons to the meeting of the Committee, but I knew before the House adjourned on that evening that the Committee was to have met on the next afternoon at three o'clock.

I understood on that occasion that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew had known of the likelihood of the Committee meeting within 24 hours. I have no impression that he disagreed with that, because like everybody else he saw the urgency for completing the Bill in the shortest time possible. It is not my responsibility that the Committee's Re-

port has not been circulated to hon. members. In Committee the hon. junior member for St. Peter did urge the necessity for increasing the weekly benefit from \$3.60 to \$5.00, and I took it upon myself to point out to him that, while there would be no disagreement on the necessity for that, I could not commit either the Cabinet or the Minister in the Minister's absence, and certainly if the Minister were then present and felt able to accept that amendment, neither the senior member for St. George nor myself would have opposed it.

I would think myself that the reason why that particular amendment was not carried then was that the Minister, for reasons which he has explained and which I have no reason not to accept, was not then present. A lot of things have happened since then. The position is this. Hon. members are pressing the completion of this Bill. Between the time the House last met and now there has been a new Minister. The former Minister, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, had the file in his possession - as he had every right to have it in his possession - over the week end because he would have had it here on Saturday when the House met, and, since it is his Ministry's file, it was perfectly correct for him to have it in his possession. Equally correctly, he passed it back over here today.

Now I myself do not think the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the new Minister, has had a chance to study the file which he has not yet seen. I thought that, as would be accepted by any reasonable person, the hon. senior member for St. Peter should have a chance, out of courtesy to him, to study the file which he had not yet seen so that he should acquaint himself with the matter. That is one point of my objection to proceeding. The other point will be this, Mr. Speaker. If hon. members are urging that the weekly pension should be now increased from \$3.60 to \$5.00, I could not commit the Government to that here and now on the floor of this House. The hon. Minister would have to consult the Cabinet and the financial advisers of the Government as to the feasibility of that. He would have to acquaint himself and satisfy himself on that point, or as an alternative the Select Committee should be summoned to meet again to consider that point and make a firm recommendation to the House, in which case the new Minister whose name, I would imagine, would be added to those on the Select Committee would have had a chance to understand the position as he sees it, or have it clarified for him after he has made his consultations. That is only fair.

If the House wishes to proceed to finishing the Bill tonight, I could undertake to finish it in the form in which it passed the second reading plus those amendments which have come from the Select Committee, but I could not undertake to commit the Cabinet to the new figure of \$5.00, because I had no consultations with anybody about it. It would be for the House to decide, if it wishes the Bill passed tonight, then it would have to be passed in the form in which the House approved the second reading plus those proposals which have so far emerged out of

the Select Committee. If, on the other hand, the House is still insisting that \$5.00 should be the new figure, then, in fairness to the new Minister as well as to the Select Committee itself, further consultations should take place. (ASIDES)

The point is that the Government is not resisting the suggestion, but I cannot commit the Cabinet to a new figure which has financial implications unless I have further consultations, and more so unless the new Minister, who is responsible for it, has time to advise himself on the matter. That is only fair.
10.25 p.m.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, if the House is insisting on having the Provident Fund Bill enacted at this moment, it can do so, but on the understanding either that there may have to be amendments made to certain vital sections of the Bill within the nearest future, or, if it does not wish to do it this way but wants to make sure that the provision of \$5.00 is in, it would do no harm to postpone - or rather - not to proceed on the basis of the old provision, and to wait until either the Select Committee has met again and reconsidered this point, or until the Minister is himself ready to advise as a result of his findings or upon his study of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the fairest way to look at it, and either of these alternatives can be adopted without rancour or without recrimination. There is no need whatever for us to be embittered with one another on a matter like this, because the matter itself does not divide the House. I want to emphasise that there is no question therefore of anybody thinking that they want \$5.00, but that the Government is resisting it. I think the former Minister knows more about it than I do, and I certainly have not had the impression in all that I have heard about it or read about the matter that anybody was resisting the \$5.00. All the impression I have had was that there was a consensus that that would have been desirable if it were financially feasible. If you want the Government to have another look at that in order to meet the wishes of the whole House in raising the weekly pension, you cannot force in all conscience immediate discussion of the Bill, because the only basis upon which the House can proceed would be to pass the Bill in the terms in which the second reading was passed, plus of course such amendments as have already been considered in Select Committee and which can be reported on. These are the alternatives; I do not see any other.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House has just intimated that on this question of increasing from \$3.60 to \$5.00 the House is not divided. If that is the case, is anything to be gained by returning to Select Committee? I am the member, as the Leader of the House said, who urged upon the Committee that the amount should be increased to \$5.00. I am to say, and I have already reported to the Leader of the Opposition on this matter, that I was shocked to find that I did not get the support to that suggestion that I had been hoping for in

Committee. If the Leader of the House knows in advance, as he has stated, that the House is of one accord on this particular point in the Bill, why is there any delay whatsoever in proceeding with the Bill? As a matter of fact, the Committee was urged to meet within 24 hours after it had been selected, but I was surprised to find that the then Minister responsible for the Bill was not at Committee. When I communicated with the Minister afterwards, I learned from him that he was never summoned to attend the meeting. Mr. Speaker, I was summoned to attend the meeting. I do not know if hon. members think a summons means a blue paper. However, the Minister responsible for the Bill informed me that he was not summoned to attend this meeting.

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

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If we remember correctly, the first and second readings of the Bill were proceeded with some despatch. The Committee was appointed and we met, and I very well remember that when I urged upon the Committee that the amount of \$3.60 per week pension for these poor people should be increased to \$5.00 and it was pointed out to me that the Committee would be remaining divided on it, I urged upon the Committee at that stage that consideration of that particular section of the Bill be deferred, because the Leader of the House who was also a member of the Committee pointed out that the Minister responsible was not present. I never knew he had not been summoned. I never thought so at that stage, but as I have seen since then, I am now able to put two and two together and get them to make something more than four. When I urged then that consideration of that section be deferred, the Leader of the House pointed out to me that they were not prepared to entertain the deferring of any consideration apart from the fact that the Minister was not present, but that the whole matter had to be returned to the House at its next meeting to get this Bill through for these poor people to get what they had been looking for so long.

All these things happened in Committee and hon. members were willing to some extent to make things as easy as were reasonably possible so that these people could get this money. In my own constituency, there are some old men and women who have given of their all. There are some old men whose physical condition is such that they now have to walk as though they were bow-legged in order to make accommodation for that condition which has crept on them through toiling in the cane fields and the hedge-rows during all the years on the estate, and I cannot for the life of me see why the Leader of the House at every stage of consideration of the Bill pointed out to us the necessity of proceeding with this with despatch in view of the fact that these people were looking and hoping to benefit from the passage of this Bill before Christmas, but he did not then intimate to us that he meant Christmas 1969. 10.35 p.m.

The hon. Leader of the House did not then intimate to us that he meant Christmas, 1969,

because what the hon. Leader of the House and the hon. senior member for St. George in Committee showed themselves very willing to entertain was the suggestion that there should be included an amount of \$100 to pay the burial fee, I do not know if those two hon. members are just standing by now and praying that by December, 1969, there will be quite enough deaths so that you will pay out this \$100 in the hope that that will be the end of things where these people are concerned.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is not fair. The reason why I felt able to accept that amendment then was...

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what has the hon. member risen? Is he on a point of order? If he is not on a point of order, I am not giving way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking hon. member to give way. I should speak on a point of elucidation. The hon. member is misinterpreting anything I have said in Select Committee. I am saying why I supported the proposal for funeral benefits.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is asking the hon. junior member for St. Peter to give way.

Mr. HINDS: I am not giving way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter has not given way.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have said that I do not know if hon. members are hoping that by December of 1969 there will be a number of deaths among some of these poor, starving old people, because it would seem to me that having regard to the haste, the speed, something has certainly come about to bring about a considerable reduction at the rate of speed with which certain hon. members were willing, in the early stages, to proceed with this Bill. I do not want to ask what was happening; I am not particularly concerned with what has happened. What I am concerned with is that there are, in my constituency, quite a number of people who stand to benefit from the provisions of this Bill and its passage through the House tonight, and I am here holding up my point to serve these people as best I can at all stages. I cannot see why any hon. member is not willing to say that Order No. 5 should become the next Order of the Day. This Bill deals with benefits accruing to sugar workers. The history of the suffering of sugar workers in this country is very painful to think of, much more to read of, and here is a case where a Government that pretends, on the surface, to be a Socialist Government, has ample opportunity, with promises from this side of the House to do all in their power to assist the Government, to pass legislation for the benefit of sugar workers at this time of the year, and after some of them have been promised that a Bill of this sort would come before the House to create this Fund since 1956, they want to postpone it. Since 1956 people have been looking forward to benefiting from

the terms of a Bill of this sort. Now that the time has come when we are on the point of doing all that could be done to help these people, we are to find attempts on the part of the Government at filibustering. Why is it? The hon. Leader of the House has told us, he has agreed that there is no division of the House on the question of the payment of \$5.00.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I have also said that if the House wishes to pass the Bill, as it had passed the second reading with that figure—certainly I would be willing to do this; but if you want to put in the new figure of \$5.00 as the weekly pension, I will have to take it back to the Cabinet.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no question of having to take anything back to the Cabinet. What we pass here becomes the law of the land. This Provident Fund does not create a charge on the Treasury. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Who would say it would not at this stage create a charge on the Treasury?) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I remarked in Committee that this Government is willing to subsidise the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and today the Transport Board with \$300,000 and it is reluctant and unwilling to do anything to assist the poor sugar workers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I have said enough already to point out that the sugar workers could be using the basis of the same expenditure which they are using today; they, as taxpayers, are having to subsidise their own travel to the tune of \$300,000 as this House has done already today. That is the point I have made. They should do the same amount of travelling at the same expense, less \$300,000. I agree that some hon. members may feel that if the sugar workers were waiting from 1956 for this benefit, they can do it again. I quite agree with them, if they say so. I have heard them; but Mr. Deputy Speaker, let those same hon. members go into Chalky Mount and Hillaby and tell those workers what they said in this hon. House, that if they have been waiting since 1956, they can wait now.

10.45 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that Your Honour knows quite well when a member is debating a matter that is not before the House, or whether he is making a contribution while keeping within the bounds of the matter under discussion. The question is whether Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day. What Order No. 5 seeks to deal with is a matter relating to sugar workers, and I cannot for the life of me see why the Government that refused in Committee—two members of the Government Party were on the Committee, and they refused to defer consideration of this matter relating to the \$5.00 weekly pension. The matter was too urgent and it could not be kept back. How it is that they find it now so convenient to have it deferred until after Christmas or to some future date, or until some new Minister familiarises himself with the matter?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would occasion me no surprise, if this matter is postponed tonight, to find in truth and in fact that by the time we come to deal with it, we hear that the Minister who was to have been Minister to deal with it is no longer the Minister to deal with it, but that some new Minister needs time to familiarise himself with the matter. It is now common knowledge that the Leader of the House is as unhappy tonight over the situation within his own Party as.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would prefer the hon. member to stick to the motion before the House.

Mr. HINDS: The motion is, Sir, why we should proceed with Item No. 5 as the next Order of the Day. The Leader of the House, who, I have just said, is so unhappy tonight, is the chief architect of the delaying tactics.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is not so. I have told the hon. member, if he or any member on the other side of the House wishes the Bill passed in the form in which it is now before the House, this can be done in less than ten minutes. It should not take from half-past eight until now for them to decide if they want the Bill passed in that form. I have also said if they still want an increase in the pension, then I must consult the Cabinet.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the House has said that he, personally, would like to see the workers get \$5.00. All hon. members on that side of the House, I now understand, want to see these poor workers get the \$5.00 pension. All hon. members on this side of the House, including the hon. Minister who was to deal with it—he was the person who told them at Cabinet level that \$5.00 is what he recommended for these people. The same hon. member is here tonight to state why the workers can get \$5.00 a week, and why he recommended \$5.00. What does the Government have to wait for now? The hon. member was not in the Select Committee, but he is here tonight. He is here to point out to the hon. Leader of the House and the hon. senior member for St. George, who were members of the Select Committee, why he recommended \$5.00 and why he was prepared to stand by his recommendation of \$5.00. This was told to the Select Committee by me. I told the hon. members of the Select Committee that the then Minister was prepared to stand by a recommendation of \$5.00, and if those hon. members had any intention of seeing those poor workers get the \$5.00 they would have accepted that recommendation, and we would have had no cause for delay as I see it tonight.

I am convinced that the workers can be given \$5.00 weekly out of the present Fund. The Minister, who was in charge of the Bill, is here to say that the workers can get \$5.00 weekly as a pension and to say why he made the recommendation to the Cabinet. What more recommendation can anybody make? The recommendation has already been made,

and all the hon. members in this House readily agree to support the \$5.00. What do we have to wait for? What is there to wait for, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I charge the hon. Leader of the House with adopting delaying tactics which can do the poor workers no good.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it might give him time to reconstruct his Party, or whatever there is for him to reconstruct; but that should not stand in the way of these poor workers getting their retroactive or back pay for which they have been waiting so long. I am wondering if, as in the case of the Leader of the House, some of these poor people from the parish St. Lucy do not call at the house where he lives. I think I remember hearing him say in Committee that some of the people make inquiries of him from time to time to know what is being done in their interest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are here tonight in the interest of these sugar workers. Why cannot we proceed and do something to help the sugar workers? There is now no point at issue, because we have already agreed with it. They can get the \$5.00, and the former Minister is here to point out everything as regards his recommendation for \$5.00. Why cannot we proceed with the same speed and the same haste that have been accompanying the first and second readings of this Bill?

Remember, Sir, it was the Leader of the House, I think, who initiated the speed at which this Bill should be proceeded with. It was he who initiated the speed with which the Select Committee should have gone to work. After all of these things have been complied with, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, why need we wait longer? I can only urge hon. members and urge the other side to give some consideration at this hour to doing something for the benefit of the poor sugar workers who have been waiting, hoping and looking for so long.
10.55 p.m.

I remember the Leader of the House intimating to the Committee that if we were able to make our recommendations and have the Chairman report at the next meeting of the House, some of the people who were to benefit from this Provident Fund would have got something out of it before Christmas. Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. Leader of the House still of that frame of mind? Does he still have those same tender feelings demonstrated at one time with the butter tin?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving way. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am still of the same mind and I have put the alternatives to the hon. member. If he wishes the Bill passed at the \$3.60 level, we can do it now. If he wishes the \$5.00 considered, consultations with the Cabinet and other people will have to be done.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the hon. member like the idea of voting against his own

conscience? His conscience dictates that \$5.00 can be paid to these people. He would like to see them have \$5.00.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, my position on this matter of the \$5.00 is the same as has been enunciated by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew when he was introducing the Bill. He said what his personal feelings were and what he thought ought to be done, but like me - I say if you want legal advice you consult lawyers; if you want medical advice you consult doctors; and if you want financial advice you consult financial experts, and you have to abide by what they say. It is not that I feel they should not have \$5.00. I do, but I am not prepared to commit the Government to that here and now until further consultation with the financial people has been done. The position is quite simple.

Mr. HINDS: I take it that the Leader of the House is hoping that because of our refusal or reluctance to accept \$3.60 when our consciences tell us that \$5.00 can be paid to these workers, this would bring about a state to enable him to postpone consideration of Item 5 being the next Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member has again misinterpreted me. I would vote for the motion which the hon. member has moved only if there is agreement on that side that we proceed on the basis of the Bill which is now before the House at the \$3.60 level. If it is something other than that, I will have to ask for it to be reconsidered. If however the hon. member wishes the Bill passed, what they may do is to accept the Bill as it is; I will give the assurance or the undertaking that whenever it is financially feasible for the rate of pension to be raised, we will bring in an amendment to that effect. I cannot be fairer than that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all the suggestions made by the Leader of the House at this hour could have been made if he were sincere. They could have been made in Committee, and they could have been made since.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member should not say that if I were sincere they could have been made. The whole point of having the Select Committee meet within 24 hours of the second reading was to have the Bill brought back here for the third reading with the Committee's Report in the shortest possible time; and Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would have been here on Friday, but it was only on Friday we had a special meeting and this was abortive, because there was no quorum; otherwise the Bill would have been enacted long since.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what really happened is this: it is a case where the hon. Leader of the House has demonstrated that after Party

considerations the interest of the sugar workers comes first. In other words, since the Select Committee met within 24 hours after the second reading of this Bill, the Leader of the House did absolutely nothing, and as we see, the Minister responsible for the Bill was given no encouragement to do anything about making further provision for the \$3.60 to be increased to \$5.00, because in the interim consideration was given to the reconstruction of the Democratic Labour Party, not to the interest of the sugar workers depending on this Provident Fund. That is the main trouble with it, and you will understand, as the Leader of the House has rightly told us, the file was handed back to the Prime Minister during the day today, which means that we must still hope to rely on the knowledge of the former Minister who had the matter to deal with. He is the person who is best able to advise us now, and what places us in a very good position is this: the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has already intimated to this Committee that some of his own constituents in the parish of St. Andrew are standing by hoping and waiting. He cited cases of people who are in almost straitened circumstances and very dependent upon the passage of this Bill. With all this before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the Leader of the House still feel that he has a leg on which to stand by suggesting that if the House is willing to accept the \$3.60, when it becomes economically feasible further consideration will be given to the matter? These are very good terms that mean absolutely nothing, because I think I told the hon. Leader of the House that figures can be taken and made to represent something today, and those same figures can be taken and made to represent something else tomorrow.

I do not see why we have to call for any further explanation from the economic experts. We have heard from the Minister who was in charge of the Bill that he recommended \$5.00. When he made that recommendation, it was not known to any hon. member on this side of the House. He must have known as Minister in charge of the Bill that it was not mere sentiment he was expressing at the time. He must have sympathy for his constituents, but it was a case where he was demonstrating to the public at large that he had an interest which transcended beyond his own constituency of St. Andrew, because the people who are to benefit from this Provident Fund are scattered throughout the length and breadth of this Island. Do you think that the Minister who was responsible for the conduct of this Bill would have made the recommendation for \$5.00 when he well knew that the financial provisions of the Fund could not make provision for it? It is a matter of whether the financial experts are too narrow in outlook. They cannot see beyond their limited confines, but the Minister has got to see to it that the poor people who have contributed their all in the sugar industry are given something of worth by way of a pension in these their last days here with us.

11.05 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these people are people who are poor; they are wretchedly poor. They are people who

have given all their lives in blood, sweat and tears, and should we, by any action of ours tonight, deny these poor people this benefit? It is very well known that ample provision will be made, or it has already been made, for the hon. Leader of the House and all hon. members ...I can now say it... on that side to have a Christmas dinner second to none. What, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the position with these poor sugar workers? They have been listening, looking, hoping and praying that we, as their representatives in this hon. House, would do something for their benefit at this hour, on the eve of Christmas. The hon. Leader of the House had promised us in Select Committee that if we acted with despatch, if we acted speedily with these workers, then they would get their benefits or some of their benefits before Christmas. Why does the hon. Leader of the House wish to play his cards with the faces down at this stage? Why is it? We see here, and I cannot help drawing attention to the fact, that the Minister who had all to do with this Bill, recommended the rate of \$5.00 and he stands here tonight ready and willing to make out a point why Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day. He is waiting patiently to give any support to any recommendation why Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to urge on the hon. Leader of the House that he should use his numbers in this case to the lasting benefit of the sugar workers. Let him use his numbers in this case to the lasting benefit of these poor people. He can use his numbers to legislate this night that they receive \$5.00 instead of \$3.60. He can use his numbers to their lasting advantage. If he can so marshal his forces and with his added strength that he was able to boast of tonight in the House - he has boasted of having added one to his numbers - can he now not use that extra one to do some good for these poor sugar workers? I am appealing to the hon. Leader of the House for the last time to be sincere in dealing with these sugar workers and to accept the motion of the former Minister of Agriculture who has been very near, and might consider himself to be very near the sugar workers of the country. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that for those reasons, and those reasons alone, Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is difficult to ask the hon. Leader of the House seriously if he says that both sides of the House are agreed on that sum - it was stressed very strongly by the mover of the second reading of this Bill that financial advice was taken. It was put to him that he could ask the financial adviser, the Financial Secretary in this case, what, if we paid \$5.00, would be the sum necessary. Is the hon. member really serious when he says that he has to go back to the Cabinet? Who would take the hon. member seriously?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would give way - I would be obliged to him if he would give way.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Any school boy could sit down and calculate it accurately.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is the whole point. When the hon. member was himself making his contribution at the second reading of this Bill, he advised the then Minister to take this back and re-examine the figures and see if a higher pension was feasible. All I am asking for now is that same privilege which he advised then.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is the hon. member saying that there was no time to ask for that figure? Anyhow, I will accept his word. It is not really that in my heart I accept it, but I will have to say so on the floor of this House.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to be very brief indeed. The hon. Leader of the House has said that the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance ought to be given some time to acquaint himself with the file on this matter; but I remember when I introduced the Bill in this House and on occasions previous to that, the hon. member prided himself as an expert on Provident Funds over there. He said that nobody else in here knew any more about the Provident Fund, including the then Minister of Agriculture, than the present Minister of Agriculture. That is what he told me when I introduced the Bill and when he asked questions on the matter of the Provident Fund, he came here and professed to be an expert on Provident Funds. That was last week when I introduced the Bill. What I do not at all understand is that an hon. member who, only last week, was an expert on Funds cannot deal with this Bill! Here is a man, not a young man, but an elderly man that you are catering to. Here is a man who can accept the fact that Order No. 5 ought to be the next Order of the Day.

11.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have said already that I was elected to this Chamber and nobody is going to stifle me when I begin to speak. I have also said that the people of my constituency sent me here to plead their case and nobody is stopping me. I will pay no attention to asides, and I will do the job that I am here to do. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am saying is that here is a person who, in the squeezing of the lemon, without even thinking of it, can accept intrigue and is witty enough to accept that intrigue when being told that one Minister is resigning to go away and study law, and in the squeezing of the lemon he can accept....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the motion before the House is that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am speaking on that motion, and I am speaking on the fact that the present hon. Minister of Agriculture has the ability - he is old enough; he is not young like me - these are the days of old people and not young people - since he is so knowledgeable and is such an expert on the Provident Fund; he is so witty.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is not whether the hon. member is an expert. The motion is whether Order No. 5 should be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has tried to make out a case that the present Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance should have some time to acquaint himself with the file on this, and I am contending that Order No. 5 to be the next Order of the Day, because the hon. member only Tuesday last professed to be an expert on this and, therefore, he has no need for a file. He challenged me, when I was Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, that I knew not more than he. This is the point I am making; so the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not acquainted with the matter and he should acquaint himself with the file - they are fighting against each other now. Last week he said he was an expert on the matter. I was no expert, but I was competent enough to introduce the Bill, and during its second reading he said he knew more about it than I.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to show you how quick and witty he is, he was the man that I suggested should be on the Committee because of the speech which he made and the fact that he said that he was an expert on the Provident Fund business. I suggested last week that he should have been placed on the Select Committee, and the same people who chose him as a Minister are the same people who refused to put him on the Select Committee last week! The same slime, the same intrigue which went on yesterday at twelve o'clock is the same intrigue which said he should not be on the Committee last week.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not accurate. The hon. member knows the basis on which Select Committees of this House are appointed. As a matter of fact, the hon. member knows that I came and consulted him, and the hon. member told me that he had already asked the hon. junior member for St. Peter to be a member of the Committee. When he told me this, I refrained from approaching the hon. junior member for St. James.

I have no recollection whatever of nobody telling me, or suggesting to me, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter should be on the Committee and my objecting to it. There would have been no reason for me to object.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House has made this point. That is not a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member has said something alleging that I did something which.... (ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not here to be dictated to. I have already ruled that it is not a point of order, and I ask the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to continue.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know me well enough; I am not the type who will go on lying on people; I speak on facts. Last week I suggested to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that the hon. senior member for St. Peter should be put on the Committee. I am not lying; I am not one to go around lying on people; they can lie; they can carry out their political intrigue and all the slime and dirtiness that they want to carry out, but I am not going to lie on anybody. I am going to come here and speak the facts and the truth. Last week the same person that they have now chosen to be Minister of Labour and National Insurance, who gave such a speech on the Provident Fund second reading debate, is the same man that was denied the opportunity to sit on the Committee. When I told the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that he should be on the Committee, he suggested the hon. junior member for St. James.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House has risen on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do challenge the hon. member's recollection. The only two members about whom the hon. member and I consulted were the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. James, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew intimated to me that he had already asked the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I did not approach the hon. junior member for St. James. In respect of no other hon. member have we had any discussion.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a question of the word of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy against mine. We all can judge whose words we can believe. I do not indulge in slime; I do not indulge in intrigue. Everybody knows that I say what I know and what I feel, even if it causes my death. I am one who feels that you can only die once.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Andrew please stick to the motion.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am speaking on Order No. 5, and I am replying to the points raised by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I am saying that that hon. member was denied the right last week to sit on the Committee. We did discuss the question of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and we discussed the question of the hon. junior member for St. James sitting on this Committee.
11.25 p.m.

I do not have to lie on anybody; they can lie on me. I will speak the truth, and the truth hurts.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. member's recollection is accurate and we had chosen three members from that side to be on the Committee, one of which was the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and the other of which was the hon. senior member for Chris-

Church who declined, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, how could the hon. senior member for St. Peter have been put in, when there are only three from that side, and I believe three or four from this side? It is plain commonsense. There was no question of any other hon. member.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I still maintain that I have a fairly good recollection of what went on. I maintain that if the credence of the words of certain hon. members and my words were to be brought in question, my words would be accepted first, because I do not stab anybody in the back. The next thing is that the hon. member suggested that I was given notice of the meeting, and that it would have been held in 24 hours' time between the afternoon of last Tuesday and Wednesday. Now I suggested to the hon. member on Tuesday that the meeting should be held on Wednesday and that he discuss it with the Clerk, and he said he had it organised. My contention is that I left here before I was given any notification of the time at which the meeting was to be held. Subsequent to that I have not been given any notification of the time the meeting was to be held, but I remember telling the hon. member that I would have liked to see the meeting of the Committee held on Wednesday, because I wanted to deal with the Report of the Select Committee on Friday. The hon. member would bear me out on that, but I was never summoned to attend the meeting, nor did I receive a telephone message. My Secretary whom the Government pays in the Ministry of Agriculture never told me that she received one, and I never received one on either of the two telephones I have at home.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, in that respect he was in no worse position certainly than I was, because I did not receive a written summons. I took my notice from the discussion and decision which we had here to have the meeting within 24 hours, and I came here the next afternoon on that basis. I had not received a written summons.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of explanation, I was a member of that Committee, and when Mr. Best, an Officer of the House here, called me, he gave me the names of those persons who had intimated that they would have been attending. The name of the hon. Leader of the House was given to me as one of those names, which means that the Leader of the House had been contacted, whether by telephone or otherwise, and had given an indication that he would have been attending.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is quite right in this except that I did not have to be contacted on the day itself. I had reached an understanding the evening before that the meeting would be held in 24 hours, and therefore having been alerted for it, I came at 3 o'clock - as a matter of fact, I think before 3 o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may continue without unwarranted interruptions, the ques-

tion of whether it should be \$5.00 or \$3.60 was brought up by hon. members, and I would say at this point in closing how I feel about it. I feel that these are people who have contributed to the economy of this country; I feel there are several of them whom all of us as representatives, including my friends and those who profess to be my friends, have got at some time or other to take money from our pockets and help them to find bread. These people have made it possible for a lot of us to get education free, whether we got it through a scholarship at Combermere, Harrison College or otherwise. Some of them were however more fortunate than I was. I was a poor boy; my parents had to pay for my education. So these people have contributed to making Barbados what it is; a Barbados that can be proud today of a buoyant economy; a Barbados that can be proud of an ever increasing and progressive economy; a Barbados that can boast of an increase in its gross national income; a Barbados which got its pride from the sweat and toil and labour of these very people.

These are the constituents of all of us in here, and what I am saying is that I saw absolutely no reason why the pension to them ought not to be subsidised. Today we are subsidising National Insurance which has a large amount of money invested, by paying the salaries of the people employed, when the National Insurance can invest \$4 million or \$5 million. We are subsidising that by way of spending \$200,000-odd in salaries. I see absolutely no reason why the House could not pass a Resolution calling on Government to subsidise this at the rate of \$1.40 per week for these suffering people. This has been my contention. In fact, I was satisfied with and accepted the advice of the Financial Secretary. I am not here saying that I discussed the issue and told them I did not think I should agree with the Financial Secretary, and that they disagreed with me. I went into it and I am not lying on anybody. It was all agreed that we should accept the advice of the Financial Secretary and have a look at it in three years' time. I am not lying, nor am I going to lie on people as they lied on me. The question of a Judas is a matter for somebody else. This does not affect me because I will live, and I am not hungry.

The point is that it is my view that the House can take a decision to subsidise this. There were 1,500 of these people who retired since 1956 and between 1956 and now would have qualified, and 300 who had to retire because of some sort of illness. This was up to the middle of this year. There may be a few more. What I am asking is to give an additional \$1.40 a week to these people who have contributed to the economy of the country, and who are suffering when we are eating.

11.35 p.m.

I will continue to eat, but I have a very soft spot for those people who cannot eat and who are suffering. I feel that to offer them \$5.00 a week is not too much. I feel that we should all get together and decide in some form or other and not criticise anybody for not doing it. I said what my personal views are. If I had had the opportunity of sitting on the Commit-

tee on Wednesday, I would have discussed the matter with my colleagues here with me and I would have agreed to a suggestion that we should give them some consideration of an additional \$1.40 per week by way of a subvention or a subsidy to the scheme. I feel that if we can subsidise other things, then we can subsidise this scheme.

There is one other thing which one has got to bear in mind and it is that these people are going, and if you give them a subsidy in this respect you do not give it to them for Old Age Pension. Therefore, what you gain on the round-about you lose in the swings, or what you lose on the round-about you gain in the swings. I think that we can discuss this matter in a very rational manner. I think that if the Hon. Leader of the House will be in agreement, we can agree and trust him this time in a matter like this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I well understand, of course, that the hon. member may not be really feeling in the best kind of mood, but there is no need to be offensive. If he asks for rational discussions and quick action, there may be a way to get them, provided that we follow the Standing Orders of the House and the Constitution of the country. This may be something which we may have to discuss.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I always follow the Constitution of the country. (*Asides*) I am not insulting anybody. Everybody knows that I am a frank man, that I say what I mean and what I feel despite if it hurts anybody or not. People hurt me too and I do not make any row; so when I hurt them they should not be worried. They hurt me, they backbite me, they stab me in my back and they lie on me. This does not matter; you take your lashes when you get them. You gave me mine and therefore let me give you yours. What I am doing now is not lying on anybody; I am above that. I know that when I lie on people, it cannot stop them, if they are honest, from eating, nor it cannot drag them into the gutter. All I am saying is that we can trust the hon. member in this respect, because I hardly think that the hon. member would do anything to stab these poor old people in their backs. They are not young, they are not under 40; all of them are over 40; and therefore, all I am saying is that he should look at this matter rationally and he can decide, and we will accept his agreeing to pass this \$3.60 today on the condition that favourable consideration, and I say "favourable consideration" advisedly, be given to subsidising the scheme to the tune of \$1.40 per week. If we can be given this promise, it is what all of us would like to see. I do not think that there is one hon. member in this House tonight who would not agree, or who would not like to agree, to these people getting \$5.00 a week. I feel that no taxpayer in this country would object to our asking him to pay an additional \$1.40 per week to make these people in their old days - these people who have already contributed to the economy of this country - happy. No taxpayer with a heart would like to discriminate against these people because they are old people. They can discriminate

against the young people if they want to do so, because the young people will still be strong, vibrant and vigorous and can fight their own battles and do so well. Therefore, if you cannot help the young people then help the old ones. (Cheers)

The question that Order No. 5 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am at a loss as to who should now move the formal adoption of the Committee's Report. I do not think that it is proper for me to do it although it is in my name and it is my portfolio. The Governor-General has sent down a Message to this House today pointing out that the portfolio of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance is out of my hands. (After a pause) If the Minister needs help, I do not mind volunteering it.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill intituled an Act to provide for the establishment of a Provident Fund out of which prescribed benefits may be paid to sugar workers and matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, be now adopted.

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

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

11.45 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee to consider the recommendations of the Select Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. HOPPIN in the Chair.

IN COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move an amendment to Clause 3(2): Delete the words "the Barbados Workers Union" and substitute therefore "such body representing sugar workers as he sees fit."

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this has been canvassed extensively. The Select Committee disagreed about this point but, surely, all of us will think that it is a more reasonable approach altogether to the problems of workers' representation. It avoids some future legislative scramble when, perhaps, the Barbados Workers Union is joined or is overtaken by another Union. We do not have to look at this as a political matter, because the Minister's discretion will be inserted in the Clause. Clearly, I say "clearly" but I do not know how clear it is to the hon. senior member for St. Peter who will, at this stage, necessarily select a representative submitted by the Barbados Workers Union. I urge hon. members that this is a compromise which can meet all the points of view expressed. It does not prevent the Minister from nominating three representatives at present from the Barbados Workers Union.

If all the arguments put forward by the ex-Minister on an earlier occasion remain the view of the Government and equally in future without the necessity of further recourse to Parliament, it does not prevent a Minister from obtaining advice from other quarters which in 10, 20 or 30 years may appear to him to be more suitable. It is not a political amendment that I am urging on hon. members. It is a straightforward commonsense amendment. I am not concerned with the Sugar Producers Federation, because there is less controversy about that since all the factories are members of the Sugar Producers Federation. I must urge the new Minister, who must be familiar with all the arguments *pro* and *con*, to accept the amendment.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. SARGEANT; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. WEEKES - 9.

NOES: Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS; Mr. St. JOHN; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; and Mr. HOLDER - 5.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is it in order for a member who has already given his voice against the motion which is now proposed - for he spoke last week in favour of the spirit of the amendment and he is now voting against it. Mr. Chairman, can that be in order? On a debate on this Bill the hon. senior member for St. Peter indicated that he supported the spirit of the amendment I have moved, and he has now voted against it. Mr. Chairman, is that in order, even for money?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: According to Standing Order No. 37(7):

"When a member's name is called by the Clerk at a division, the member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes". A member shall not answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which he may

have expressed when the voices were taken collectively."

11.55 p.m.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make the following amendments:

(a) insert immediately after paragraph (a) the following as paragraph (b) -

(b) the payment on the death of any sugar worker to whom this Act applies of a funeral grant in the manner provided by section 14;"

(b) renumber the existing paragraph (b) as paragraph (c).

I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part.

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

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

Clauses 8 and 9 were called and passed.

Clause 10 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to amend Clause 10 by inserting at the end thereof the words "not later than three months after the receipt thereof by the Minister".

I beg to move that Clause 10 as amended stand part.

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

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

Clauses 11, 12 and 13 were called and passed.

Clause 14 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to amend Clause 14 by adding the following sub-clauses (6), (7), and (8) -

(6) In the case of the death of any sugar worker to whom this Act applies the Board may grant and pay to the person who has met or is liable to meet the cost of the funeral of such deceased sugar worker a funeral grant in the sum of one hundred dollars.

(7) Where -

(a) the person who has met or is liable to meet the cost of the funeral of the deceased sugar worker cannot be found, or

(b) the cost of the funeral is less than the amount of the grant mentioned in subsection 6,

the grant or, as the case may be, the remainder thereof may be paid to such person as the Board may decide.

(8) No funeral grant shall be granted or paid under subsection (6) in any case where a funeral grant is payable under section 21(i)(d) of the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966."

I beg to move that Clause 14 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the words "three dollars and sixty cents" be deleted and the words "five dollars" inserted in line 3 of Clause 14.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if (A VOICE: Sit down!) You or nobody can tell me to sit down. I am exercising my democratic right. Mr. Chairman, I see that nobody has got up to second the amendment made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, but I would like to speak on this section. I am not seconding it.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, during the course of my address on the motion that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day, I pointed out that it was my view that the Government should give consideration, and I qualified it by saying "favourable" consideration by increasing the amount from \$3.60 to \$5.00 by way of a subsidy. Whilst I am as anxious as the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the hon. senior member for St. James and all the other members on this side, and I think as anxious as any other member in the Chamber, that these people should get their \$5.00, and whilst I am anxious to see a Resolution brought down by the next sitting for provision to subsidise the Fund by an appropriate amount, I will not vote for the amendment, because I know that if the amount is to be found, I am satisfied that it cannot be found from the present Fund.

12.05 a.m.

I am anxious to see a Resolution brought down by the next time we meet for provision to subsidise the Fund by the appropriate amount. I will not vote for the amendment because I know that if the amount is to be found, I am satisfied that it cannot be found from the present Fund in the way in which it is financed. (Cheers) As I said here, Sir, I am going to criticise and my criticism is going to be constructive. I am going to criticise the Government. I have pointed out that I am still a member of the Party, but I reserve my right to criticise the Government if I feel that they are to be criticised, and to vote according to my conscience. I have more experience

in Government than the members on the other side, and I should like to ask those members, while we are all anxious to get this thing done, to review the amendment. I know and I have said that on the financial advice which I have got as the then Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, from the Financial Secretary, the Fund could not carry this increase because you cannot use the whole \$3.92 million for paying these pensioners. What you were doing is that you were taking out just over \$1 million to pay the arrears and you have \$2 million, the interest from which you will pay your weekly pensioners. The Fund cannot do that even if you were getting 20 per cent. It is over \$2 million and there are over 2,000 people per week who would have to be receiving money from the Fund. I play my politics clean. If a person treats me unjustly, I am going to attack him.

I told the Prime Minister this morning that if his Party attacks me I am going to attack them, and if they have done me an injustice, I am going to come out and get it off my chest whether they like it or not. I am going to attack them to the bitter end. (Asides) I have made it clear that if they bring down something that I do not like, I will attack it, and if they attack me I am going to attack them worse than they attack me. (Asides) I reserve my right to vote in accordance with my conscience and nobody should be annoyed with me for that. (Asides).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: I am a member of the Democratic Labour Party with an independent mind. I have always been independent. I am a member of the Democratic Labour Party until they dismiss me or until my constituents remove me. What I am saying is that I am going to attack them if I have to do so. In this case, I see no need of doing that. All I am doing here is to ask the Hon. Minister - I am not even asking the Hon. Leader of the House, because I have a few issues to fight with him and I am going to fight them; and when I am finished I am going to speak to him and I will shake his hand too. That shows the broad-minded man that I am. I am asking the Hon. Minister of Labour.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I made a motion to increase this \$3.60 to \$5.00. I understand that it is *ultra vires* and I am going to withdraw that motion.

Mr. EDWARDS: Now that the hon. member has withdrawn that motion I want an undertaking, not from the Hon. Leader of the House because the Hon. Leader of the House is slick enough to say that he is not the Minister responsible for this. (A MEMBER: Is he slick?) Nobody knows that better than I. I am calling on the Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance now to give this House an undertaking that he will make representation to his colleagues and let them know what the wishes of the House are, and let us have the necessary Resolution brought down. Don't tell me that we cannot find it, because we have just found \$300,000 for the Trans-

port Board that I did not oppose. These people are dear to my heart. You can come and tax me. (ASIDES) The intrigue that went on out there was enough to make anybody thirsty; it was enough to kill anybody, but I have a big stout heart. Mr. Chairman, I want an undertaking from my friend whom I congratulated on his new appointment this morning. I had enough guts to do it. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: It did not hurt you.) It did not hurt me. You do not hurt me and therefore you will be my friend always, although you may be a bit gullible. You might have taken people at their face value and I honestly believe you did so, because I feel that if the hon. member knew that something was pushed over on him which was not true, he would have told them to come with the truth. I have that much confidence in the hon. member. My friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, has always been my friend. When I go down to the Infirmary, he is always there; when I go to the Esplanade with my choir he is always there, and we drink some gin together too. (ASIDES) The only thing now, Mr. Chairman, is that the boot will be on the other foot, because I will not be able to buy it now. The hon. member can buy it. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I want an undertaking from him, not from the Hon. Leader of the House, after having discussed the matter with the financial experts in order to see how much money it would take, that he will ask that further consideration be given to the suggestion I have made calling on the Government to bring down a sum of money to subsidise the Fund at the rate of \$1.40 per person per week. If that is done, then I will be happy. I will make this pledge that if it is not done and done within a reasonable time, I will bring in a Resolution calling on that official, and I will be campaigning on it, because I am satisfied that there have been other things that I have joined, and I will continue to join, in subsidising, that I feel ought to be subsidised.
12.15 a.m.

I feel very strongly about this. I feel as strongly about this as I feel that the youth of this country should not be discriminated against. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask for the undertaking. I should like to hear what comments the hon. Minister of Labour would have to make on my pledge and plea on behalf of the poor, retired, hungry agricultural workers some of whom retired since 1956.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member who has just sat down - he knows my stand on the Provident Fund, because he cannot very well forget so easily that time after time I got on my feet and pressed it. (Mr. EDWARDS: Press it now.) Mr. Chairman, some people have to be forgiven, but they cannot be forgotten. I give the hon. senior member for St. Andrew my pledge that I will make due representation to the Cabinet in the direction which he would like me to do.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I only intervened to say that I have just heard a classic definition of political fluidity.

The question that Clause 14, as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 15 and 16 were called and passed.

Clause 17 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 17 be amended by inserting immediately after the words "retirement pensions" appearing in the first line thereof the words "and funeral grants".

I beg to move that Clause 17, as amended stand part.

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

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

Clause 18 was called.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 18 be amended by inserting immediately after the words "retirement pensions" appearing in the first line thereof the words "and funeral grants".

I beg to move that Clause 18, as amended stand part.

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

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

Clauses 19 to 25 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill, as amended, in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think this concludes Government Business for this sitting. I had indicated earlier in the day to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I was going to suggest that the Christmas Recess be taken until Tuesday, 21st January, 1969. The hon. member said that this was agreeable to him. I, therefore, beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st January, 1969 at twelve noon.

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

Mr. Speaker, before I finish I should like to extend to Your Honour and Mrs. Brancker as well as to all hon. members on both sides of the House and also the servants of this House the wishes of this side of the House and certainly my own personal wishes for a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it is customary on these occasions to reciprocate on behalf of the people on this side of the House, and I should like to do so on this occasion, too, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank hon. members for their expression of good wishes so far as myself and wife are concerned, and the officers of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY AND HON. C. E. TALMA: 21 YEARS OF SERVICE IN HOUSE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House would like to know that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown as well as the hon. junior member for Christ Church will both at this time be celebrating their 21st year of membership of this House - in the case of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, an unbroken 21 years, in the case of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, 21 years of broken membership.

I do not know if Your Honour would want to take official notice of these two anniversaries but, if so, I would suggest that some appropriate ceremony, perhaps, early in the New Year be organised to honour the two hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually, I can inform hon. members that steps are being actively taken in respect of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who first became a member of this House in 1946, and has had unbroken service from then until now.
12.25 a.m.

Hon. members of course will be appropriately advised of that function which is contemplated for the first Tuesday in next month. The other matter is receiving active consideration and will in due course be appropriately dealt with - the matter affecting the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

I shall convey the good wishes of hon. members to the Staff of the House, and I am sure the Staff of the House will ask me to reciprocate on their behalf; and I know also that hon. members are looking forward to a complete restoration to health of our Deputy Clerk, Mr. H. Lisle Thomas.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st January, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

12.28 a.m.