

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th January, 1965

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development)

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of 22nd December, 1964, have been circulated and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed. (A Pause).

Hearing no objection, I hereby declare the Minutes of that Meeting duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the U.K. under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on 30th September, 1964, in respect of Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature;

The Customs Duties (Vehicles imported for the University of the West Indies) Order, 1965.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st October, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Hole town, St. James for the provision of a public beach and recreational area.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$12,500 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65, No. 50 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$400 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65

No. 48 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution that \$15,000 provided in the 1964-65 Estimates under Head 24, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Item 121 - Irrigation Equipment, to replace obsolete pipeline at Bullens Agricultural Station be now used for replacement of irrigation pipe fittings and equipment at the following four Agricultural Stations, namely-Bullens, Jerusalem, The Home and Codrington.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$300 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary

Estimates 1964-65 No. 49 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That cannot be done yet. That will be done as soon as possible.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Currency Act, 1959 and to provide for giving legal effect to the provisions of the British Caribbean Currency Agreement, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 16/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. George is now ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

I would also like to state that the Government proposes, as intimated by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, to deal with the Money Resolution for \$800, of which notice was given today, in all its stages,

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

There is ready, one answer to a question and I do not think that hon. members would mind holding over their business in order to accommodate the Government.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 2.55 p.m.

QUESTION

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is a Question standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, relative to a Branch post Office in St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister

Is Government aware that the Building now used as a Branch Post Office in the Parish of St. Thomas has for a long time needed rebuilding?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister take steps to have the said building replaced?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to repeal the Currency Act 1959 and to provide for giving legal effect to the provisions of the British Caribbean Currency Agreement, 1964, be now read a first time.]

I should like to inform the House that I have just been notified of the urgency of this matter being dealt with today. I am therefore asking hon. members to accommodate the Government in dealing with this Bill in all of its stages today, I will explain it when moving the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947, 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.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re DEATH OF MR. HA. A. TALMA

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is proceeded with, I should like, as is customary, to express our sympathy to an hon. member - the hon. senior member for Christ Church- at the passing of his brother, Mr. Herbert Augustus Talma. In doing so I should like to move the passing of the following Resolution-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy with the hon. senior member for Christ Church, Hon. C. E. Talma, Minister of Communications and Works, at the passing of his brother, the late Herbert Augustus Talma;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow and nearest of kin.

Mr. Speaker, there is very little we can say on this occasion to assuage the profound loss which an hon. member has sustained at the passing of someone who is close and dear to him; but I should still like to think that our expressions of sympathy tend, in some way, to mitigate this deep loss, and also at the same time, serve to indicate not only the esteem in which the hon. member is held, but also the esteem of the person who has passed to the Great Beyond. As a matter of fact, in this case, I feel confident in saying that the esteem in which the late Mr. Talma was held and his contribution to the community was so meritorious that even if he had not been a brother of an hon. member of this Chamber, although it is not traditional, this Chamber would still have been justified, to some extent, in recording the deep loss felt by the community at the sudden passing of Mr. Talma. I think it is safe to say that Mr. Talma was held in the highest possible esteem by all sections of this community, and that his contribution has enriched our community life in the several fields in which, from time to time, he endeavoured. As an educator, as an advocate at the Bar and as one who was called upon to dispense justice on the Bench, Mr. Talma carried out his duties in the community in a very fitting manner. I am sure that hon. members will agree that the community has suffered a great loss by Mr. Talma's relatively early passing, and that his contribution would have been even greater had he been spared with us for a longer time. His nobility of character, his modesty, his completely unassuming personality and general goodwill towards all with whom he came into contact - he was at all times ready to give a sympathetic ear and a helping hand to all those who were in need of it - all of these things marked him out as one of the personalities of the community more or less endowed by nature to play an important part indeed. That at the relatively early age of 65 years he was suddenly struck down, our sense of loss is all the more greater in that he was not spared to make a further mark in our fields of endeavour in this community. 3.05 p.m.

Both he and his relatives have for the last two generations been making marked contributions to the life not only of Barbados and the other West Indian Colonies, but even further a field; and another brother has achieved very great distinction in one of the African colonies. I am sure, Sir, that the demonstration of respect and sympathy accorded him at his funeral last Thursday, when one of the greatest gatherings ever seen in the parish of Christ Church turned out to participate in the funeral ceremony, must have gone a long way towards healing the wound which had been left in the hearts of his relatives, Sir, when they saw this widespread mark of respect in memory of his passing.

The public press has paid full compliment to the outstanding characteristics of Mr. Talma. It has recalled in detail the many and varied aspects of his career, and has also paid deserved tributes to his memory, and as colleagues of his brother in this Chamber, Sir, all of us, I am sure, regard it not only as an obligation, but as a gesture which we feel more than proud to make today in placing on record our own sympathy over his passing. I do hope that the expressions of sympathy of honourable members today not only will assure the hon. senior member for Christ Church and his relatives that the members of this House share the great affection and respect for Mr. Talma which the community itself has indicated that it so generously felt, but we do hope that in some small measure our expressions of sympathy will tend to assuage the sorrow which the hon. member, has felt over his completely unexpected death.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I must associate myself with the remarks made in seconding this Resolution to the relatives of the late Herbert Augustus Talma. I knew this gentleman from my school days, and I know that every word of the tribute paid by the Hon. Mover of this Resolution is true and fitting. The late "Herbie" Talma, as the community called him, was a gentleman of sympathy and one who manifested in the community such gentlemanly qualities as we hope will never be wanting in this island of Barbados. He was a scholar, an athlete, a schoolmaster and a judge, and in every one of these phases he manifested charm and integrity, and the passing of such a character in this community must be felt especially in this day and generation. He was not the ordinary, robust sort who tried to foist his personality on other people, but the influence he wielded will never be forgotten, and will go on to leave its mark upon all those with whom he had the good fortune to come in contact. I was extremely sorry to hear of the untimely passing of the gentleman, and I regret very much that circumstances prevented me from attending the funeral; but I must take this opportunity to associate myself with the Resolution offered in this Chamber to the bereaved relatives in the hope that time will cure their pain.

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. Speaker, I too would like on behalf of the Official Opposition to pay tribute to the late Herbert Augustus Talma. I was fortunate enough to have known him for several years, although I did not have the opportunity of being taught by him, but I was on many occasions the recipient of his sage counsel and the wise advice which he gave from the richness of his experience. A graduate of Codrington College, the motto of which College is "vultus in hostem - "face towards the foe", Mr. Talma journeyed to the far corner of an alien field, in the Southern States of America, and in that far corner he exemplified the motto of his Alma Mater, "face towards the foe", and in those days there could have been no greater foe to a man of his race and background than those which he found in one of the Carolinas. He made a success of teaching there; he studied at the Inns of Court, and returned to this Island where first he contributed to the public weal by teaching and giving of his mathematical knowledge to many a pupil. His character having been moulded in the crucible of hard work and insufficient means, he passed on what he had learned in the broad field of experience to those pupils who were fortunate enough to come under his domination. He was in many respects a fine man to talk to, and I had the opportunity in learning many things from him. In the words of another poet I can remember "we tired the sun with talking, and sent him down the sky." His passing has made us all the poorer; yet his name will always be remembered among us for the dualities which he manifested to so great a degree. It must have been of a man like him that Horace spoke when he referred to that man "integer vitae scelerisque purus", "pure of life and free from crime". It was one of the blessings for the full realisation of all his hopes that that blessing was vouchsafed to him to see his son become a doctor, and he must have taken a great deal of pride in that fact. 3.15 p.m.

All of us who knew him were sorry and saddened by his passing, and the least we can do at this time is to offer our condolences to his bereaved relatives and to signify how much we thought of him by supporting this Address which has been so ably and eloquently moved by the Hon. Leader of this House.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to associate myself, on behalf of my Party, with those kind words which have been said of the late Mr. H. A. Talma. After hearing the speech made by the hon. junior member for the City, I do not think that anything which I have to say now can take its place. However, Sir, from the time I knew the late Mr. H. A. Talma, wherever I met him I found him to be one way. Wherever I met him, he used to always ask me "How is St. Joseph?" And by his conversation I can say

that he always had the poor at heart.

Knowing him for so long, I was very sorry when I heard of his death, because I did not know that he was ill; otherwise, I would have made it my business to pay him a visit before he passed on.

Sir, as you would know, good things do not remain for too long, and bad things we never forget; but Sir, because of the great qualities of the late Mr. H. A. Talma, I can

only say that he was one of those good men who passed to the Great Beyond, and may he rest in peace.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to a public spirited and public citizen like the late Mr. H. A. Talma passing to the Great Beyond, I do not see how I can allow a Resolution of this sort being passed without my paying a tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, the late Mr. H. A. Talma was one of those unassuming and quiet men in life whose passing, in the manner as he did, was fitting to his character, in that he was not allowed to remain on earth to suffer long; he had a comparatively quick passing. That sort of passing is difficult for those who have been left behind, but better for the person who has gone on.

Mr. Speaker, I can also say that for the whole of the Talma family, it seems characteristic that they have this built-in quietness; yet they are people of outstanding qualities and public spiritedness. I would say that all that has been said of the late Mr. H. A. Talma is a fitting compliment to those who have been left behind.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before I put this question, I desire to associate myself with, and to endorse all the tributes paid in this Chamber to the late Herbert Augustus Talma, in as much as I have known him for over three decades. I have practised before him when he was a Magistrate, a Petty Debt Judge and an Acting Judge of the Assistant Court of Appeal. It can be truly said of him in his judicial office that he at all times, irrespective of who came before him, did his very best to uphold the reins of Justice evenly. I recall on one occasion that a close, personal friend of his appeared before him in a matter in which a member of this Chamber was also a party, and then as on every other occasion in which I have appeared before him, the late Mr. H. A. Talma did his duty and did it fearlessly and conscientiously. May he rest in peace.

I now ask hon. members to join me and signify their assent to the passage of this Resolution by standing in their places for a period of two minutes as a token of sympathy with the relatives of the late Herbert Augustus Talma.

Hon. members stood in their places for two minutes,

Mr. SPEAKER:

This Resolution has been unanimously passed, and the Clerk is now directed to take appropriate action to have it conveyed to the relatives of the deceased.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my sister-in-law, Mrs. Evelyn Talma, the widow of my late brother, and all their children, and other relatives and members of the family, I wish to extend our heartfelt thanks and appreciation for the kind and sincere expressions of sympathy which have been extended to the family by hon. members of this Chamber and indeed, by a large section of the community in general.

I may add that the expressions of sympathy and the numerous acts of condolences which have been tendered to the family have helped to lighten the shock and strain which we all encountered during the sudden passing of my brother. We feel indebted to members of this Chamber for the sentiments expressed in the Resolution which has been passed today, and I now thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members for your kindness.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that Question Time be taken.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

3.25 p.m.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time, and intimation was given earlier today that the Oral Reply to parliamentary Question No. 16/1964, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George, was ready.

REPAIRS TO GOVERNMENT-OWNED VEHICLES

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works

Will the Minister please state whether it is a fact that certain garages have been allowed to effect repairs to Government owned vehicles although such repairs could have been done by the workshop at the Department of Highways and Transport?

2. If the answer is \"yes\", will the Minister please state if a directive was issued in 1955 to all Government Departments, that all repairs to Government-owned vehicles must be done by the Workshop at Highways and Transport?

3. If the answer is \"yes\", will the Minister please state whether this directive has ever been rescinded?
4. If the answer to (3) is \"yes\", will the Minister please state at what time and for what reasons such action was taken?
5. If the answer to (3) is \"no\" will the Minister please state how such repairs now fall to be done by outside garages and what are the names of the garages concerned?
6. Will the Minister please state what action he proposes to take in the circumstances?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the replies to the hon. member's Question are as follows-

(1) Certain garages have effected repairs to Government-owned Vehicles in special cases of grave urgency.

(2) Yes, Sir. In 1955 the Department of Highways and Transport was made responsible for the upkeep and maintenance (excluding minor repairs) of all Government vehicles, machinery, launches etc. except in the cases of the Police Department and Fire Service where the responsibility of the Department of Highways and Transport was limited to major repairs, overhauls and regular inspections.

(3) The directive has not been rescinded.

(4) Does not arise.

(5) Repairs have been effected to Government-owned vehicles by private garages mainly on account of the inability of the Department of Highways and Transport with its present resources to cope expeditiously with repairs to all plant and equipment owned by the Government. Also new vehicles receive free service under the terms of purchase for a specific period, and some repairs are carried out under the manufacturers' guarantee.

The names of the garages concerned are:-

(i) Robert Thorn Limited (Courtesy Garage)

(ii) Chas. McEneaney & Co.

(iii) Fort Royal Garage

(iv) Eckstein Brothers

(v) Linton's Garage

(vi) Cole's Garage

(vii) Redman and Taylor's Garage

(viii)Electric Sales and Service

(ix)City Garage Trading Co.

(6) The Minister proposes to take appropriate steps to so equip the Department of Highways and Transport that it will be able to cope with all repairs to Government vehicles. However, it may on occasion still be necessary to have repairs done at private garages so as not to delay urgent Government business. Such occasions will be kept to a minimum.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There does not appear to be any supplementary question. Will the Hon. Leader of the House therefore intimate what he intends to proceed with next?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Resolution for \$800.00 of which notice was given earlier today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 NO. 46
PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS**

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the Resolution on the Order Paper is one for the sum of \$7,288 and it is in respect of three Heads of the Estimates. Under Item 18 - Government Advertisements - the sum of \$6,340.00 is required; under Item 21 - Uniforms for Messengers - the sum of \$168.00 is required and under Item 32 which is a new Item - \"Coat-of-Arms\" - the sum of \$780 is required. The Addendum to the Resolution sets out in fairly minor details the reason for which these additional sums of money are being asked. In connection with the new Item - \"Coat-of-Arms\" - the explanation is as follows-

Barbados has a Badge but no Coat-of-Arms. An application for Arms for the Island has been submitted to the College of Arms, London. and the Government has been requested to remit to the Garter King of Arms the standard fee of one hundred and fifty guineas. Supplementary provision is now sought of this amount plus a sum of \$24 for contingencies.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 NO. 49 GOLDEN ROCK DAY NURSERY

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is the Resolution for \$800.00 of which notice was given today. This sum is required as an additional grant to the Committee of Management of the Golden Rock Day Nursery. In 1963 the Housing Authority which was quite conscious of its responsibility to this community, built the first Day Nursery at the Pine Housing Area and after the Committee was appointed to run this Day Nursery, it asked for some money. 3.35 p.m.

In the Estimate for 1964-65 the Government provided a grant of \$1,000 for this Day Nursery. The Committee learnt from experience, and it has discovered that it was very difficult or impossible for it to raise the entire amount necessary to run the Day Nursery to the end of the financial year. The cost of running this Day Nursery is \$5,300 for the year, and after raising funds by voluntary efforts, cake sales, dances, evening radio talks and Jumble sales, the Committee discovered that there would still be a

deficit of \$800. Representation having been made to the Government and in as much as this Day Nursery was started by the Government, and also in as much as the Government is conscious of its responsibility to not only children of school age, but children of pre-school age, support was given to the Golden Rock Day Nursery.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution for \$800 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G FERGUSSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 1964

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 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.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the last occasion when this Chamber met, we dealt with certain amendments to the Wireless Telegraphy Act, and this is a Resolution seeking the approval of this Chamber for the approval of the Wireless Telegraphy Regulations which are set out in the Addendum below. The Addendum sets out that these Regulations seek to amend the Wireless Telegraphy Regulations, 1940, in order to remove the requirements for licences in respect of wireless broadcast receivers, and to make provision for licences for wireless broadcast television receivers. The licence fee for wireless broadcast television receivers is fixed at \$10 per annum and is payable to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

As hon. members will recall, the Regulations governing the licence fee on ordinary radios were observed in the breach, but on this occasion, there shall be paid to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation by and on behalf of the licensee prior to the grant of every such licence a sum of

\$10. Subject to the provisions of Regulation 10 hereof, all valid licences granted under paragraph (I) of this Regulation shall be renewable annually during the month of January in each year on production

of the licence at the office of the Corporation, and on payment to the Corporation by and on behalf of the licensee of the sum of \$10. To every licence there is a notice which will appear in the paper and will be attached to each licence which is issued. This licence is renewable, as I said, annually during the month of January of each year on its production at the office or other designated place of business of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and on payment by or on behalf of the licensee to the Corporation of the sum of \$10, and the receipt of the General Manager of the Corporation or of such other officer of the Corporation as is duly authorised is sufficient proof of renewal.

This licence is subject to cancellation or withdrawal at any time either by specific notice in writing sent to either of the addresses set out in the above licence or by means of a general notice in the Press of the island.

Under the Wireless Telegraph Act, 1940-32, the maximum penalty for non-payment of this licence or for failure to comply with any other terms and conditions thereof is a fine not exceeding £100 or six months imprisonment with or without hard labour. 3.45 p.m.

The present Clause has not been amended. The penalty was always there but it was not enforced. I would just bring that to the attention of hon. members; but in this connection of a licence fee of \$10 per year for being owner and operator of a television set, it would be enforced not in the breach, but in the actual collection of the fee in question.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass. Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think any of us under these circumstances would be in opposition to paying some kind of licence fee in respect of television. It is true, as the Hon. Minister has said, that you had a law enacted years and years ago for the paying of a licence fee of ten shillings per annum by persons who operated radio sets, but this law was really observed in the breach rather than in the spirit.

However, Sir, I am somewhat worried, if I am to remember the speech of the Hon. Minister of Education to the nation, when he reminded us of the advantages which we could benefit from by television and I think most of us would endorse that statement. Television today can be the means of the dissemination of knowledge, of culture and other means of education. Therefore, I think television is something which I believe any Government in power would want to reach the rank and file of the community or the man in the street of this country.

Judging from the economy of the country, unless my interpretation is wrong, this Resolution seeks to amend the Wireless Telegraphy Regulations, 1940, in order to remove the requirements for licence in respect of wireless and broadcast receivers, and to make provision for licences for wireless broadcast television receivers.

As the Hon. Minister said, the fee which the people were called upon to pay for radios was not introduced by this Government and apparently the people did not pay it. The fee for wireless broadcast television receivers is now fixed at \$10 per annum and it is payable to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The Hon. Minister has said that it will not be observed in the breach. No doubt, that fee

would come down rather heavily on the 20,000 people in this country who have installed in their homes what are known as Rediffusion sets.

Now, Sir, as I have said. I think we all endorse the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Education about the advantages of television. I understand up to now - and I am speaking subject to correction because the Minister would know the figures - that about 2,000 television sets have been installed. Speaking for myself, from what I have seen in other countries, I think that is a good start, and I have nothing but to praise it. However, I am quite sure it was the desire of the Minister of Education that not only persons

in my position or other hon. members in this Chamber or even people in the upper half of the community but people in every walk should have installed wireless telegraphy receivers. Just in the same way that people down under the hills, the workers, the domestics and the like can have Rediffusion sets in their homes, I think it would be the desire of the Hon. Minister and all of us in this Chamber that in due course those same people should have television sets.

I do not think any hon. member of this House would like to deny these people the right of viewing and listening to their own television; but in fixing this licence fee at the rate of \$10 per annum, - it does seem to me to be prohibitive to these people. You may say that to anybody who can rent a set at \$8.00 or \$9.00 per month, this fee of \$10 per annum may not be too much to pay: but, as I see it, from the economy of this country, and judging from those who have Rediffusion sets in their homes, and bearing in mind those people are the people whom the Hon. Minister of Education would like to benefit from television, this fee of \$10 per annum to start with would have to be radically reduced. I have said so on more than one occasion to the people who are concerned with this business. I have told them that the price must be considerably reduced because anything more than \$5.00 a month is more than what the domestic workers and people in that category can afford to pay per month, I am convinced that if television must reach those people whom the Hon. Minister of Education and hon. members in this Chamber would like it to reach, these charges would have to be considerably reduced. Do not let us say that any person who can pay either \$9.00 or \$10 per month for the rental of this service can pay this licence fee of \$10 per annum.

It is my considered opinion that, in view of the fact that this television service is actually guaranteed and supported by the Government, this fee rather than be set at \$10 per annum, should be \$5.00 per annum; and I am sure if it is set at \$5.00 you would see how much more you would be able to collect. I consider the licence fee of \$10 per annum is really too much. If you say that you would like T.V. to reach the peak of 20,000, I join with you because unless you reach that peak, you cannot guarantee that it will be in the hands of those whom you want to have it.

We have taken on television when television has reached its peak in other countries. We want it to be the same way as Rediffusion where everyone can have it in their house. I repeat, \$5.00 would be a reasonable charge for a licence fee in view of the fact that C.B.C. is supported by the Government. With these few remarks. I suggest that the licence fee as fixed at \$10 be reduced to \$5.00. I believe when you take this matter from every possible angle, that is to say, if you wish people to get the benefit from television - and I am thinking of the poor old lady who comes from Newcastle, St. John, who would like to see it, and I am thinking of the extension of electricity down there. 3.55 p.m.

I am thinking of the extension of electricity throughout this island and of people who want to be kept

off the streets at night lying on the banks, and so on, when there is no other place for them to go. I think that these people should have the benefit of television too, and they should have it at a rate which they can afford to pay. Least of all, the Government should not pass any sort of legislation which would make it prohibitive for these people to own and have the benefit of television. It may not be prohibitive to people who get an income more than £500 a year; but to those who get an average income of £500 a year or £600, if you want them to get the benefit of television, it is prohibitive to ask them to pay a licence fee of \$10 per annum. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will repeat what I said before. I have already had the opportunity of discussing this matter with persons who have a tremendous amount of finance in this business, in the rental of television sets, and I have made it quite clear to them that they are wasting time in thinking that the economy of this island can afford people to pay \$10 or \$13 a year. When you bring this fee down to about \$5.00 per annum, then you will be doing something for the people.

I do not expect you to reach any high peak within a year or two. You have come along with something to which we all pay tribute; I have the highest praise for the start which you have made. I want to say this: I should like to hear more local news and happenings coming over, and I would also like to hear more Barbadian voices. I would also like to see more television sets getting into people's houses, I feel, Sir, that an amount of \$5 per annum would be sufficient for a licence fee. I have always agreed that the majesty of the law is such that if you want people to respect legislation it must be reasonable. This is a question of \$10 per annum for a licence; this is not a question of \$10 for a licence and you are finished with it. I am not talking about the few people who can pay \$10 a year for their licence; I am talking about the majority of people who cannot afford to pay that fee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to see television succeed in this island. I have studied the situation very carefully and seriously; I have had the opportunity of discussing the matter with people who have high financial interest in this business, and I have told them that at this price and with the economy of this country and the position of the general worker, it cannot succeed. I am thinking of the average worker to whom you would like to get this knowledge passed over. I am moving, Sir, that this licence fee be reduced to \$5 per annum, and if it becomes necessary to increase this amount then we can come back to the House with the matter. As it stands now, this gives the opportunity only to the few who put in television. There are some 20,000 people who have children and who cannot afford to pay this licence fee. I am therefore moving that where the figures \"\$10\" appear, they should be deleted and the figure \"\$5\" be inserted.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken on this matter already and I have voiced my views. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but in a different manner. I do not agree with him on the broad idea. I do not think that, as it stands now, television is a mass movement. (Mr. MOTTLEY I did not say it was) I did not say that you said it was, because it will never get to the mass movement at this rate. The Hon. Minister of Education, in presenting this matter of radio and television, spoke of the benefit to the community generally. I should like to say that my analysis of this matter is that television, as it now stands, is a higher income group facility. People in the higher income brackets can afford television at the present cost. 4.05 p.m.

One may say that that same group can afford to pay \$10 a year as a licence fee, but I am not viewing it from the point of view of what those persons can afford to pay. Whether it is rent or otherwise, what I am prepared to say is what I have said already: there is absolutely no justification for a licence fee at all.

There is no such thing as a licence fee in the United States of America when you own a television set. The reason for that is that in the United States of America, radio and television are a commercial business; so they set out to collect income through the commercial medium and not through the users, because the users are the ones that create the volume of business for them to charge the advertisers; so there is no justification in making T.V. a commercial business, and then charging the users for the television sets because in any case the Government collects money when you own a television set through the ad valorem duty, although the Government said that they are restricting the profit which the dealers are going to make on T.V. sets. When you buy a T.V. set, the Government collects ad valorem duty on what it costs; so the fact that you have a television station means that the Government gets additional income.

Now if the Government says that C.B.C. is a commercial station, and this is a subvention to the T.V. Station on that basis that the C.B.C. and T.V. can pay for themselves, I will say this: I know the income of Rediffusion because I have just negotiated with them, and they are making handsome profits based on rentals of radio sets at the rate of \$2.00 per month. It is true that the Government is not

going to receive any rental because a person owns a radio set, but the fact that more radios will be sold in the island means that the Government will get an added income. When you put down the radio station, more people bought small transistors, and you find every little boy around the corner, people on bicycles and people with snowball carts with them, and I do not know what is going to happen when the Australians come here, because it would be difficult to get people to work. You might as well close down the schools too because you will find a boy with a transistor radio in his desk while he is working. You will realise what the schoolmasters are going to have to face. I feel also, with Telstar and people going to the moon that the Japanese people are going to make more television sets which will be sold. You can buy a television set in the United States for \$100. As soon as the Station gets better, people will be buying smaller sets which they can view from a shorter distance and they would not have to have a wide screen.

I have never agreed with a radio licence, and I have never paid other than when the radio was first bought, and therefore they can come and lock me up now in retrospect. Why should I pay a licence fee to hear B.B.C. news coming from London or the Voice of America? You can justify these things now that we have a station. The B.B.C. is not a commercial station. You can turn on the B.B.C. for 24 hours, and you do not hear anybody selling Tide or soap. For that reason the British Broadcasting Corporation instituted this idea of a licensing fee in order that they would get revenue from that source in order to assist. Here in Barbados the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is a commercial station competing with other stations, and it is the only broadcasting station in the island as distinct from the wired broadcasting of Rediffusion; so it has a scope wider than the other station. What is the justification for a licence fee in the circumstances of C.B.C, as compared with the B.B.C.? You do not pay a licence fee in the United States of America because you own a radio. The next thing is that you will have to pay a licence fee because you own a refrigerator. There can be absolutely no Justification of a licence fee as long as the Government agrees that it is to be a commercial broadcasting station. That presupposes that your advertising is built up, and I know that has not been built up yet. You cannot open a station and in the first year or two get all the income. Do not tell me that the future for Barbados means that C.B.C. is not going to get more out of business as your programmes improve. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has advertisers in and out of Barbados which Rediffusion does not have. Let us take the rum people. I have heard on the 6 o'clock news Mount Gay advertising rum. The reason why they advertise

rum on C.B.C. is because it can be heard in the Leeward and Windward Islands; so all the people who have overseas connections are making advertisements for which you charge rates as distinct from the locally wired broadcasting station. From the income which Rediffusion gets at the rate of \$2 a month from rental of sets, they have put up a reserve of nearly half a million dollars, and if the Govern- cannot make a profit like that at C.B.C., I do not know. What are you going to use the licence fee to do? So far as the users of the new television sets are concerned, it would not affect them, but a fee in itself should be justified. Soon you will make a man pay a fee when he has ten pairs of shoes or owns a refrigerator.

I would say, Sir, that the users of radios have improved, and I will challenge any member on the Government Bench that the income of this Government has increased more than 50% by way of ad valorem duty, since the broadcasting station was built, on electrical equipment, and that is nothing to do with television. More people are going to buy radios and you will find many homes now with two or three, but they have to pay duty on them. You cannot buy a radio duty free from a store, and on the Japanese radios that are being sold in Barbados, this Government collects more duty, because the ad valorem duty on Japanese goods is twice the amount as that charged on goods coming from the United Kingdom. You are going to get Japanese television sets here, and I have seen some in the United States of America, What you must have here is not the grandiose television sets that some of us would like to have. What you

want them to have is maybe a 12-inch set, as I have seen in the United Kingdom. 4.15 p.m.

Take those shopkeepers around the country. May be, the twelve-inch small television sets which I have seen in the U.S.A. would do for them because they are cheap and cheap to all. These sets are built for those people who have a narrow space and do not have much room in which to view the set. Those people who do not have much room find it difficult to utilise a large set. These things are bound to expand, and if we are keeping close and watching the improvements of T.V., we have to look at what the Japanese people are doing in this respect, because they are advancing by leaps and bounds. They are more advanced in the improvement of transistor radios than anybody else. They are selling so many transistor radios right in New York itself and they are selling them against all the radios which the American people can make. If the American people can buy Japanese radios, you will know what we are going to do.

Sir, as long as the C.B.C. station is a commercial station, I do not see the necessity for a licence fee unless the Minister is willing to tell us that it is impossible for the station to make money unless you pay a licence fee. If you reduce the fee from \$10.00 to \$5.00, you can extend the trade. One of the wisest things that happened which Rediffusion Limited did was this. When they came here, they charged for the rental of the service of Rediffusion \$2.00 a month and they have been able to expand on that rental. They have not applied for any increase on that rent for the service and over the years they have expanded to the extent that in one in every four houses in Barbados, there is a Rediffusion set. There are 40,000 houses and 25,000 with Rediffusion sets in Barbados. That is a terrific proportion. In fact, I should say that 1 was talking about families. There is one in every four families that has Rediffusion sets. Here it is: you have this expansion with Rediffusion. It is because they started out with making you pay an economical rent.

You may say now it does not matter to the people who have to pay \$10 for a licence fee because they are paying \$13 and \$14 per month for the rental of the service, but they are not the people whom the

Minister says that he wants the sets to reach. You cannot reach the people by the present users of television sets. They are the type of people who, I would say, have a status complex. They would put in one because they would say \"I don't want to be left behind.\" They would do that when the ordinary man will not be able to begin to dream to pay \$16 a month rent for television. As a matter of fact, that is house rent. An ordinary man cannot pay that unless he wants his wife to chase him out of the house.

These rentals must be reduced, and I say that business in the venture is going to force this rent to be reduced. As soon as you find someone coming here with cheap rentals in television sets and bringing in cheap television sets, that is going to force the others to come down. I say this to the Hon. Minister: how would you justify a licence fee of \$10 within a cheap television area? I feel that the Hon. Minister should be prepared to tell us what does he envisage for T.V. if it has to operate independently and it does not get any support from the Radio Station.

This is one of the reasons why I agree to its being run by a public company. I do not understand your dealing with money when you cannot tell us the source of income from which you are getting that money. I think the Hon. Minister should tell us what is the source of income. What information can you give the House as to how you are operating? Can you tell us if it has come up to your anticipation? What are the kinks in it? Surely, you can give us some idea of the projection as to whether it is going to pay for itself.

The Hon. Minister spoke of the radio business. He said that there was a radio licence fee of ten shillings per annum, but nobody paid it, and nobody worried about collecting it. Nobody is against paying a licence fee if it is justified, even if it is \$20 per annum; but I do not like the idea of taxing people just for the sake of taxing. The Hon. Minis-

ter said that there was no consumption tax on television sets. That does not mean that there would never be any consumption tax because imposing taxation is something of your own Judgment. No Government would tell you that you have reached the limit of taxation. If any Government tells you so, we would be very happy to hear it.

I think the Hon. Minister should tell us if this \$10 licence fee for a wireless receiving set is going directly to C.B.C, along with the money which it collects from advertisements. Since the station came into effect, I have never been a regular viewer of television but I understand from those who are regular viewers that they see more advertisements than anything else on their sets. I am sure that these advertisements will increase, and I know that they are expensive. Let us take what is going to happen at the time of elections. If the Government agrees that you should appear on television that would be selling time. I may say here now, that if the Government agrees to that, I am not going to ask the Government for any free time. If they can buy twenty minutes time, I can buy five.

However, Sir, that is by the way. I am serious about this. I feel that we should not follow this system of imposing this taxation. We should follow the American system where they have commercialised television and radio broadcasts, and where you get your income from the people who use it. It is the man who wants time to advertise his things on it. He is the man who is making the money, and he is the man who should pay for it. 4.25 p.m.

It is the man who is advertising Tide, sweet soap and so on, who is making the money. I am paying for

the cost of television; I am paying duty for it, and therefore he is the man who must pay and you must see that he is paying for this advertising. I made my contribution when I bought a radio. If you are only guaranteeing the money to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and you must make it pay, then the Government is in a better position financially by putting down the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. If this is being done as a temporary measure -I have not had the time to analyse it, but if a person has a television set which costs him \$300 or \$400, then this amount of \$10 per annum as a license fee is a small amount to pay. The sum of \$300 or \$400 is the capital cost, but the \$10 per annum goes on for years. You do not want a person who is using a TV set to think that he is a Pope or a Prince; you do not want a person to feel that he has TV and you have none. One boy told another boy: \"you live in a big house and you have no TV\". The other fellow replied \"You live in a big house with TV and you have no pipe.\" (Laughter). Sir that only shows you what operates in the minds of children. You do not want TV to be regarded as a big house tax. I feel that you want to remove this sort of concept from the minds of some people. As soon as some people get refrigerators, their front doors are kept open. You do not want to create these bogey ideas. Material things are made to be used and to be enjoyed.

The Hon. Minister has said that somebody would help us with getting some of these TV sets for the schools, and I hope that we will have the facility of obtaining these things. I can see the popularity of this. I have seen that persons in our building have put up TV sets; it is true that we saved money because we did not have to spend any money in electricity because they had these TV sets. I think it is time that we should make some of these things available to the community because the community as a whole cannot pay for them. If the Premier is making a Television Broadcast, it cannot have any meaning now because you are only getting through to some people; but on the other hand, when President Johnson goes on TV, he goes to the nation. We do not manufacture these TV sets here, but I would say that the Minister should not have this imposition of \$10 per annum as a licence fee for a TV set. That should not be so because that would be a stumbling block if you are reaching the masses of the people. The company is getting an income so that this fee will not be necessary. I am satisfied that the ad valorem duty which the Government will get on a TV set will be more than \$10. You do not want to be increasing the cost of TV unnecessarily. The fee for putting an advertise-

ment over the radio is not by any means cheap, but it is an excellent medium in getting what you want done. In days gone by, we had to use gasoline and handbills, but nowadays we have the announcements made over the radio. However, this licence fee is too high; as a matter of fact, I am saying that there is no necessity for this licence fee if we are going to have this Caribbean Broadcasting Station on a commercial basis. I think that you should run this Station in the same manner as it is run in the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have heard my voice so that you will understand how it is with me. (Mr. WALCOTT Well, do not strain it). However, Sir, you will remember that I have always said that television is a big-shot thing. (Laughter). I have always said that television is not for the small working-class man. I said that from the very beginning. Now the Government is asking for the sum of \$10 per annum as a license fee for television. 4.25 p.m.

Before you go further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say that I believe the majority of people will sooner get T.B. before they get T.V. Would the ordinary working class man with six or eight children in a home and getting \$200 a month be able to buy or rent a television set? No, Sir. As the hon.

senior member for Bridgetown said, one would have to be in the \$500 a month bracket. A man may have to pay \$40 or \$50 a month for a house; then he has his milk bill and his food bill, and he may have to get a small car to take him to and from work. How on earth could he ever get a T.V. set? Only a few people would be able to buy or rent a set, and those few would be in a position to pay \$50 a year for a license.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to know from the Minister how he arrived at a fee of \$10 a year. If the Minister can tell me that from the amount of sets which have been sold the amount of money collected from license fees would help the company to tide over, that would be all right, I understand that all the apparatus has not been put up to give proper reception, but I do not know if it is true because I would more likely contract T.B. before I get T.V., so television is still a big shot thing. If you go into areas where there is electricity, you will find that there are still more people using kerosene oil lamps than those using electricity, and that is because they feel they are not able to instal electricity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I should like to say that the general background of noise on all sides of the House makes it difficult for me to understand the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have the Rules in front of you concerning any member who speaks or carries on a conversation while another member is on his feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I said the general background of noise.

Mr. SMITH:

I hope, Sir, that you will try to understand me for a moment. The point I was trying to make, however, is that in certain areas there are more people using kerosene oil lamps than those using electricity, but if they were in a position to instal electricity, they would do so. Do you expect these people to own a T.V. set? There are some people who believe that to try to hang your hat higher than you can reach is a good thing. Now the Government may be surprised at the amount of T.V. sets which have already been distributed to homes, but they must wait and see how many are going to be returned to the stores. You, Sir, work in the Courts, and you can find out how many people are brought before the Judge for not paying their Rediffusion bill of \$2 a month. If they cannot pay \$2 a month, how on earth would they be able to pay \$13 or \$14 a month rent for television? If a person has to pay \$13 or \$14 a month rent for a television set and also has to pay rent for his home, something has to be neglected, and he may find himself trying to open the T.V. set to live in, because the landlord is not going to be satisfied to know that he has a T.V. set in his house and is not paying his rent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government is doing nothing on behalf of the majority of people as far as television is concerned . When it comes to the licence fee, I feel they are going a little too quickly in imposing the \$10 fee, because when people take up the newspaper tomorrow and see, or it comes over the radio tonight that they have to budget for an additional \$10 a year, those who intended buying a set may not worry to do so. They should have waited at least a year or two allowed people to put in as many sets as possible in their homes and then turn on the heat; but they turned on the heat too quickly. 4.45 p.m.

If that is all the sense which they have, I am not responsible for that. If I were a member of their Party, I would tell them \"Too soon would be too quick\". If everybody over there is one and the same thing, well, go ahead and

put it on. I am not going to help them to put it on because I am not in favour of anything at all. I say: not one cent. As far as this is concerned, they would have my vote if it is something. If it were something to harm the people, I would say \"no\", but it is nothing to harm those poor working people who put me here; so I am with the others.

The hon. senior member for the City said that this fee should be reduced to \$5.00. The hon. Junior member for St. Joseph is saying now that it should be nothing. This is only turning back the minds of the people from putting in televi-sion. I dare suppose that only five per cent of the people of the country would be able to instal it. I know a friend of mine who is only waiting for the month to end to tell a business company which installed a television set at his place to come for it. The particular firm took a set at his home and told him to try it out for a month, and at the end of the month he could either pay the deposit on it or return it. This fellow is enjoying what is coming over it until the end of this month. He told me that he was going to carry it back because his wife told him that he is not able to pay for it. You have big shots for big shot things. You have a big shot T.V. and now you have a \$10 licence fee for it. Big man! Big money! Big T.V.!

I am saying that if you think that you are going to help the poor man by television, it is not going to help him, at least not just now. One of the mistakes which I believe you have made already is fixing the price which people should pay for television sets because it is possible with competition that this price would become cheaper. If firms are competing against each other in the sale of wireless sets, you are liable to get them cheaper; but when you go and fix the mark-up value for them, these boys who are in the trade are not going to compete against each other. As it goes now they are not in the position to extend their credit for a little longer. If they were in the other position, they may have Been able to say: let them pay for it in one year, or two years and you will also get some other firms saying that you have five years to pay for it. When they extend it to five years, they would say that they are trying to help the little fellow to come in and get one. There are lots of people who have motor cars now who would never have been able to own one, were it not for the merchants giving them a chance to pay for one. There are people who would prefer to pay for a new motor car and own one by a longer credit system than having a shorter time to pay for it. It would seem to me better to have a television set on reasonable terms by giving you the opportunity of a little longer time to pay for it. If the terms are a little less, you may find people who would find the wherewithal to pay for it.

If the Government cannot see their way to 'fix-it-right', they are going to fix it wrong. They are fixing it wrong by calling on the people to pay \$10 for a licence fee. I am not in favour of one cent being paid. As I have said, \"too early, too quick\". It may come a time when the people would see their way to pay more, but not yet. Not at this time. It is too quick. It is only just last month that television came into being, and this month you are imposing a licence fee on T. V. sets. There is the possibility that some who are now trying to hold on to keeping it would say that this licence fee of \$10 per annum is going to stop them.

I do not know if this fee of \$10 is imposed to help the C.B.C.. If this licence fee of \$10 is going to

save them from falling through, tell us so. Tell the people so and let the people know the position. Therefore, whoever wants to enjoy T.V. would be quite satisfied to pay for it. But your barely saying that you are calling for it and not letting us know your reasons makes us to feel that because you are the Govern-ment and because you can put it on, you are putting it on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker,

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, when Sir Winston Churchill was first a member of the House of Commons, he was one day asked to reply to a speech made by Lord Charles Beresford, who was also a member of the House, but who was some years senior to himself. This member was renowned for the vacuity of his ideas. In reply to him, Sir Winston said in what has become a famous speech that the hon. member is a kind of person who before he gets up does not know what he is going to say, when he is on his feet does not know what he is saying, and when he sits down does not know what he has said.

I was forcibly reminded of that as I listened to the speech of the hon. member who has just sat. And I was reminded of that for more than one reason, because judging from what he has said, the Party which he represents spoke with two policies on the same thing and within the shortest possible time. This hon. member is condemning television, calling down all sorts of imprecations on it, repeating the poorest possible future for it, while his colleague, the leader of the Party in this House, appeared before a T.V. screen and addressed to us, in a histrionic and quite dramatic way, the very outpourings of his heart for the very service which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has condemned. 4.55 p.m.

This House can therefore brush aside the Barbados Labour Party in most of its pronouncements, but certainly in anything which it has to say about television, except to note with approval that at least one section of it knows what to say about television, even if the other section does not know what to say about it. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph rambled far and wide over this matter. He would have us believe that there are large numbers of people in this island who, as he says, will never be able to afford television. Yet he reminded us that everybody did not have a motor car or a refrigerator when motor cars or refrigerators first came to the island, but in process of time more and more people owned them, and therefore the process of time has brought all of these things within the reach of more and more people. Therefore, the same example which the hon. member quotes so clumsily by some clumsy sleight of hand, he quotes against the scope of television sets. We are not now discussing here a project which is an old one or which has become old; we are not discussing an aspect of Government policy which is so old and so well set that the people have been doubtful of its origin; we are discussing a project which started only four weeks ago. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a matter of fact, it is not even four weeks old because at the time at which I am speaking, I think it is one hour short of four weeks of the establishment of this institution of the television service.

The hon. member is not able to castigate the Government for having broken one of its election promises because we have not broken any. But we are quite willing to give honour where honour is due. Because we have kept our promises to the people and we have done what we have promised, the hon. member is now castigating us in an ordinary debate in order to bolster up ideas which they did not

understand, or if they did understand them, they did not have the ability to grasp them. We are discussing here and now a Resolution which seeks to approve certain Regulations which arise out of an amendment to the Wireless

Telegraphy Act of 1940. Four weeks ago we instituted television and three weeks ago we passed an amendment to the Act, and therefore most of what I am going to say now, I have already said with respect to CBC Television. The Regulations which this Resolution now before the House is asking us to approve, were made by the Cabinet in exercise of their right as the Government of this island, and these Regulations are now before the House with the accompanying Resolution. I may say in passing that I must reject the suggestion by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the figures of \$10 should be changed to the figure of \$5 because that is impossible under the Constitution, The hon. member either has to accept the figures of \$10 or reject them.

Several months ago when the Cabinet reached the decision to set up this television service - I may say that this decision was reached shortly after the radio service was set up by the Government - definite proposals accompanying the institution of that service were brought before this House. They were fully debated and discussed in this Chamber, and all the explanations were given with one reservation. We did say, when we came to the financial Resolutions concerning CBC Television, that there were other aspects of television with which we would acquaint the House from time to time. We said that we could not acquaint the House of them at the time because these were fiscal matters, and we would acquaint the House of them at Budget time.

Now let us come to the Budget time. At Budget time the Minister of Finance dealt with the matters at great length; he dealt with the matters of finance and the establishment of television. He disclosed that there would be no consumption tax levied on television receivers which were coming into this island, and he also disclosed that it was proposed to bring in a Resolution deleting the radio licence fee and that we would have a television licence fee which would be at the sum which is now proposed in these Regulations. All of that was known. The hon. member, who is not now in his place, had most of the Budget talk. Night after night one would hear his voice coming over the radio. In the course of a lengthy speech, the hon. member reminded us that there was no need for us to thank the Government because he could lick the plate. All of that is over. At no point during the course of the hon. member's speech did he refer to any of these proposals of the financing of CBC Television or with the proposal that the licence fee would be this sum of \$10. As a matter of fact, there is a sense in which this debate ran out of order because the hon. member criticised the fiscal proposals which had already been agreed to by the House - proposal which had been the subject of a Budget Statement and which the House, by its positive vote, had agreed to by the consequential financial legislation,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, any such criticism is a reflection on votes which have already been passed during the course of this session. I will not, however, make that point too hard or too firm because I realise that in connection with a new service which is being established, hon. members should always have the right to ask questions about it; and this Government does not shrink from answering any questions about television. Some people say that the cost of television to some people is too great; that maybe true in respect of some people, but not in respect of all the people. 5.05 p.m.

Granted, therefore, that there are some people who in this initial stage of the service can afford either to rent or to purchase sets, and granted also that this number must necessarily be, all things being equal,

in the minority, would it be fair of this Government to make the entire community carry the burden of a service which as of now is enjoyed only by a few? In the way some people want it done, that would be the most one-sided and unconscionable levy of taxation you could ever make, to make a majority who cannot now afford such a privilege pay for the minority who can. No democratic Government, least of all no democratic Government with this kind of thinking, would ever walk on this unworthy path, and this Party which has pledged itself in speech and writing and all manner of public performance to the amelioration of the lot of the humble man, would be the last political organisation in this world to

institute that form of taxation; so that the imposition of the licence fee at this stage is eminently justified by the nature of the case, by the nature of the service and by the number of users who as of now partake of the Service.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what would happen five years from now, but it may well be that in the natural ebb and flow of commercial competition and in all these improvements which industrial production makes from time to time that television receivers will come into this island costing something like \$50 a piece. When that time comes, that will be a new situation, and instead of there being 2,500 sets as there are now in people's homes, there may well be 30,500. That would be all to the good, and in that new situation certain new fiscal considerations may well arise, and whoever is Minister of Finance at that time and at that juncture may well see fit to recommend a change in the licence fee or its abolition. But we cannot legislate for the future for a development which does not now exist; and since we do not know how many homes to the last unit will have television receivers in 1970, we cannot now frame a policy for that day, ignoring the circumstances of this day. Some people say on the other hand that it is the Government's fault that television receivers are so expensive. Let me make this clear. This is the easiest of all charges for us to refute. First of all, in order to make it possible for more and more homes to enjoy the benefit of television, whether by hire or purchase or both, we abolished the Consumption Tax, as on any television receiver of a normal price, a person who had consumption tax to pay would probably find himself paying, in addition to other charges, something at the barest minimum of \$60 or \$70 in consumption tax alone. When, therefore, you charge a licence fee of \$10 even for five years, the charge of the licence fee is less than the minimum a man or a purchaser would have had to pay in consumption tax. Suppose, therefore, this was not an enterprise which is young; suppose that it was ten years old and all of these things were viewed with a hindsight, and it would seem that the spread of television receivers.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said \"would have had to pay\". Am I to understand that there was a consumption tax on T.V. sets prior to this?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is hardly a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

There was no consumption tax because there were no television sets, but I think you will remember that the Minister of Finance had said in his Budget Speech that there would have been if he had not decided that there should not be. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I remember intervening in the Budget Debate to tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that it was entirely wrong of him to say what had not happened or what would have happened, because in truth and in fact the occasion for his prediction

had not arisen. In other words, no tax had been laid on, and therefore it was quite foolish to decide that if there had been a tax, it would have been more burdensome.

The point I was making was this, Mr. Speaker: if a service were ten years old and all the things you are now looking forward to could be viewed with hindsight, and if the commercial prospects and projections which we have worked on for this joint enterprise of radio and television were fulfilled, and the Government had still maintained what would in the light of these fulfilments be an unnecessary imposition, then of course all the criticism which was made here this evening would have been valid; but instead of being at the end of a year, we are at the beginning of one, and furthermore I know hon. members in this Chamber well enough to realise that the day this Government comes into this House and asks for a subsidy for the CBC on the ground that it is not making money, a howl will be raised from one end of this island to the other. If we are taking steps to safeguard the Government's integrity and Government's position against that kind of contingency, then you must allow us the right as the Government of this island to initiate what policies we want which we feel are justified to obviate that sort of contingency. If we took some obvious steps to prevent that state of affairs from happening and then through carelessness or lack of foresight we had to come to ask for money and tell you that because of improper budgeting and projections we had not set this enterprise on firm foundation, we should deserve all the criticism- and more- which hon. members would see fit to hurl upon us.

We have no apologies to make for this. In one purely narrow sense, this is a fiscal matter arising out of pro-posals in the Budget which this House had accepted both openly and directly. In another and wider sense, if we tell you that this part of our financial projections to make certain that as far as humanly possible we shall never have to come with a tale of woe before you, then you have to give us credit for that part of our policy.

5.15 p.m.

You can criticise us, but never on the ground that we do not know what we are doing. There are several other things which are mentioned in this debate, all of which I need not answer, but they arise out of the fact that this service is new. Naturally, the Government is at one with the Opposition that they are desirous of seeing this service provided all over the Island. We wish to see it spread to home. One aspect of that escaped us, but I asked hon. members to say this. When something is new and young, it must necessarily have its teething troubles; therefore, criticism of a young service is only valid if you criticise it in the light of what it is going to do and not in the light of what it has not done.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, before the Resolution is passed, I just want to speak about a few misconceptions. The Resolution is not asking members of the House to approve of the establishment of a Television Broadcasting Station the nature of the Resolution is to approve of Regulations which the Government in the little recess over the Christmas Season has brought in order to collect a little revenue.

As long as we get our premise correct, we can go on

to any misconceptions which may have arisen. Some hon. members asked for a reduction in the licence fee while some urged for a complete abolition of the licence fee. I cannot really understand how anyone whether he is Social-ist Conservative minded can argue that in a Resolution such as this, we should ask people, who do not enjoy a certain facility because of the lack of income, to subsidise or pay taxation for the facilities which are afforded to those who are in a better position.

There is no point in making the analogy between the Barbados Rediffusion Service and the Television Broad-sting Service, because on the one hand, the Barbados Redissusion Service has no power to enforce a licence on the general public; they can only make a general charge. On the other hand, the Television Service of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is operating by Government\'s authority we have not told anyone that it would be via-ble from the date of its establishment. It has to be financed by various means, such as by import duties, advertisements, imposition of a licence fee, such as what you get in the United Kingdom, which is the country which first instituted television broadcasting and which is operating it up to the present moment.

If you want a parallel situation, I think the situation which obtains in the United Kingdom is very near to what obtains in Barbados today because in the United Kingdom you have the Government Broadcasting Station which is known as the B.B.C. and you have also two independent television networks as well as the Scottish Independent Television network. Therefore, you have alongside each other, four television networks in which one is operated by Government. If you have three independent television networks and one by the Government, and you have the choice of any station which you want to use, you may say that there is no justification for people who live in Scotland and who may not be able to receive the B.B.C, to pay a licence fee,

Here in Barbados, there is only one television station. I may say that television was born in England because England had television before any other country, including the U.S.A, Even although other countries had television and were experimenting with it, none can gainsay the fact that television started in the United Kingdom. Despite the fact that there are three independent television networks besides the B.B.C., the television fee has been increased in the United Kingdom and these other three are in no way depending on public subsidy for their successful operations. Here is the position in the United Kingdom. You have three independent corporations spread throughout the length and breadth of the country and in all the British Islands, probably excluding the Orkney Islands. The viewer can choose what sort of programmes he wants to watch, yet still he has to pay the licence fee. If that is so in the United Kingdom, how much the more in Barbados where we have the facility, and it is the only one capable of

providing a television service for the poor benighted inhabitants of rural districts, like the rural district which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph represent and of which he considers himself the sole champion in the Universe. Why should those persons living in this community who lack the income purchasing sets be called upon to subsidise a facility which they cannot enjoy themselves? I cannot see the Hon. member's argument.

The hon. member talks as if there are two sides to the question. I would have thought that any one besides the hon. senior member for the City would have been urgent to pass this Resolution as it is in order to ensure that no subsidy comes from the masses; if anything, they should say that the licence fee should be increased. Personally, I think the licence fee should not be less than \$1.00 a month. As it is now, it is eighty-three point something cents per month.

Hon. members will probably remember, - those who are debating this Resolution as if it is a debate on the pros and cons for establishing television - that as far back as the Budget Speech which I made in April, last year, I certainly told hon. members that the Government had the intention of establishing a television service. At that time, I stated that there will be no consumption tax on television or on radios, and the reason which I also advanced was that it was being done in order to encourage people to purchase radio and television sets.

5.25 p.m.

Buying such commodities in normal circumstances would have come under the category of electronic household goods, such as washing machines would be characterised, if people are paying customs tariff as such. The import duty on these commodities would be something like 30% plus 20%, which would probably increase the cost price to the purchaser to something in the average vicinity of \$100. We said that in order to encourage people to purchase television sets, the mark-up would be restricted to 25% of the landed cost. You would be surprised to know, Sir, that although the Government of Jamaica had television established for over two years, that Government approached me and asked me how I managed to control the mark-up at 25%, and I gave them what I thought would be the cost to the importers. And the Government of Jamaica proposes to impose the same mark-up on television sets. Whether you are a merchant or a purchaser of a television set - if you are a merchant and you find that a mark-up of 25% is unremunerative, we are not taking away anything from you. We do not want the business houses to turn themselves into charitable institutions, and any merchant who feels like that has the remedy in his hand. All he has to do is to stop importing these television sets. When the Government introduces a new service, we cannot allow the mercantile element of this country to exploit the consumers, as they have been exploited for such a long time, by the exorbitant mark-ups which were enjoyed under the previous Government. We will not do anything which will cause any man to go out of business.

How can you argue that the imposition of 25% on a commodity which you have never sold before will cause any hardship to enure to the people of this country? From

the point of view of the purchaser and the consumer we have provided a service which we think in Barbados, as an enlightened country and a country which is going forward, will stimulate skills, technical proficiency and allow Government Departments, like the Ministry of Education, to experiment with new teaching techniques, new approaches to education and to increase the general standards of the community. We are not in any way apologising for that. We say that it would not be fair

to ask the taxpayers generally to subscribe inordinately to a service such as this. We think that some sort of social contribution should be made. I do not share the unbounded optimism, because television is expensive, the receipts would be sufficient to defray the cost of the establishment of the Institution and also amortize the money which is.....

Mr. WALOOTT:

On a point of order. That is precisely what the Hon. Minister said, The Hon. Premier was not in here. The Hon. Minister said that the amortization of this money would be done through the Consortium and the Government was acting as a guarantor of this money so that the question of a subsidy never arose.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member is referring to the debate in which the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is authorised to borrow money, in that I agree. What I was saying, Sir, is that I am not optimistic that a new service such as this would be able to gather in a sufficiently large volume of advertising business as to cover its cost as well as to pay back this money which this House has authorised the Corporation to borrow. This Government is committed to meet any operating deficits apart from the deficits from the Banks which the Corporation may incur until we indulge in other methods of financing. With the increase in number of sets and the growth of popularity in advertising yielding revenue, with the spread of facilities to the neighbouring islands, we will not have to pay any subsidy. It would be hypocritical for me or for anyone who understands the difference between two and seven, to say otherwise, and it appears to be very difficult for some hon. members of the House to see that this Government will not have to provide any subsidy to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. There will be a substantial increase in revenue from the advertising sets. The Barbados Government advertising includes radio, magazine programmes sports meetings, and our advertising revenue is just over \$1 million. Until that revenue increases, until businessmen are induced to spend a larger proportion of their incomes on advertising, one sector can only gain advertising revenue at the expense of another sector.

In other words, Sir, what I am saying is this; the revenue from the operation of television will increase and it will not necessarily increase at any phenomenal rate. It must increase at the expense of its sister service and at the expense of newspaper advertising in this country. Sir, that is the impact of a service such as this. If you are smoothing out these fluctuations and disparities, then you will want this revenue to be increased at a steady rate, but not necessarily at a phenomenal rate because of the many advertising dislocation in the community which would be undesirable. We have made a decision to establish a television service after thinking of the benefits which would accrue and what would be the source of revenue of this television service.

5.35 p.m.

What then are the sources of revenue from the T.V. Service? The sources of revenue by agreement of which every single member of the House was aware over eight months ago, was that there would be an imposition of a licence fee of \$10. I do not have to justify a licence fee. I am a Socialist and I do not believe in making people have less money by paying for luxuries for people who have more money than they. If I may sum it up in a nutshell.

Secondly the import duties are net additions to the customs receipts of this island. The import duties are a net imposition and would not have existed before

Mr. Speaker, If the Hon. senior member for St. Peter will allow me to continue, I will do so. I sat back here

patiently and listened for one and a half hours.(Mr. WAL-COTT: You said it was a subsidy when there was no sub-sidy). This is a different occasion and a different day.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I remind the hon. senior member for St. Peter that he is not on his feet and he should not be heard?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I understand that the difficulty is that when the hon. member is whispering sweet nothings into the Reporter's car, it is very difficult to get down what I have said; so if for no other reason that the hon. member cannot restrain himself, I would ask him on behalf of the Reporter to allow me to be heard, because we do want to be able to check what I have said. The Hon. member obviously does not understand and probably would be annoyed if I said he does not understand, but when the hon. member is talking about a Resolution.....

Mr. Speaker, will you ask the hon. member to refrain from interrupting me?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already asked the hon. member to refrain from interrupting. May I just remind the hon. member, as this is the first meeting of the year, of Standing Order No. 29 (6) \"Behaviour of Members not Speaking\" which reads as follows-

\"While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions.\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not want to digress, but the hon. member obviously does not understand, and there-fore I do not intend to waste time on members who do not understand. This is nothing to do with the Minister of Education; I am saying what my opinion is. I am Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Education cannot arrogate to himself the right to speak on financial matters. When you want a Government statement on economic matters, you have to see me whether I am right or wrong, and there-fore having had the benefit of my opinion as the last opinion, he should be happy. I am not going to allow any member of this House to leave here today with the impression, whether the Minister of Education or anybody else intended that they should get that impression which I do not think he did either from this debate or any other debate, that the Station is going to be an overwhelming success from this month when it has only been operating four weeks, or that at the end of the financial year in 1966 that there may not be some deficit in the overall operations of C.B.C. If the hon. member does not like me to say this, he would like to be able to come back eighteen months from now and say that we did not get up and tell the House that we were going to have a subsidy. I did not say that there is going to be a subsidy or that there is not going to be a subsidy. We have worked out projections in which there should not be a subsidy, and these were the premises from which the Minister of Education was speaking, but I know enough from this business, not being an amateur strate-gist in my Job, to say that projections are only

projections. You may get an inefficient Manager or a poor Advertising Manager. Fortunately we have a good one now.

Mr. Speaker, I am not projecting what will happen in the next eighteen months; I am saying that our legal position is that we are entitled to subsidise if there is a deficit. I am hoping there will be no deficit, and one of the reasons is to do what we said eight months ago, that is to have a licence fee of \$10. In other words, Sir, we are not asking approval for the establishment of a T.V. Station and trying to persuade hon. members to support it on the grounds that it is going to make more money than the Irish Sweepstake; We are purely saying that the licence fees which we spoke about eight months ago will accrue to the Corporation. The other source of revenue which we agreed with Thomson Television was that the import duty on Television sets should also go straight over to the Corporation, so that if we get \$180,000 from import duty, that will not be a subsidy because it is nothing that is being deducted from normal receipts. It is something which is accruing to the revenue of this island directly as a result of the estab-

lishment of the Station. is it unfair to allocate import duty to the C.B.C. at the end of the Financial year? Ail this was in the Agreement which hon. members of the House should have been aware of over a year ago.

If from advertising revenue, from licence fees and from the appropriation of import duty on television sets, the Company is faced not with a deficit but an actual operating deficit, who is going to pay for it but the Government of Barbados out of the public revenue of Barbados? We own the Station, Just as much as we own the Transport Board and the Natural Gas Corporation, and the hon. member himself has said on occasions that he regards these public corporations as something which the Government should subsidise. When he is talking about wages, he often says: \"Do not talk about losing money because the Government can raise taxes and the Government can pay.\" When not talking about wages and the Order Paper is a short one such as this, it is not fair for members to have these lengthy and protracted debates about a subsidy.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I never raised the question of a subsidy in this debate. I said repeatedly that I was not here when the Minister introduced, this question, but the Minister told this House that this was a matter they were underwriting, and the question of a subsidy did not arise. This is the first time in my life that I am hearing of a .subsidy. It was written in the Bill that we would have to pay no deficit, and I have never asked the Government to pay a subsidy for a T.V. yet. I spoke about transport and said that we have to subsidise it because it is done all over the world.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The Hon. Minister of Education was at pains to explain that. If we came to the House with a Resolution for the backing of \$500,000 for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, we would understand some of the, difficulty of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, as it is more than penetration; but we cannot understand the difficulty with the Hon. senior member for St. Peter. 5.45 p.m.

We could talk for eighteen years, and the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph would not be able to understand the difference. The hon. member said that the Government was asking the House to vote money to rent or subsidise the operation.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier was in the House. The hon. member said that when it came to the C.B.C., what he was asking for was authority to borrow the money, but when the question arose about a subsidy, the Minister said that no question of a subsidy arose because the Consortium was supposed to run this as a commercial concern and that it would pay for itself. He went on to say that far from not being able to pay for itself, the money which they are borrowing was money which they were going to pay back.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Again, if that was the point, the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph would not be able to understand.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to you for your protection. You hear how the Hon. Premier is getting on. You have heard him. I am appealing to you for your protection; otherwise you keep quiet and leave it to me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have no intention of doing anything of the sort this afternoon or any other afternoon. I simply implore and advise the Hon. senior member for St. John to deal with the points and forget that there is any other member in the House, except the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Sir, I could have understood if it were the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, but I am a bit non-plussed that the hon. senior member for St. Peter did not grasp what the Hon. Minister was saying. When they asked to borrow money, they were not asking for a grant from the Treasury. However, maybe, we will have a discussion about that later. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is a commercial operation, and we would be most

pessimistic to forecast that it would not be able to repay that loan.

Now, Sir, If I may just conclude, I say that on the question of a consumption tax, the hon. senior member for St. Peter asked if taxes would be imposed on the people. I made a statement in my Budget Speech last year that there would be no question of a consumption tax. I went further than that. I said that we were removing the tax which was described as a radio licence fee of \$2.40 per annum and from which there was something like \$75,000 to be collected. We have granted a moratorium on that. We are not collecting the arrears because as far as the radio licence fee is concerned, no check was kept on the companies who brought them in, and the machinery of collecting is extremely difficult. We would not be collecting that. Further, we have said that only the new sets would be paid for. We also, on the face of it, if we sought to collect that money, would be involved with dealing with children now because of the change in technology. According to the hon. member, we are now purchasing transistor radios cheaply owing to the growth of the Japanese industry in electronics. Technically, children also have transistor radios and they should not be made to pay a radio licence. For those and - multiplicity of other reasons - the difficulty of the collection, and because the amount of money collected would be less than the cost of collection, the fact that school children were now enjoying these facilities, the fact that we have established a Radio Broadcasting Station - we are not enforcing the radio licence fee.

As I have said, they were 18,000 wireless receiving sets in the Island and normally, we should be receiving \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year from those 18,000 to 20,000 sets; but for all those reasons which I have stated, because we want people to listen to radio broadcasting, and not only by C.B.C. - because of all those factors together, the Government at one stroke of the pen deprived itself of \$75,000. If we add these two together, even if it took us three years to collect that \$75,000, the Government has deprived itself of collecting that amount; and at the same time that we are providing facilities, we have cut off the source of revenue in order that a larger number of people can enjoy those facilities. We are bringing television sets in the Island, and we have controlled the price of those sets so that a larger number of people may enjoy those facilities. That is the legal obligation of the Government. The point is this. When the legal liability is there, is it to be seriously suggested, with the licence fee of less than one dollar a month for a commodity which costs over \$400, that that licence fee should be abolished? Should it be abolished when the legal liability is still there and before we are out of the woods? We have progressed so rapidly in this country that you get members of the Party of which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a member saying that we have done nothing at all. They are saying so because they have gone to sleep and they have not yet awakened to understand what it is at all. The fact is that we have in our short time established both radio and television within a year. Well, now, if we are feeling our way towards economic viability, despite the fact that we would be abolishing the radio licence fee and imposing a television fee of \$10, are you seriously suggesting that we should reduce this licence fee?

Mr. Speaker, we think that we have done justice to all sections of the community and to the people who watch tele-vision.

5.55 p.m.

Until we can see our way to do so should we, with one stroke of the pen, remove one of the last remaining sources of revenue which is available to us? Sir, I do not think we should do that.

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

A, division was taken as follows:-

AYES:

Mr. BATSONt Honourables E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD; C E. TALMA; G. G. FERGUSSON,

J. C. TUDOR; MESSRS. BOXILL: LOWE; WEEKS AND YEARWOOD - 10.

NOES: MESSRS: WALCOTT; HOLDER; SMITH; SEA-LEY AND LYNCH - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question has been resolved in the affirmative, ten Hon. members voting \"AYE\", and five hon. members voting \"NO\". I now declare that the \"AYES\" have it.

This Resolution has now been duly passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.-
To move the passing of the following Resolution

Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No.3) Regulations, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which seeks approval of the Regulations entitled "\"The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1964\" made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the twenty-first day of December, 1964, under the provisions of section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traf-fic Act, 1937, as amended by section 4I of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the twenty-first day of December, 1964.

The Addendum sets out that these Regulations, which have been laid in the Legislature, seek to place the respon-sibility for the fixing of motor omnibus fares on the Pub-lic Utilities Board. Hon. members will remember that at the last meeting of this House the Public Utilities Act, 1951, was amended whereby, in future, the matter of public tran-sport would be placed under the Public Utilities Act in so far as the fixing of the bus fares is concerned. These are the Regulations which are now being made or which have been made under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1945, which sets out the principal regulations which are now being further amended. Mr. Speaker, I hardly need to point out the benefits which will accrue in having these Regulations because the principle of the amendment to the Public Utilities Act has already been agreed to, and these are merely the Regulations to carry out the various purposes under the Act which has already been passed. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Reso-lution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this Resolution has come before us so closely behind the other one which has been passed and when we hear so much spoken about the character of public corporations. When I speak in this House I do not speak for effect; I speak on the basis of that to which I have given some study. Whether the Government likes it or not, I shall be proved to be true eventually. I am not going to make reference to the debate which has Just been passed, because there is no need to do so. There is no need to make any comparison between this Resolution and the one which has just been passed, because there is no connection between transportation and television. When I speak about the subsidy on transport I would like to say that this Resolution seeks to place the responsibility of fixing motor omnibus fares on the Public Utilities Board, and, as the Hon. Minister has rightly said, this is a matter to which Che House has agreed in principle. However, Sir, I want to say that whenever any measure comes before this Chamber any hon. member has the right to express his views on it. I was

unable to speak on the amending Bill because I had other commitments. I would like to draw this to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications, and I do not think that he would be averse to this. The fact that you have a Public Utilities Board -well, I am throwing out a warning to the hon. member as to

this whole question of bus transport, I did not seek my own rights on this matter. I spoke with international people on this matter and they have said that this Report on the transport services was an excellent Report, but it warns the Government that they should not undertake to make transport viable. That is a myth. Hon. members have been pressing that and I have not been going on with that, I do not regard the matter of bus fares as something sacrosanct so that they should never be increased. The Public Utilities Board will regard the question of bus fares like that of the telephone rates, the electricity rates or the gas rates. I want to say that bus fares, within the context of our economy, are more important to industry and life than all the other things about which we talk.

6.05 p.m.

If you stop the buses tomorrow, you will bring industry to a complete standstill. Apart from that, poor people travel on buses, but you cannot assume that the poorest use telephones; so you cannot look at it from the point of view of the Public Utility Board fixing telephone rates. Even the poorest do not use electricity. Though we would like to see all these things in the hands of everybody. We would like to see the poor removed from poverty so that they can utilise these things and the word "poor" would be a matter of history.

I should like to warn the Hon. Minister to be extremely careful on this question of the Public Utility Board. With the powers that the Board possesses and they go and raise bus fares, you would have not only political dynamite, but their thinking might not be the thinking to justify an increase in bus fares. The United States Government vote millions of dollars annually to the various States in order to make it possible for school children to travel free of charge. There are school buses in the United States which run as a free service. Bus services do not pay, and these are services that are run completely by municipalities. The New York service is run by the New York Transit Authority; yet the Federal Government makes a contribution towards the running of the underground system and the top system, and the wages are the highest in the world. This happens in the richest Country in the world where the per capita income is \$3,000 per annum, while the per capita income of Barbados is in the vicinity of \$500 or \$600 per annum. In the United States where the per capita income is about ten times the per capita income of Barbados, that country still sees the necessity for public transport to receive a public subvention.

I am warning the Minister, Mr. Speaker, because I have listened to the thinking of some of the people in this country, and there is a gradual trend that when wages go up, they do not measure the increase. They believe, for instance, that when you build a new hospital, you have to start looking around to see how much you can charge anybody for going there, forgetting that there are certain public services which you will never be able to pay for in a State. I am not suggesting that people must run buses free. I am dealing with this because it is done in European countries. They are importing labour from Barbados to work in their system in Britain, and had it not been for Barbadians and West Indians, many British people could not go to work; so we are responsible for running the bus service in London tonight, and Englishmen will tell you so.

I want the Minister to be aware that one cannot always be sure of the people you put on these Utility Boards. I am not dealing with the socialist or political concept, but their outlook towards these questions in a community, because if a bus service is not making money, and you can show them that you are not making a return, they may feel that it justifies an increase. That may be their job since they are doing nothing to do with a subsidy. If this is a means of doing that, you have to be very clear in your mind that it is your intention that there would be no subsidy and they have to run the service viably. I have paid much attention to this; and it is an excellent authority that you should not endeavour to run a bus service in a poor country to make it economically viable. Sometimes you have an operational profit, and sometimes the State puts money in to show an operational profit. That happens in the United States of America, in London and in European countries.

The Hon. Minister will know that I am not affected personally nor will my Union be affected if they increase bus fares; but we are interested in the general life of the community also, and that is why we do not ask for more than we feel the community can bear. If it is a charge that can become burdensome, we gear things carefully. The Hon. Minister and his colleagues are sitting down there tonight because the Trade Union which I have the honour to lead and represent has kept the industrial stability of this island at such a level that they can run the Government without the fear of having a strike every week as in Trinidad and some of the other places; but had it not been for that stability, they might have found a country that is so disturbed that it would be impossible for them to sit down with that peace. So I want to say this not only to them but to the public as a whole that they owe a whole lot to the Trade Union in this country for the economic growth it has had in the last ten years.

When talking about wages, therefore, I am doing so against the general background of the economy of this country; and whenever you give a man something more to buy something to eat, it does not mean on the other side that you have to look for a backdoor to drag it back out of his hand. We hope that you are not putting this in the hands of the Public Utilities Board as a means of making people pay more bus fares to make the service pay, because the people involved are the domestic servants, people who work for \$8 and \$10 a week, and school children; and therefore if you provide a service, you cannot ask them to pay more to make the service viable or therefore they must walk.

I hope the Minister will not lose sight of what the Public Utilities Board might eventually try to impose, and leave this country in a position where bus fares become a matter for the Public Utilities Board, when in truth and in fact bus fares and a subsidy are involved in Government political policy.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Speaker, there is one point I should like to make in putting the responsibility of fixing fares in the hands of the Public Utilities Board.

6.15 p.m.

I recall, and I welcome very much, the Minister's statement that school children should pay the same fare as they were paying before. What I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is that nothing should be done to increase the fare for school children. I realise that school children are an asset to any country, and I would like to see that the rates be maintained for all school children.

It is true that many school children cannot catch what is normally called \"the School Bus\", from rural parishes; therefore, they are compelled to travel by the normal passenger buses and pay passenger rates. What I would like to see is a sort of ticket system introduced for those children who have to get to school at an earlier time. The fare rates should be the same as that for school children all over the Island. When that ticket system is introduced, whatever bus those children have to travel on in the morning, as long as they produce that ticket, it would mean that they would not have to pay passenger rates.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, according to the Addendum to this Resolution, these Regulations seek to place the responsibility for the fixing of Motor Omnibus Fares on the Public Utilities Board.

Sir, I am not voting against this Resolution, although I do not feel too happy about it. However, I do not think that the present Government is trying to shirk its responsibility and throw it on this Board.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I want to say is this. The members of these Boards do not have to give any satisfaction whatsoever to the people. They do as they like. Some of them would tell you that they do not care what happens

because they do not have to ask any one for a vote. When you meet people with this sort of attitude, you know very well what can happen.

The people who are using the buses are the very poorest class of people. No man who has a bank account of \$2,000 is going to use a bus for transport and I will say that \$2,000 is no money. Any man with that kind of money is going to try and buy a motor car to get around with. It is those people who have nothing at all in the bank who have to use the buses, and we have to consider and think about them. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has just said, those people consist of the small servant girl, the little boy, people who are still working for \$8.00 and \$10.00 a week. It is that class of people who have to pay bus fare. It is the people who work for that sort of money who have to look for money to pay bus fare and they have even to get lunch out of it. You have to think of those people when you are thinking about bus fares. You have to try and make it as easy as possible for them. I cannot see how you are going to get away from helping and assisting these bus concessionaires at the same time in order to help them to run their services. If you are going to make the bus fares commensurate with the cost of running transport, you will have surely to make bus fares higher, and it is a sure case that if you make the bus fares higher than what they are, these people whom I have mentioned would not be able to pay more to get them to and from work.

I, therefore, warn the Hon. Minister that he has to be very careful about this matter. This is something like a hot brick in your hands when the Hon. Minister has put the responsibility in the hands of the Public Utilities Board. I know that there are some of us who can get on with other people, but there are some people who do not want to listen to you just because you are not asked to give them your vote. Because of that, they care very little what they do. As I see it, the Hon. Minister would have to keep his eyes wide open and see to it that those people do not create any unnecessary hardships on the people who already have a great burden to carry. Some of the people on these Boards can be very sympathetic, but some do not care anything at all. When you get it like that, the Hon. Minister can only hope that their

time would soon come to an end; but as long as they are there, they will do just as they like. Some can be very clever. You should see to it that undue hardship is not placed on these poor people who have to use omni-buses.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, whenever the occasion presents itself to deal with the Public Utilities Board or anything to deal with public utilities., one is reminded how in the early days the Public Utilities Board came into being. I still believe, myself, that a Public Utilities Board in the community comprised of persons so minded of the utility and its needs is an absolute necessity to the country.

6.25 p.m.

In this case, however, I am somewhat confused. Al-though I have always been a private enterprise politician, I have never been a diehard private enterprise politician to the extent that I believe that everything or every public utility should be run by private enterprise. I consider that to be very stupid. The Addendum to this Resolution states that these Regulations seek to place the responsibility for the fixing of motor omnibus fares on the Public Utilities Board. What I am worried about is that your channel of transport service is divided between private enterprise and state ownership, despite the fact that the transport service is operated by a Board known as the Transport Board. The responsibility of the Public Utilities Board will be not only to fix the prices to be charged and to see that investors make a reasonable profit and do not fleece the public, but also that the public get a fair break and a proper service from the public utility.

Under the Public Utilities Act, if I can remember rightly, the Public Utilities Board must see, as soon as a particular public utility is placed under the responsibility of the Board, not only about the rates and prices which are charged, but also about the services which are rendered.

What I want clarified by the Hon. Minister is this; it does seem to me to be some sort of dual responsibility where you have a Transport Board operating a service on the part of the Government, and then this Board is still charged with the responsibility of all other matter connected with the service of transport except the fixing of the rates. That is a dual responsibility which will be very conflicting if it is not changed very quickly for the simple reason that when representation is made to the Public Utilities Board by the largest concessionaires in the island for increased bus fares or whatever the case may be, the Board has no other responsibility than the fixing of the bus fares, while, in my opinion if this whole service, instead of being under the Transport Board and the Public Utilities Board, came only under the Public Utilities Board, they would be able not only to accept what is put to them relative to the fixing of the fares, but it would also be a question of the re-routing of buses as villages are built up -and not only the re-routing of buses, but also seeing to the service when representation is made.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of my very early days in here when there was a big fight on to establish the Public Utilities Board which we fought for, and some amendments were made. While it is a good gesture to allow the Board to get the facts and figures before them, the position still seems to me to be somewhat conflicting and I would like the Hon. Minister to say whether the Board is only charged with the fixing of the fares of these Companies. I think that the Public Utilities Board should have greater authority or should be possessed with greater powers than merely the fixing of the bus fares. I hope that the Hon. Minister will tell us any reasons which they have for not extending the powers of the Public-

Utilities Board. It is the right of the Government in power to appoint the Public Utilities Board; and while it is their right to appoint the Board, I am wondering whether you should divide this responsibility, as it were. I am quite sure that there are other hon. members who would also like to have this explanation. You cannot deny the fact that the Transport service is a public utility, and a very necessary public utility too. As it is, this service is state-owned and it is also being run by private enterprise. If it is your right to appoint your public Utilities Board, I am wondering if it would not be a better arrangement to have your Public Utilities Board and whether public enterprise carried on the business or not, you should still have the right to appoint the Board and have the last word. The public will feel that you have the right to appoint the Public Utilities Board, and you will not appoint any Board which will recklessly come down and say that it does not matter whether the buses are run through Chimborazo, the Fine or anywhere else. I am sure that the Government will remove such irresponsible persons from the Public Utilities Board,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker I do not understand the hon. member. From the time I became a member of this House he has always taken the credit for promoting the idea of the Public Utilities Board (Mr. MOTTLEY I still do that.) The hon. member says he is still doing that. He had told me personally that the last Government filched the idea of a Public Utilities Board from a Bill which his Party intended to introduce. (Mr. MOTTLEY That is true too). Well, the hon. member says that that is true too, and I am therefore very glad to get confirmation from so high an authority as he.

6.35 p.m.

Now from 1953 the Public Utilities Board has been regulating the different costs for various companies in this island, including gas, electricity and telephone. We are adding another sector of the economy of public utilities to the Schedule. I do not know a single member of the Public Utilities Board if I saw him on the street. I used to know a gentleman by the name of Judge Manning, because he had an office next door to mine. He was not a Barbadian. I also knew the Secretary because I used to see him going in and out of Judge Manning's office. The Electors' Association also has an office on the other side to that office; so that is the only way I would know anything about the Public Utilities Board, But according to the Act of 1953, Section 5, "The members of the Board shall hold office for a period of five years from the date of their appointments: provided that -

a member may at any time by notice in writing to the Governor-in-Executive Committee resign his office; and the Governor-in-Executive Committee may declare the office of any member vacant on the ground that he is from any just cause unfit to continue in office."

Now this is the Bill which according to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was actually prepared by the members of his Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I object to that most strongly.

Mr. BARROW:

You cannot have a point of order while I am on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member rose on a point of order and actually misquoted me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will decide. Will both hon. members please sit? I will hear the hon. senior member for Bridgetown on his point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member rose on a point of order and I waited to see how long he would go on; but as to saying that we presented the draft, that is not so. We borrowed the idea of a Public Utilities Board, but that is nothing to do with drafting the Bill.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown informed me at the time when this Bill was before this House - I was a member of the House - that they had written up to the Conservative Party in Ontario and got a draft of the Bill, and that Adams had stolen the Bill from them. Those were his words.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I cannot let the hon. member say that I said some person had stolen the Bill. I may have said that they, stole the idea, but not the Bill. The hon. member knows as well as I do that they did steal the idea of the Bill from us, because they violently opposed the idea of a Public Utilities Board; but they were more in a position to know where to get a copy of such a Bill than we were. I believe I said they stole the idea, but not the Bill. The hon. member must be careful how he makes these remarks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not contesting it. I was saying what my impression 12 years ago was, but he is putting a narrow distinction on words. I was not clear in my mind whether he meant that they broke into the Conservative Headquarters and took it out of a drawer. As a matter of fact, if you look back in the debates, you will see the records, and I will abide by what the hon. member said in the course of the debates. However, he has gone on long enough on this issue to let me establish my next point.

If this is a Bill emanated from a Conservative Legislature, and the section which I read says that a member may only be removed from office on the grounds that he is from any Just cause unfit to continue in office by the Government, how can the hon. member suggest that by putting transportation under the Public Utilities Board this Government can in some way influence the members of that Board and hold the threat of expulsion or compulsory resignation over them? That is all I am saying in view of the fact that he had so much to do with it in the beginning.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have given the hon. member a lot of latitude on a point of order. He made a long speech on a point of order and ended up by saying I am suggesting something which I never suggested. First of all, I said from the beginning that whenever a Bill or any Regulation comes down which deals with public utility, I am always reminded, especially when dealing with the Public Utilities Board, of the part we played, and what I told the Hon. member is that we had the idea in our manifesto, and members of the then Government opposed it, but eventually they brought it down, and I am reminded also of section 27 which was fought out in this House for nearly a whole night. I wanted the

Minister to explain some-thing to me, but I do not know why the Hon. Premier inter-

preted me as having talked about influencing somebody. If the Government appointed persons to a Board who reck-lessly did something that would drag down the Government, they would have the right to remove them. If the Public Utilities Board decided to charge 60 cents a unit for electricity for domestic service, are you going to tell me that the Government would sanction that and not remove them from the Board? The whole idea of that section was to give the Government power to remove persons who recklessly did something to drag the Government, because as soon as you have power to appoint a Board, you have power to remove it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remember that on an occasion when we were dealing with the Electric Company and the Telephone Company, one ex-member of the last Government suggested that Rediffusion should come under the Public Utilities Board, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter made it quite clear that Rediffusion was not a public utility. There is the Electric Company, the Gas Company and the Telephone Company, and I believe that outside of the Gas Company, this is the only Company that is partly owned by the Transport Board which is Government, and partly owned by private enterprise, and I would like the Minister in charge to explain the reason for having these rates fixed by the Public Utilities Board, and having the other necessary things which are also public utilities fixed by a separate and distinct Board. It seems to me that there is going to be a conflict.

6.45 p.m.

I am not saying that just to be getting up here and talk-ing. I have always said that I am not so naive as to feel that every possible public utility must be run by free enter-prise. You have to consider what should be done by free enterprise. If you look around, you will see that more pub-lic utilities are run by the State or the Municipality than by free enterprise. I want to get the carifired which I have raised about the other utilities and Transport Board.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, has tened carefully to all those speeches which have been, and I have taken it that all those speeches could have not more appropriately made when the amendment to the public Utilities Act was considered. But it may be that members have been given the pryllege to make speeches at this late hour because the principale of amendment has been agreed to, and this is just a sequential regulation of the principle which ready considered. Be that as it may, I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I would say that many of his points are very important.

I do not care at this time to elaborate as to what points I agree with, but suffice it to say that I have made notes of what the hon. member has said and I would raise them at the appropriate time and place. These Regulations which are made to place the responsibility of fixing bus fares on the Public Utilities Board are really in keeping with normal trends in that transport is a public utility service just as much as natural gas, electricity or telephone. Therefore, putting it under the Public Utilities Board really regularises the functions of the Public Utilities Board as was set up in 1953 under the Public Utilities Act.

The appointment of the Public Utilities Board was vested formerly in the hands of the Executive

Committee, but it is now in the hands of the Cabinet. The appointment of members to the Board is for five years subject to their fitness to act. If they fail to perform their duties in keeping with Government's policy - and Government's policy is to see, in this instance, that bus fares are kept to the minimum- they can be taken off the Board; therefore, I hope that will allay the fears of hon. members.

I will also mention that bus fares were amended in 1958 and they were revised slightly in 1964. The revision is of such a nature as not to render any hardship mainly on the persons who are least able to pay. I refer to the people who live in the country. In their case, you can very

well say that there is no increase at all., However, that is by the way.

As I have said, members of the Public Utilities Board are appointed by the Cabinet and they will remain there and serve as long as they comply with Government's policy: so that if they fail to comply with this Government's policy, it will be a question of the revision of the appointment and having the matter adjusted in keeping with our policy.

Sir, I will give you the assurance that bus fares will be kept at the lowest rates possible in spite of this adjustment. As I have said, very valuable points were made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I will assure him that I will raise some of those points at the appropriate time and place and keep a strict eye on the Public Utilities Board to see that bus fares are not treated in a manner like the other Public Utilities which are vested in the Public Utilities Board.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter also raised the question about a free service being given to school children. I will say that more or less all those points are in keeping with Government's policy. I do not think I should elaborate any further more than to say that the policy of the Government will be carried out by the Public Utilities Board, and we will see to it that bus fares are kept at the lowest possible rates and in keeping with the wishes of the Government.

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

THE FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (REPEAL OF SPECIAL ACTS) BILL, 1964

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works Second reading of the Friendly Societies (Repeal of Special Acts) Act, 1964.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

This Bill seeks to repeal the special Acts under which certain friendly societies were incorporated and to require the societies to be registered under the Friendly Societies Act, 1905, 1905-1, within a prescribed period.

Section 10 of Act 1905-I provided that "no friendly or benevolent society which had been incorporated under any special Act of this Island shall, so long as such special Act continues in force, be registered under this Act". Section 12 of the said Act determines the classes of societies which may be registered thereunder and the societies to which the Acts in the Schedule relate all appear to come within

the scope of the said section. When registered the societies would be subject to the supervision of the Registrar of Friendly Societies and their accounts to audit by the Auditor General. Under the Bill one year's grace would be given within which period registration would have to be effected.

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

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very un-happy about the general state of affairs as regards Friendly Societies in this Island, and it is incumbent on the Government to carry out a proper investigation of the Societies. 6.55 p.m.

Mr. Wells and his wife have been here nearly twelve years ago, and they wrote a long document on the Friendly Societies. I know what I am saying from the experience of one which is next door to our own building. That is allowed to operate or continue near our own Trade Union property so that adjacent to our building you have a nuisance where a place is tumbling down and there are a lot of dirty things about the place. We have to foot the expense of clearing up these things, and the Registrar cannot do anything with this Friendly Society. That is not in the best interest of the community. I could go into a Court and give evidence in relation to a situation such as this. We cannot even ex-

tend our own building. Because of the state of affairs which exists there. We have this sort of situation existing since the year 1905, and we have the same sort of mediaeval practice going on in this year 1965. I think that the Hon. Minister should institute an enquiry in this case. We should either take the money and put it in a Trust Fund for children or something like that. There are inoperative organizations with funds knocking about and at the same time we say that we live in a poor community. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we should really carry out a proper investigation in this case and do something about it because it is not in the best interest of the community. I hope that the Hon. Minister will institute some sort of enquiry, whether it is done departmentally or not in order to get these matters settled.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 were called and passed. The Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

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

On motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is not our in-tention to proceed with any more business this afternoon. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 19th January, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 19th January, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.05 p.m.