

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th July, 1967.

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

PRESENT

His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Sir. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L.(Hon.), (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the business of this Honourable House begins, I will like to say how pleased I am to see in his place today the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown. We welcome him back to this Honourable Chamber and we hope that he is in the best of health. (Cheers).

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very grateful for your welcome and the welcome of your colleagues.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement of Revenue and expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the year ended 31st December, 1965.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for two months ended 31st May, 1967.

NOTICE OF REPLIES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Question No. 37 is now ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to ask leave of the House to give further notices later today.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first is a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. HOLDER: WHEREAS it is the consensus of opinion that pigrearing is highly beneficial to the economy of this country;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to re-introduce the "pig-feed" subsidy instituted by the previous Government.

Mr. SMITH: WHEREAS last year's heavy rainfall has drawn attention to the precarious situation of residents in Mellowes, Melvins, Church Village, Surinam and other hill-side residential areas in the parish of St. Joseph;

AND WHEREAS it may be deemed advisable for Government to come to the assistance of these people dwelling on the brink of disaster, by acquiring land and re-siting these threatened houses;

BE IT RESOLVED that, now this year's rainy season is fastly approaching, this House urgently request the Government to acquire suitable land anywhere in the parish of St. Joseph for the purpose of resiting these houses.

QUESTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. HOLDER: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Government aware that the homes of the residents of Hometown, St. James are at present in imminent danger of being flooded owing to the heavy rain waters, which flow from the inland parishes through the culvert at the Hometown Bridge on to the sand barrier that now separates the said water from the sea?

2. Will Government alleviate the danger by constructing a temporary drain so as to allow the said water free passage to the sea?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The second question stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is it a fact that the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department has submitted a report to Government recommending ways and means of relieving the inadequate water service now being experienced in the districts of Horse Hill, Chimborazo, Sugar Hill, St. Bernard's Village, and Melvin's Hill in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. Is the Minister aware that the residents of these districts are embarrassed when they go to the standpipes to find no water available?

3. If the answer to the above is "Yes", will the Minister please state the reasons for the delay in taking

positive action to relieve the long-suffering residents of these districts?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The third stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, *re* Judgment Summons.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Government aware that delays of up to 3 months are being experienced in having Judgment Summons heard in the Magistrate's Courts of District "A" and that this is causing great hardship to litigants?
2. Will the Government take steps by re-assignments of Magistrates or otherwise, to speed up the work of the Civil side of the Magistrate's Courts concerned? 2.50 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas, his query *re* Garrison Savannah.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the part of the Garrison Savannah used for ceremonial military parades and regimental drills is very uneven and unsuitable for its purpose?
2. Have any steps been taken to level and improve the area concerned since the Independence celebrations?
3. Will the Government give consideration to preparing a hard surfaced parade square large enough to satisfy the drilling and ceremonial needs of the Barbados Regiment?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his query *re* Transportation for residents of Shop Hill and Dunscombe.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Transport:-

1. Is the Minister aware that residents on and near Highway 3 from Shop Hill as far north as Dunscombe in the parish of St. Thomas are finding great difficulty in getting buses to Bridgetown, especially in the early morning?
2. Will the Minister take steps to remedy this situation?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his query *re* local loans.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Finance:-

1. How many local loans have been floated by the Government in 1967 to date?
2. Have all these loans been fully subscribed?
3. Has the closing date for subscription to any of these loans been extended, and if so how much was subscribed before the extension and how much after?
4. What commissions, placing fees, brokages or other like payments have been made in respect of any of these loans and to whom?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The same hon. member, His query *re* partial surfacing of certain roads in the parish of St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the public road linking the highway at Shop Hill with the highway at Cane Gar-

den via Ham Pond and Whitehall Village, all in the parish of St. Thomas is only partially surfaced and is generally in a very bad state of repair?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have the said road repaired at the earliest opportunity?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, his query *re* ambulance service.

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware that the ambulance service for conveying sick persons from throughout the island to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other institutions and places for medical treatment, is hopelessly inadequate and very unsatisfactory?
2. Would Government care to centralise such ambulance services as are now available by bringing them under one or more centres of control with a view to reducing time-wastage; and having such ambulances as are now available, manned to provide a 24-hour a day service?
3. Would Government consider the plight of persons requiring such ambulance services - chiefly young girls and old people - and the hours such services are found to be in demand - chiefly at night - and seek to equip the available ambulances with a wireless system for linking them to Police communications, or instal a walkie-talkie system connecting the ambulances with their own central headquarters for efficiency of service?
4. What ambulance services (excepting police in accident cases or other emergencies) are now available to the public on Sundays and Bank-holidays?
5. Will Government examine the feasibility of providing transport services for patients leaving institutions for-the-sick on discharge, other than ambulance, except in cases where the patient's condition demands ambulance transport, and which should be certified by a doctor?
6. Will Government see to it that the suffering public requiring ambulance services, are not denied this through having all ambulances garage-serviced the same day?

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to give the additional notices which I could not give at the proper time a few minutes ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave to give certain Government Notices. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like, to lay on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, a Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for two months ended 31st May, 1967.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1967.

The Public Officers Loans and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1967.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1967.

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1967.

The Customs Duties (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Order, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

A Resolution to give effect to the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1967.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$22,062 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 6 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$3,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 7 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure of \$22,000 required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1967-68 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$3,500 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 8 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of certain parcels of land, together with the buildings thereon, situate at Wellington Street in the City of Bridgetown, for the purpose of extending the Housecraft Centre.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill relating to exchange control.

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

A Bill to make provision for the payment of fees in respect of the issue and renewal of Barbados Passports and other travel documents and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

A Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.
3.00 p.m.

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

A Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924.

A Bill to amend the Registration Office Act, 1961.

A Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949.

A Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th July, 1967.

A Bill to make provision for the preparation and publication of a new edition of the Laws of Barbados and for the maintenance of the Laws of Barbados on a cumulative basis.

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

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY
QUESTIONS LAID

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the following Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions are ready:-

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 43, asked by the hon. senior member for Christ Church:

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 45, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter:

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 50, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

ALLEGED MALTREATMENT OF BARBADIANS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The first question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 37, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the Reply to which was allowed to remain over.

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

Is Government aware that a number of Barbadians who returned to Barbados from Britain by chartered flights during the month of November, 1966, for the Barbados Independence Celebrations have been maltreated?

Is it within Government's knowledge that the Barbados Tourist Board is named as co-sponsor of one of the two chartered flights from Britain to Barbados for the said Independence Celebrations?

Would Government act speedily and instruct the Barbados High Commissioner in Britain to assist the Board of Trade in England with any investigations into this matter which may be instituted there on behalf of Barbadian nationals?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. No complaints have been received.

2. The Barbados Tourist Board was requested by Government to ensure that proper arrangements were made by the Travel Agents.

3. Does not arise.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to enquire of the Minister if, since this Question was tabled, any enquiries have been made.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the information of the hon. member, enquiries were carried out in the United Kingdom and by the Tourist Board. I can read a paragraph from one of the letters by the Tourist Board in the United Kingdom. It is dated 1st June, 1967 and it is as follows:-

"I have had absolutely no complaints from any passengers who travelled on the two chartered flights to Barbados regarding any maltreatment or, for that matter, any inconvenience whatever. In fact, this office as well as the High Commission received many assurances of satisfaction from passengers who requested further chartered passages for the second anniversary celebrations and for Christmas 1967."

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if the Board of Trade instituted any investigations in this matter.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no information of any complaints or investigations by the Board of Trade.

ALLEGED FINANCIAL IRREGULARITIES AT THE BARBADOS MARKETING CORPORATION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 43, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Will the Minister state whether it is a fact that it has been reported to him that financial irregularities have been committed at the Barbados Marketing Corporation?
2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will the Minister state whether any member or members of the said Corporation was or were involved?
3. If any member or members was or were involved, will the Minister state the name or names of such member or members and whether any and if so what steps have been taken against such member or members?
4. Is it a fact that the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation has resigned?
5. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state the date of the said resignation, and whether the said Chairman resigned voluntarily or was called upon to resign?
6. If the said Chairman was called upon to resign, will the Minister state by whom he was called upon to resign and for what reason?
7. Is the Minister aware that the Corporation now carries on the business of buying and selling pork? If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state whether this aspect of the corporation's business is operated at a loss or profit?
8. If the said business is operated at a loss, will the Minister state how much was the loss incurred from the commencement of the said business of buying and selling pork up to this date?
9. Will the Minister state whether it is a fact or not that a number of employees of the said corporation working in the Abattoir and or pork-processing section of the said corporation have been dismissed?
10. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state the reasons for the said dismissal?
11. Is the Minister aware that the Reports of the Corporation for the financial years 1965, 1966, 1967 have not been laid on the table of the House of Assembly?
12. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state why the said reports have not been laid?
13. Will the Minister state whether the said Corporation operated at a profit in its financial years 1965-66 and 1966-67 or at a loss?
14. If it operated at a profit in any of the said years, will the Minister state how much was the profit for each and every year?
15. If it operated at a loss in any of the said years, will the Minister state how much was the loss for each and every year?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir, in the sense that cheques were issued without the authority of the Board.

2. Yes, Sir. One.

3. From the available information the Chairman instructed the then Manager to issue the said cheques. In view of the fact that there has been no actual financial loss or suggestion of fraud and in view of the Chairman's resignation mentioned in reply to No. 5 below no further steps have been taken in that incident.

4. Yes, Sir.

5. The Chairman resigned with effect from the 18th April, 1967, of his own accord.

6. Does not arise.

7. Yes, Sir. So far the Corporation has suffered a loss.

8. Losses are estimated at \$85,000.

9. No employees working in the abattoir have been dismissed and none could have been dismissed from the pork-processing section for the reason that this section has not yet gone into operation.

10. Does not arise.

11. Yes, Sir.

12. The report for the financial year 1965-66 has not yet been received by the Ministry but a request has been made for its early submission. The financial year of the Marketing Corporation ends on 30th June, consequently no report for the year 1966-67 is available for laying.

13. The Corporation operated at a loss during the financial year 1965-66. The financial year of the Corporation ends on 30th June, and the question in so far as it applies to the year 1966/67 does not arise.

14. Does not arise.

15. The loss for the year 1964-66 was \$191,035.57.

Mr. St. JOHN: In view of the replies, will the Hon. Minister state whether the matter had been reported to the Director of Public Prosecutions?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that question is that I do not know.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister say what he thinks should be done in this matter?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That is a matter for the Board.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Hon. Minister say....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members that Question Time finished at 3.15 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Rule 14 (3) be now suspended for today's Sitting.

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before Question Time expired, I was putting the supplementary question: what was the amount of the cheque involved and who was the payee?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The amount was \$14,500. (1) payable to J. M. Mayers and (2) payable to S. H. Cheeseman.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state who was the Chairman of the Corporation at the time?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not think that is a proper question to ask.

Mr. St. JOHN: I have not heard if the Hon. Minister said that the Chairman had resigned.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have already answered that. It has been published in the "Official Gazette" who was the Chairman of the Marketing Corporation and it was published in the "Official Gazette" that the then Chairman had resigned. It was also published in the "Official Gazette" who was the then Chairman.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Hon. Minister state whether the then Chairman was Mr. S. H. Cheeseman?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I cannot say who was the Chairman.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Hon. Minister state whether his Ministry is satisfied that there is no fraud?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have already said that there is no suggestion of fraud?

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state why his Ministry is satisfied that there is no fraud?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, why have I risen? I have risen to explain to members that this is the House of Assembly. I would like members on the other side to understand that this is the House of Assembly and not an inquisition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir. What I would like members on the other side to understand is that this is the House of Assembly and not an inquisition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want the hon. member to address the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been a bandying of questions from that side to this side. Standing Order 14 has been suspended. I would remain in here until tomorrow but not if it goes on in this way.

(A MEMBER: What is it that he is saying?)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: We are in the House and I am a member. I have the right if I feel advantage is taken of the Chair to say so.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Hon. Minister state if there was an investigation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The position is this. We carried out an investigation internally.

Mr. St. JOHN: By whom?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I think the hon. member will have to give notice of that question.

Mr. St. JOHN: The Hon. Minister is trying to shield somebody?
3.20 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot agree that I am trying to shield anybody. I have given as much information as I possibly can.

Mr. HINDS: Will the Minister state whether this matter has been referred to the Attorney General?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is "yes".

Mr. HINDS: Will the Minister state what is the advice of the Attorney General?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is still undergoing the consideration of the Attorney General.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister state if the amount of \$14,500 has been repaid to the Corporation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer to that is "yes".

Mr. HINDS: By whom, Mr. Deputy Speaker? This is the people's business.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I have been advised, the money was repaid by the person who had received it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to ask the Minister was the money received in cash or by cheque, and if by cheque, by whom was the cheque signed?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was not concerned with the person who signed the cheque. My concern was that the money was repaid to the Corporation.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is that the way the Minister does his business? Is the Minister aware that any moment a man can go in the Law Court and prosecute and *sub poena* the Minister and he has to answer the questions then?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can try.

Mr. HINDS: Was the amount of \$14,500 paid into the Corporation's office or was it paid into the bank of the Corporation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that was given already. According to the accounts of the Corporation, the money was paid back to the Corporation.

Mr. HINDS: That is not the point. Was it paid into the Corporation's office and a receipt issued for it or was it paid into a bank to the credit of the Corporation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am only concerned again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the accounts of the Corporation. The money is there to the credit of the Corporation.

Mr. St. JOHN: In view of the disclosure made by the Minister, will the Minister consider appointing a Commission of Enquiry into the affairs of the Corporation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that question was already answered.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, was the Chairman's resignation - and I put in parenthesis on his own accord - was it linked with this \$14,500 cheque?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: As far as I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was no other reason for the Chairman's resignation in his letter of resignation other than he resigned in the interest of the Corporation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is it not a fact that the Chairman saw the Minister and discussed this financial irregularity before the letter of resignation was received by the Minister?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is "no".

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state in view of the loss of \$85,000 and the buying and selling of pork whether

he is satisfied as to the interest of the people involved in the buying and selling of pork.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is I am not satisfied until it can be handled properly.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state whether he has taken any steps in an effort to discover whether there was fraud?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is yes.

Mr. St. JOHN: What were the steps and what were the results?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: An investigation is being carried out, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. St. JOHN: Has the Minister reported this matter to the police? Has the Minister reported the loss of \$85,000 and the circumstances to the police?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The loss was not reported to the police.

Mr. St. JOHN: Did the Minister make any report or cause any report to be made with respect to the pork buying and selling operations of the Corporations?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is yes.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state why he reported the buying and selling of the pork and did not report the \$14,500 cheque incident.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Because the money was repaid whereas the involvement with the pork was outstanding.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Minister see that if instead of this shuffling he would give a straight answer that he has damaged his reputation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is "no".

Mr. St. JOHN: Is the Minister satisfied that none of this \$85,000 is recoverable?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, I am satisfied.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister also state whether any of this \$85,000 is money due by people who have got pork from the Corporation and have not paid for it?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This is not included in the outstanding arrears of pork. The debts from pork are not included in the \$85,000. Steps were taken to collect this money. This has nothing to do with the \$85,000.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister state how much that amount is?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I shall promise the hon. member to get the exact figure for him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I understood the Minister to say that the Chairman resigned on the 18th April. I would like to enquire if there was any communication in writing from the Minister to the Chairman immediately before the 18th April.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Minister remembers whether or not immediately prior to the 18th he discussed this very matter of the \$14,500 with the Attorney General.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, anything that I discuss with the Attorney General in my capacity as a Minister of Government is not a matter for the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: It is a matter of this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are certain things which we consider under the Official Secrets Act that are not brought out in public.

Mr. St. JOHN: In view of the loss of \$85,000 - I notice that the Minister said that no employees from the Abbatoir section have been dismissed - is the Minister telling us that nobody involved in the buying and selling of the pork has been disciplined in any manner.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will have to make further investigation subsequent to my having given the answers to this question whether any action has been taken against any officer. I should point out that these answers were prepared some four or five weeks ago.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Did the Chairman resign by letter? If so, would the Minister be pleased to read the letter?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am tired of getting up. The Chairman has resigned; his resignation was published in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. HINDS: We are asking the Minister to read the letter. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Which letter?) The letter of resignation. Does the Minister have the letter in his possession?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer is "yes", and further, I am not reading the letter.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister aware that his action here this evening causes the Opposition and the general public to be highly suspicious of him as a Minister from this day forward?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take exception to those remarks.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister know what constitutes fraud?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take exception to the statement of the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has taken exception to words which have been used by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. Will the Minister direct my attention to the specific words to which he has taken exception?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am taking exception to the hon. member's statement that the public in general is suspicious of my action. The insinuation is..... (ASIDES).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not hear the hon. junior member for St. Thomas unless he is standing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I take it, Sir, that the hon. member's statement is an imputation of improper motives.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair does not agree with that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Has the Minister got a different point of view but cannot express it because of Cabinet responsibility?

IMPORTANCE OF GRAPHS AND PRODUCTION-RECORDS AT THE PINE FARM

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 45, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

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

1. Is Government aware of the importance of plotting graphs and keeping production-records in a well regulated dairy or milk-producing farm?

2. Is the Government's Livestock Farm at the Pine Farm, St. Michael or part thereof, operated as a dairy as described at 1?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is in the affirmative have figures supplied for record of milk-production or other purposes at the said Livestock Station been found at all times to be based on absolute accuracy, or have they been found to be fictitious?

4. If fictitious figures have been supplied, what attempts have been made to determine the cause for inaccuracies?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Yes, Sir. A part of the Government's Central Livestock Station at the Pine, St. Michael, is operated as far as is possible, as a well-run dairy unit. Actual production and breeding records have been kept and maintained at the Central Livestock Station from its inception which covers a period of about 22 years.

3. Production and other records at the Central Livestock Station has always, as far as is known, been based on absolute accuracy. None of the figures have been found to be fictitious.

4. Does not arise.

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY re MEMBERSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 50, which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Prime Minister:-

1. What is the Government's policy towards membership in the International Labour Organisation?

2. Is the Government aware that its Annual Conference takes place next month?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

1. Barbados applied for membership of the I.L.O. in a letter dated 29th April, 1967, to the Director-General of the Organisation and became the 119 State member of the Organisation on the 8th May, 1967, the date of receipt of the letter by the Director-General. This information was publicised the day before the Honourable Member asked the Question.

2. Yes, Sir. Barbados was represented at the Annual Conference by a tripartite delegation comprising two Government representatives and one representative each of workers and employers.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Minister know, or does he remember that I had to tell this House when I came back from Geneva in March this year that I was asked left and right why did Barbados join the I.L.O.? All the members of the Committee, to which I belong had circulated documents. Is the hon. member aware that I told him all of that on the floor of this House?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am also aware of the fact that the question was asked on the day after the circulation of the information.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister aware that the news was publicised on the Monday after the Question had been left here at the House in the Clerk's Office on the Friday previously?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That is not my fault.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is not the first time that that has happened. Answers have been given in here after the questions have been filed with the Clerk. Is the Minister aware that in connection with the I.L.O. there was a great deal of difficulty in getting this Government to send a delegate to Jamaica to discuss Human Rights?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There was no difficulty at all.
3.40 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Private Members' Business.

Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City: Second reading of a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited Act, 1964.

The hon. member is not in his place.
Financial Statement

Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House note the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal Year 1967-68 contained in a Statement in this Honourable House on 30th June, 1967, by the Minister of Finance.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not propose to deal with this Resolution now for the simple reason that when I gave notice of this Resolution on the Order Paper, in reply to a question by me, the Hon. Leader of the House said that the same facilities as was accorded to the Hon. Prime Minister will be accorded to us. I have not seen anything in here for broadcasting our speeches.

We did not know whether there would have been a suspension of Standing Orders today. I did not know what you were doing. I therefore could not know if they were ready for me to go on with this resolution today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like the Hon. Leader of the House to answer this. How much time can we get from Radio Barbados? I would also like to know whether the other speakers will be able to speak over the radio?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is really very difficult to answer the hon. member sometimes. It is difficult because the hon. member still wants to make an issue out of every conceivable thing.

The mere fact that Your Honour has called out something does not mean that you are going to deal with it today. On having notice that they are ready to proceed with the issue, I would have to make the necessary arrangements.

But there is such a thing as parliamentary etiquette. It is understandable that the hon. member who has given notice of two censure motions would wish to deal with those censure motions as quickly as possible and therefore no preparation was made for his reply to the Budget Speech.

The next thing we know is that he is asked whether he is proceeding with the Budget motion. Of course, that is the second item under Private Members' Business. As soon as

we know from him that he is ready to proceed with the Budget Motion, the arrangements will be made for him to proceed with it. If he says that he will be ready next Tuesday before proceeding with it, I would have to find out from the radio stations when they can accommodate us and give them early notice.

As to what the hon. member asked, I have already said that we would broadcast one speech from that side and the reply to that side.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member has a habit of using big words. He talks of parliamentary etiquette. In this matter the Speaker says to the House that he wants it to be taken early. What has that to do with parliamentary etiquette? Long words, that is all.

I did not ask him anything whatsoever about it. I did ask the Marshal whether any steps were taken to get the radio service to come in today. I would prefer to err with the Marshal than with the Leader of the House. There is only one motion of censure. Does the Hon. Leader of the House think that in the absence of the Speaker, I would go on with any Censure Motion?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

This House has noted with alarm and profound regret the unwillingness of Mr. Speaker to rule against members of the Government when as sometimes happens words used by them are objected to as being offensive and a breach of Standing Order No. 26 (5).

The House further especially deplores the act of Mr. Speaker in making a ruling which led to disorder and the subsequent adjournment of its sitting on July 4th and deems the action of Mr. Speaker as unworthy of the Chair and a cause for the gravest censure.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, as I have just said, the Speaker being absent, I do not know what attitude he has about that and I do not propose to go on with it. I would go on with it when I know his attitude towards it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member said that with the absence of the Speaker, he does not wish to proceed with the Censure Motion. The hon. member earlier in the session moved a Motion of Censure against His Honour the Speaker and he knows the Speaker does not think it appropriate to be present in the House when a Censure Motion against him is being debated.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I took special pains to state that I do not know what the attitude of the Speaker would be. Did the Speaker state what his attitude would be towards another Censure Motion? It does not necessarily mean that he does not want to do so this time. I do not know what would be his attitude on this occasion. The Speaker said on that occasion that he did not intend to follow the precedent of a previous Speaker. I like to be gracious. He went on to say this and that. I will criticize anyone as long as I have a mouth.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I thank the hon. member for his explanation to the House. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will not however be allowed to get away with this. He cannot be allowed to say that his reason for not dealing with the motion is because the Speaker is not in here. The absence of Mr. Speaker cannot prevent him from dealing with the motion. He knows that. If he does not wish to proceed with the motion, well say so.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, I am not in the habit of telling lies.
3.50 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and it reads as follows:-

This House is of the opinion that the Ruling of His Honour the Speaker that the Suspension of a sitting of the House on July 4th, 1967 for a week is in order within the wording of Standing Order No. 36(8) is incorrect and should not be established as a precedent.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the hon. member proceeds on this one, I wish to solicit from Your Honour a ruling on the propriety of this part of the motion. The motion reads that the House is of the opinion that the Ruling of His Honour the Speaker that the Suspension of a sitting of the House on 4th July, 1967, for a week is in order within the wording of Standing Order No. 36(8) is incorrect and should not be established as a precedent.

It seems to me that the hon. member is questioning a ruling of the Chair which the Chair feels it could properly make within its own interpretation of the Standing Orders. If as Mr. Speaker has said on the occasion when the hon. member challenged him that he was convinced that he himself was acting properly it seems to me to be improper to move a substantive motion on a ruling given by Mr. Speaker where Mr. Speaker himself so far as the House is aware acted within the Standing Orders. I should just like a ruling on that. What the hon. member is asking the House to say is that Mr. Speaker's ruling should not be used as a precedent. If Your Honour finds that Mr. Speaker was correct, obviously what Mr. Speaker had done on that occasion must be used as a precedent. It is not now a question of a mere censuring of Mr. Speaker. It is a question of finding out whether Mr. Speaker can be challenged having acted within the Standing Orders which he himself drew to the attention of the House in reply to his ruling.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I do not know whether the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking on a point of order, but in order to stop something that is absolutely right, absolutely legitimate, absolutely lawful and absolutely in order, he makes a speech of that sort. If Mr. Speaker were in the Chair, I had another question to raise, but imagine the Hon. Leader of the House who has been in here for many years telling you that this is not in order and should not be on the Order Paper. How does it get on the Order Paper? The Standing Order for the benefit of those who do not know is as follows:-

"1. Where under any Standing Order (or the practice of the House) notice is required, such notice shall be given -

- (a) when the House is sitting, by being handed in at the Table; or
- (b) when the House is not sitting, by being handed in at the Office of the Clerk within the hours prescribed for the purpose.

2. All such notices shall be signed.

3. Not less than three clear days' notice of any motion shall be given unless it is in the name of a Minister, in which case one day's notice shall be sufficient.

4. The Clerk shall indicate the day upon which a notice was handed in, unless it is a notice for the next sitting of the House or an amendment to a Bill.

5. Any such notice shall be submitted to the Speaker who shall direct -

- (a) that it be printed in the terms in which it was handed in; or
- (b) that it be printed with such alterations as he may direct; or
- (c) that it be returned to the Member who signed it, as being in his opinion out of order."

It could not get here if the Speaker did not pass it, and the hon. member who ought to know better, but who does not know better, and who does these things perversely, gets up and tries to put you wrong.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker,

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am not giving way to the hon. member.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member says, referring to the issues which I have raised in connection with this Resolution, that I am doing it perversely. This is, as he must know, an implication against my motives as Leader of this House. I take strong objection

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I withdraw the word "perversely" in a perversial manner.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I still object to that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In a characteristic manner.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well then, if he is speaking about himself, it is alright.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member was once a schoolmaster. He has forgotten all his English. He left school.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. Leader of the Opposition discussing the matter before us?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member addressed a remark to me and I am only reminding him of certain things. Nothing gets here if the Speaker does not feel it is alright, but for him to try to - I do not want to use the word 'fool' - to try to tell you that if this debate is allowed; you are bound by a previous ruling of the Speaker. Do you tell little children that sort of thing and expect them to believe it? Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are all human beings, we all may make mistakes, but it is silly if a mistake is pointed out to you to say I made no mistake. If hon. members have not had a broad experience of a thing, if they do not understand, ask somebody else who understands to tell them. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that disorder is provided for in the Standing Orders. If disorder arises in Committee, the Speaker reports to the House, and if it arises in the House, the Speaker may adjourn the House or suspend the sitting. If I was talking to a group of little children in a home for mental defectives, would they not understand that adjourning all proceedings is different from suspending the sitting or the particular matter which you are discussing? What Mr. Speaker did was to use both words, "adjourn" and "suspend". There was a bit of noise on my left when Mr. Speaker was on his feet and there was a general uproar crescendo. I must use these words when I am speaking to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was rising and I wanted to hear what Mr. Speaker said. I distinctly heard Mr. Speaker say "adjourn", immediately after and then the Speaker suspended the sitting or adjourned the House. Immediately that took place, the two members for St. Peter went to the Lady Stenographer and she transcribed her notes in two minutes of the House breaking up in disorder. The Reporter had in her shorthand notes the words "adjourn". I heard the word "adjourned" and the Shorthand Writer heard the word "adjourned". The Acting Deputy Clerk had in his Minutes the word "suspended" and therefore I assumed that the Speaker used both words. Certainly it is more likely that the Shorthand Writer was right in what she heard. When we come to the Standing Orders, if the House was adjourned, you would have to have a new Order Paper and go on according to the Order Paper. Of course, it is reasonable to suppose that the Order Paper would have started with the debate which had been the cause of the disorder, but the alternative is to suspend the sitting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even the Government will understand that there must be a difference between adjourning all proceedings and suspending the sitting or that particular item with which you are dealing, and I drew to the Speaker's

attention that fact. Unfortunately all the Hansards mention in "May" are not available.

I drew to the Speaker's attention what "May" says and the references which he gave. On page 329 of the sixteenth Edition of "May", this is what it says:-

"In the event of grave disorder arising in the House, the Speaker may adjourn the House without question put, if he thinks it necessary to do so, or he may suspend the sitting for a time to be named by him."

This House is never adjourned without question put except in case of grave disorder. You always put the motion that the House adjourn until Tuesday next or Thursday next, just as in the House of Commons, except that in the House of Commons the House is adjourned because it is known that the sitting is from day to day.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I want to know if the hon. member has asked for a ruling and what are we really dealing with? What is the subject-matter before the House? (Mr. CRAIG: The Deputy Speaker should know that.)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not giving any advice to Your Honour or whoever is occupying the Chair. The hon. member is butting in as if you are at a tea meeting quite unnecessarily and irrelevantly and by implication making a reflection on the Chair, because if I were out of order, Your Honour would have stopped me ever since. If the hon. member thinks that that can put me off, he is greatly mistaken; it has never happened in my life. I say that you adjourn the House and in every case, I repeat, you adjourn the House until a specific date because, although the Standing Order speaks of 12 o'clock noon, you can adjourn until some other hour. However, you suspend the sitting for a short time until tempers are cooled and members are in a better frame of mind and then you continue.

One of the Authorities I was able to find puts it in this way:-

"On 13 November, 1912, and 11 April, 1923, the Speaker suspended the sitting for an hour. When he resumed the Chair, the state of disorder continued and he adjourned the House without question put."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, apart from the fact that English is English, this could not be clearer. You either adjourn the House or suspend the sitting for a time, and if the disorder continues, then you adjourn the House. Look at the farcical result of the Speaker's ruling! The Mace remained on the table. The Marshal of the House, according to the Speaker's direction - I do not know when he gave it - was supposed to remain with that Mace in his custody and a policeman was here all day and all night to see that no person walked off with that Mace. The only person who would walk off with the Mace was the person who did it already. (Laughter)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I did it already and I would do it again, if there was a Speaker in the Chair like that one.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: One of the usual points of disorder being made. 4.10 p.m.

We had the spectacle of a policeman day and night watching the Mace. Can you imagine that!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this has gone on long enough.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I repeat! I have not started to deal with the terms of the Resolution. I merely drew Your Honour's attention to the fact that Mr. Speaker has not acted in accordance with established orders. That is my motion to Mr. Speaker. I state that Mr. Speaker has not

acted in accordance with the authority laid down in the Standing Order and that this action can be questioned, I have not started to debate the Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give this matter my attention and will rule on it at the next sitting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What would anybody with sense think of the Leader of the House? He attempts to mislead the House by saying that I am not in order. The hon. member is saying the exact reverse to what it is. This is the only thing which I can do. This is no attempt to mislead the House.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think Your Honour said that you will give your ruling.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Here it is that I am accused of doing the only thing that is right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not questioning what the hon. member thinks. I said that I would give my ruling at the next sitting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it were not for the fact that the Hon. Leader of the House has this propensity of intervening and giving pontifical advice, we would not have this sort of thing. I have not censured the ruling of Mr. Speaker - all I am saying is that the House is saying that this should not be taken as a precedent. If members can be made to resume, why suspend or adjourn? It is farcical to think that for one whole week a policeman was taken off his duty just to watch the Mace. You can deal with that according to the Standing order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not understand what we are doing now. I am trying to follow the hon. member. I do not know if we are dealing with the Resolution or what.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is speaking on the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I must ask if the Hon. member is proceeding with the Resolution. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, said that you will reserve your ruling until later. That was to a point which I raised to the moving of a Resolution of this sort. Since Your Honour has reserved your ruling until later, how can the hon. member proceed? I do not see what the hon. member can proceed with when Your Honour has not yet ruled.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking on a point of order, is the Hon. Leader of the House asking you to tear up Standing Orders?

If the Hon. Speaker did not think it was in order, he would have handed it back to the Clerk. The hon. member continues to interrupt. The hon. member is so well read that he cannot understand Standing Orders.

I am not censuring the Speaker. That is the Speaker's ruling. I am asking the House to say that it should not be established as a precedent. We had the spectacle of a policeman being taken off his work to watch the Mace on the table because the Speaker used the word "suspension". If you cannot keep them quiet you suspend for a short time. If by that time you do not succeed in keeping them quiet, then you adjourn the whole proceedings. As long as I am in here, he is not going to get away with it.
4.20 p.m.

I am not going to fear, the hon. Leader of the House's recent essays in Ecclesiastical topics would have convinced him that numbers of people will bear with the hon. member for a time, but when he deliberately tries to mislead other people - I ask the House as calmly as I can merely to say that in

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I think everybody knows by now that nothing the hon. member says can certainly affect me; I am in this House in spite of him, not because of him, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I return to a very simple thing, it is possible that I may be wrong in asking for a ruling, but nevertheless, since I was a member of this House, whenever a Speaker has been asked for a ruling, if he does not give his ruling immediately but reserves it, the debate immediately stops until Mr. Speaker is clear in his mind as to what he intends to do.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Over and over again the hon. member is so saturated with this belief in himself he does not see when he makes those statements he is insulting you, he is telling the Chair what to do. Let us avoid the spectacle of having the whole House suspended for a week, which is a contradiction in terms. When the House adjourns, everything is over; when it is suspended it is only for 15 minutes, half hour, when Mr. Speaker thinks that tempers will cool. All I am asking this House to say is that they feel that the Speaker should abide by the alternative in the Standing Order and adjourn the House and not suspend the sitting. Can not that hon. member see the difference? You adjourn for a date, you suspend for a time, two different things. Either you suspend for a time or else adjourn for a week and there you do not have the spectacle of the policeman and so on.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps we would soon realise that today it is impossible for anyone at this stage on this Resolution to ask Your Honour now to give a ruling, and the reason why I submit that to you for your consideration is that the crux of what the hon. member is doing is an attempt to question the ruling of the Speaker, and he can only do that by a substantive motion. This Resolution having got on the Order Paper by being presented at a previous sitting of this House, the Speaker having directed that it be printed in the manner in which it is printed, the Speaker was then sitting in the House, he was presiding over the issues of this House, he had given his ruling and therefore that can only be a question of a substantive motion, and the hon. Leader can only question that by moving a subsequent motion, because if you recognise

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. and the time for Private Members' Business has expired.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that Standing Order No. 18 (6) be suspended for the remainder of this sitting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Under Private Members' Business, I crave your permission to say this, Order No. 1, The West Indies Hospital

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This was called early in the day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to make this clear. I spoke to the Leader of the House and he was not ready when I spoke to him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot entertain that now. I have the honour to inform this hon. Chamber that I have received from the President of the Senate a Bill called the Diplomatic Privileges Immunities Bill, 1967 with one amendment. I have also received from the Clerk of the Senate a letter which reads as follows:

18th July, 1967.

I am directed by His Honour the President to acknowledge receipt of the Message dated 4th July 1967 from the Honourable the House of Assembly inviting the Senate to appoint members to a Select Committee of the House to consider and report on a Bill entitled The Barbados Citizenship Bill 1967.

I am further instructed to state that the following Senators have been appointed to serve:

Senator H. A. Vaughan, Leader of the Senate,
Senator F. G. Smith

Senator P. M. Greaves
Senator H. F. Alkins

(SGD.) L. H. CLARKE
Clerk to the Senate."

4.30 p.m.

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

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that this Bill has been sent to a Select Committee. (A MEMBER: This is an Amendment). Pardon me, Sir.

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

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister:-

To move the House into Committee on the Bill to provide for the acquisition, deprivation and renunciation of citizenship of Barbados and for purposes incidental to or connected therewith.

This Bill has been referred to a Select Committee which has not yet reported.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

A Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1967.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is really a relic of a few weeks ago in connection with the Regulations made under Section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, and approved and sanctioned by the Minister of Communications and Works on the Second day of June 1967. These Regulations, entitled the "Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 1967", have been laid in the Legislature a few weeks ago. The object of this Resolution is to regularise the fee for permits when people are learning to drive Motor Vehicles, instead of the permits being granted free of charge. A fee of two dollars is now being charged for a permit for a person to learn to drive a motor vehicle, and a fee of one dollar is being charged for the renewal of any such permit. This is a simple matter. It is not, as hon. members on the other side may think, a matter of legislation. This is just to regularise something which is already in force. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not intend to oppose this Resolution, but I must say this: The hon. member says that this Resolution is to regularise something and I do not know what is meant by that. Does it mean that something was done irregularly? This is something which is calling for an additional fee. It is now proposed to charge a fee of \$2.00 on the first issue of a learner's permit and \$1.00 for the renewal of any such permit.

The Hon. Minister, in the course of his reply, will be able to say what existed before. There was no charge before and this is something new by way of collecting money. We have no fault to find with this Resolution, but there was no charge before. There is now the imposition of a fee of \$2.00 for a permit for a person to learn to drive, and there is a renewal of \$1.00 for the renewal of any such permit.

I may say, Sir, that the Addendum to this Resolution seems to be very sparsely written. It seems to have left out information which should have been forthcoming to this Parliament. Normally, I think the period of learning to drive a Motor vehicle is three months, and at the end of that three months you have to renew your permit and then you have to pay \$1.00. I quite appreciate that. I do not think that there is any serious burden on the prospective driver. This is really something which will make the learner pay for the licence which he gets if he gets through, otherwise he will have to renew his permit and pay an extra dollar every time he needs a permit. At the same time, the Government will receive this money. I think the Government will have an easy passage with this Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the Hon. Minister subconsciously used the correct word "regularise", and the question is that people are having to pay \$2.00 now before we approve of the regularisation; therefore, this would be regularising what has been wrongly happening. I would like to know if it is a fact that \$2.00 is taken from people even although we have not approved of this Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the truth is that I do not know; I have not checked with the police but this is not any more irregular than in 1939, I think it was, when the hon. member was a member of this Chamber and they passed legislation forbidding two people to ride on a bicycle. That was in force before the Resolution was passed and then the matter was regularised in here, making it illegal for two persons to ride on a bicycle. I do not know if the police have been collecting this fee, but I will endeavour to give the hon. member the information next week, if he so desires it.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 4

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 43 - Ministry of Health and Community Development was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the first item is Item 153A (New) - Nursing Courses, and it is for the sum of \$4,800.

This amount represents Barbados' contribution to the second-year costs of U.W.I. two year pilot programme in the training of Nursing Tutors and Administrators. A Barbadian Nurse is attending the Course of training for Nursing Tutors for 1966-67 under enabling fellowship from the Pan

American Health Organisation and at least two others are expected to benefit during the second year (1967-68) of the project.

Sir, this is the scheme for trained nurses in administration and I am asking that this course be continued and this is the contribution to be made in order that this course be continued.

I beg to move that this Head be now agreed to.

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

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

HEAD 46 - QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Head 46 - Queen Elizabeth Hospital - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Item 130A (New) - Conversion of Fuel System - is for the sum of \$15,000.

It is proposed to convert the boilers at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital so that they would burn fuel oil instead of natural gas. The provision requested is to meet the cost of effecting this conversion.

Unfortunately, this is a result of a revote in 1966. This work was undertaken some time ago at a cost of \$13,000 and we have been advised that it would be more beneficial and a savings would be effected if we convert the boilers from natural gas to fuel oil.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to convert the boilers at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from using natural gas to using oil. I do not know why we should use oil at the moment. We are dealing with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Well, there must be really a reason for changing from one fuel to another. We have to view this matter seriously. It is not enough to say that we are changing from one fuel to another.

Are we saying that our source of natural gas is swinging? It may be that, possibly. Well, there is oil there to be had, I repeat, is this because of the failure of our wells of natural gas?
4.50 p.m.

I think that we have a very short and uninformative addendum which just reads "It is proposed to convert the boilers at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital so that they would burn fuel oil instead of natural gas. The provision requested is to meet the cost of effecting this conversion", and the provision I see here for that is \$15,000. I do not think that is enough to convince me to begin to think of voting, not to vote, but to begin to think of voting. I must know a lot more than this.

We have one big general hospital in Barbados, that is the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, do not mind the talk we hear about the hospital in St. Peter, that is a privately run concern and a very expensive institution and provides very little help for the paupers of St. Peter, so let us forget that. When we have to change from one fuel to another at Queen Elizabeth, I want to know why; there must be a very good reason. Why hesitate? Read up the files and give us the information, this very short and uninformative addendum is not good enough. Let the Minister tell the House why he has to introduce this change. Natural gas is a product of this island, and until now we did not produce oil in the quantities that are considered commercial, we import oil. Why? We change first and then we talk about the money.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, although we have been carrying out exploration for oil and natural gas, there is no definite knowledge as to the period and amount of time the resources of natural gas in this country will last. If when you take into consideration the amount of natural gas that is being used for commercial and other

purposes, as compared with the amounts for domestic purposes, you will see that the consumer rate on the quantity used was far above that which was used for industrial purposes, and we feel that the natural resources of this country should be more extended for the use of the citizens of Barbados more than for commercial purposes. The cost of the changeover of the fuel from natural gas to other fuel would be cheaper for the hospital and places like the abattoir than natural gas. Beside that, in the exploration for oil for local domestic purposes and household uses, it would be cheaper for the hospital and it would be more beneficial to the general citizens of Barbados for household purposes.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister says when he says that he prefers to expand the natural gas for domestic purposes than to the hospital. The hospital is not an industrial enterprise, it is more of a domestic concern, although nobody wants to make his home there for a long period, yet why is it because of oil being cheaper and we do not know whether or not gas will fail, therefore we have to change now, at the same time not only ensuring that we have a continuous supply of fuel, but we have a cheaper and as efficient a fuel? Is it that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. senior member for St. Peter that oil is cheaper than natural gas for the hospital to use, and beside that it can be used for more beneficial purposes. We do not know how long our natural gas resources will last, whether for 10 years 15 years or whether it is one year. We are now in the explorative stages for oil and we know that there is a certain amount of natural gas and it is being considered to contend with out normal gas supply for domestic purposes, but it is cheaper to use oil than natural gas.

Mr. HUSBANDS: We in the northern parishes do not live in hopes of getting natural gas piped to the north, but I wonder why if oil is cheaper why we do not hear any talk of oil stoves being used. We in the north can forget about getting the benefit of natural gas, although we have to pay for the subsidies which get this concern going, lasting as long as it has. We are in a very unfavourable position because we have got nothing in return, not even a hope of gas ever coming out to the north. For a long time now representatives for the parish of St. Peter have been looking at this fuel and wondering why it was never extended to the north when subsidies had to be drawn from taxpayers of the whole island; pipes run through St. James for the householders in St. James, it runs through St. Thomas, they may be even on the way out to St. Andrew, the very source. I am glad the Government has been viewing the question from the point of view of serving the householder first. The supply is uncertain, but I have no fault to find with the conversion, I want to know the reason. I know it is economic, and it is the foresight due to its economic advantage that the conversion is to be made.
5.00 p.m.

I should like the Hon. Minister to give me a hearing. The Ministers should see to it that a definite effort is made not to present these addenda as mean and as sparse as they are. They are too mean and too sparse. There is no getting away from that. You have to pass thousands of dollars every day and I am saying that the Ministers, who have to administer the policy of the Government, should see to it that members of Parliament are not insulted by the wording of Addenda such as this three-line, 26-word Addendum. That is not good enough.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I will speak at this stage because, unless this debate is put in its right perspective, there might be made many speeches which are meaningless. In the first place, I would like to explain to the Committee that this Resolution was agreed to already in the financial year, 1965-66. It was Resolution No. 23/1966 for \$30,000 for the conversion during the 1965-66 financial year. We are just asking for a revote. This is a conversion whereby they will use either fuel oil or natural gas. It is for the benefit and safety of the inmates of the Hospital that we are doing this. Therefore what is the debate all about?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister had said what he has just said, could anybody imagine me saying what I said? You have to pump and pump before you can get the information that you want, and I will pump and pump until I get it. (Laughter) Now that I have got it, I am satisfied. I have been told that this was agreed to in 1965-66 and this is a revote. I should like to say that politics is a business which involves expediency. Things change, institutions change and men change their views. Do you tell me that in 1966 I committed myself and I agreed to do something and in 1967 I must say nothing? No, Mr. Chairman, that is not good enough.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is another point on which I rise to comment. The Hon. Minister has said that they are seeking to convert these boilers for the greater security of the inmates at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital so that they will burn either oil or natural gas. I see here from the note to this item that it is proposed to convert the boilers at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital so that they would burn fuel oil instead of natural gas. I would be glad if the Minister would clarify the situation. Is what is stated in this note wrong, or is it that it is what the Minister has said, that they will use either oil or natural gas?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I will refer to the file in relation to the Natural Gas Corporation in 1967. It says here that any prolonged interruption in the natural gas supply will have serious effects on the working of the Hospital. This could be guarded against by having the boilers fitted with dual burners which could burn either oil or natural gas. It is for that reason that this Resolution is before us.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister saying that the note is wrong? I want to pin down the Minister to this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: No, the Minister is not saying that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We press the Minister for the sake of getting genuine clarification. Is it possible to get the Minister to agree that it is a question of using fuel oil as well as natural gas? The Minister has got up three times and he says the same thing. I think that the Civil Servants should be disciplined if what the Minister is saying is a mistake.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak on this Resolution and I gave way to the Hon. Minister of Trade. The point with which I am dealing he has actually answered. When one reads this Resolution it is so simple that you are left to consider what will be the standby for the fuel system at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital if they were to change from the use of natural gas to the use of fuel oil. When the Minister rose again I understood him to say that both will be used in case of emergency. I have also learned from the Minister of Trade - I must say that I did not expect him to speak so soon after the Resolution was introduced; however, I am wondering if the gas is getting on the short side and they are concerned about it. There is an industry in St. James which employs many workers and I say that they have got the impression that they will not be able to use natural gas.

5.10 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, the Minister's answer was early. It just puts me to think why it is that the industry in St. James has changed over. I am also wondering if the oil which is to be used will be much cheaper than the natural gas. If the Hon. Minister had allowed members on this side to put their questions or state their views, he would have been able to answer this question. The question was asked why it is that the industry in St. James has been changed over. Workers will be put out of employment as a result.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a limited supply of natural gas and the Estimate which we have is that what supply we have will last for five years.

It has been the policy of the Government to extend natural gas to as many householders as possible. Over the

past two or three years, there has been a crash programme for the expansion of natural gas to householders for domestic use.

It has been said that oil can be just as cheap as natural gas and that is the reason why we are changing over to oil and leaving the natural gas for the householders. At the same time, we are encouraging householders to use natural gas instead of oil - and the Government is bent on taking natural gas to householders as against using it in industry - and that is the reason why we are changing over from natural gas. We are changing over from natural gas so that it may be extended to householders. Again, we have taken into account the estimate that there is only a limited supply of natural gas.

Sir, there is some natural gas at the Mount. They have found some natural gas in a well there. As it stands, the well at Springvale is not in operation and according to our advice, the life of natural gas here is only for the next five years. We want to preserve that for the householders.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there has been some misunderstanding on the Ministers' benches as to the real reason for this conversion of natural gas to fuel oil at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We learnt from the mouths of two Ministers that there is under consideration by the Government the extension of the natural gas service to as many householders as possible.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. It is not a question of its being extended suddenly. The Government is continuing that policy. It has been the policy of the Government for over four years.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Hon. Minister for that information and I am looking forward to the day when those in St. James, St. Thomas, St. Lucy and even in St. Andrew will be able to use natural gas for household purposes. In those parishes, there are householders who desire to get natural gas. I feel that the Government in its crash programme on natural gas should extend it for the use of those householders.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, I would also like to remind the hon. member that the last Government had also put down pipes for natural gas and up to now the people from that area have not been able to make use of it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the present Government having the pipes laid down for natural gas through St. James, St. Thomas and other parishes around, we feel sure that the foundation, so to speak, has been laid for the tapping of the line and we are sure that the present Government which has as its policy the carrying of natural gas to householders would be able to do so easier because it would not have to undertake certain capital cost because the former Government had laid down the pipes.

Whether or not the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be using fuel oil in the future or natural gas, or both, we find that, according to the Minister of Social Services, in 1966 a Resolution for \$13,000 to effect this conversion was sent down. Now, less than a year after the conversion it is costing us \$2,000 more.

I would like to know as regards this conversion from natural gas to fuel oil at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, if the machines in the laundry at the Hospital are going to be converted from the use of natural gas to fuel oil, or if the conversion will take place through the whole hospital.

(A VOICE: Boilers.)

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the other side "boilers." We have also heard fuel oil and natural gas. We heard one Minister telling us that this conversion is going to make it possible for the boilers at the Hospital in the future to consume either natural gas or fuel oil. Another Minister said that the Government's crash programme is extending its natural gas programme to as many house-

holders as possible and it must be understood that the Government is discouraging the use of natural gas in industry. 5.20 p.m.

You will understand, Sir, that if the Hon. Ministers did not know or are not in concord with the policy agreement of Government. You will appreciate how difficult it must be for us on this side of the table to accept what we are being told about this matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement on the question of policy on this side. It has been pointed out to the other side that it is the policy of the Government to reduce or to discourage the use of natural gas by large concerns so as to conserve it for domestic use, and the Government is now trying to stop the hospital from using natural gas so that more householders can have their domestic supply. The Biscuit Co. uses natural gas, all of these big concerns - the industry which the hon. junior member for St. James mentioned - are denied the use of natural gas in order to extend it to householders.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Trade told this hon. House just a few minutes ago that there was no means of measuring or knowing how long the natural gas would last. The Minister of Agriculture now tells us that we have a five-year supply approximately, which shows us quite plainly that even when these Ministers leave their offices to come to this House they are not in agreement. One does not know what the other knows; one says we have no means of knowing, the other says it will last for five years.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, we can only go by the advice from the experts. About five years ago the Government was told that there was approximately 10 years supply; I personally consulted and spoke with the Skinner people who are exploring for oil and natural gas and what they explained to me is that there is no instrument that can determine to what extent oil or natural gas can be assessed at the early stage. What they explained was that there can be a small area with very high pressure as well as there can be low pressure and a very large supply of oil or natural gas in the early stage. One of the wells might have been kicking off a big supply of oil or natural gas; there is nothing to determine the amount, and it is just a matter of time. I am no expert in natural gas or oil.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Minister of Agriculture has had the experience, having been a schoolmaster in his earlier days, he has been able to look at the advice given by the experts five years ago, and he has been able to subtract five from ten leaving five. I am sure that the hon. Minister could have spent a half-second before he came in this House to teach the hon. Minister who has just sat down that five from ten leaves five.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that we cannot give any definite facts. It might last ten years, it might last more. If the hon. member could sit down and teach somebody five from ten leaves five, that is entirely up to him, but we have no guarantee as to the exact time the supply will last.

Mr. HINDS: What we are concerned with, Mr. Chairman is this. We have heard in here this afternoon statements to convince us that in the minds of hon. Ministers our natural gas supply is very uncertain and as a consequence the Government has set about to look after the sick people first at the hospital, so what we understand that they are doing now is this, discouraging the use of natural gas for heating and other purposes at the hospital. What we want to know now is this, does the Government not think it time to get further expert advice on the true supply of natural gas? We understand, despite the fact that we get these estimates from the experts, that they cannot be accepted in toto, but if the expert tells us we have approximately 10 years' supply, we can say the experts could be wrong and it might mean 12 years, or on the other hand, it might be 8 years. Since the Government has seen fit to

turn to the hospital and carry out a sanction, is it that the Government is telling the consumers of natural gas in the households that you can get a supply but that they have no idea as to how long this supply is going to last. In other words that you are connected up today, you can get a supply today but we cannot guarantee you that next year you will have a supply that we can offer you today? What we have been told by these hon. ministers is really not good enough, because the Minister of Social Services tells us that the wording at line 2 of this Addendum instead of natural gas, fuel oil; he is telling us now that this could not be correct. Strange enough, what the Minister has told us has not been borne out by either of the other hon. Ministers who spoke on this same Resolution.

5.30 p.m.

We are satisfied that there is something wrong about this question of natural gas and the real reason for this conversion. We feel that this Government knows that the natural gas supply is limited and it is much better to tell us something else rather than tell us about a crash programme. Where are you crashing? The first place is at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. They are crashing from natural gas and going to fuel oil. We are not being given the correct information on this question of the conversion from natural gas to fuel oil. Perhaps less than a year ago it would cost \$13,000 and now today it will cost an extra \$2,000. I am wondering why the work was not carried out earlier so that this expense of this additional \$2,000 would not be added today.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this matter raises a much larger question than is contained in the three lines which form Note 2 of this Resolution. The whole question of the natural gas supply in Barbados is clearly raised by this expenditure which the Government is asking this House to make. As the Hon. Minister has remarked, this policy of conversion by industrial Governmental users of natural gas to the use of imported fuel oil is not a new one. Many years ago an expert reported as to the supply of natural gas and Government advisers have been going into this question. When the experts spoke about ten years' supply, they should have spoken about so many million cubic feet and the Government would have been left free to say that that will be about ten years' or twenty years' supply. I take it that that is what the Government has done and we consider it unfortunate that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has now taken over. It was known that natural gas was a diminishing source of supply. The wells in which it was located in St. Andrew are there and it is clear that when we are faced with a limited source of supply something must be done about it.

I am not surprised at hearing the Minister speak about a crash supply to bring natural gas into more homes. If the supply is limited, one would think that you would make some effort to see that those who are cooking with natural gas would have that gas to cook with. If you go on using this gas, it would diminish the source of supply. Although we have heard only prophecies of gloom in respect of natural gas I am informed that there is some element on the bright side. Since new methods of exploring for natural gas have been developed in many parts of the world - there are many new drilling techniques which are used - there is some hope that the gas resources can be increased. The Natural Gas Corporation has been complaining to the Government that the Government is not doing enough. If I am misrepresenting anything, I would like to be corrected by the Government; but, has the Government been receiving advice that more exploration must be done in order to utilise the gas and more money must be spent on gas exploration if the supply is not going to run out, notwithstanding that these half measures have been inflicted on gas users. I suppose that an agreement would have to be reached as to the use of gas. Money has to be spent and the Corporation cannot be left without the necessary funds if natural gas is to be used in households and for industrial use.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to accept the need for this Resolution because it is much easier for a Government institution to convert to an alternative system than household-

ers. I would have preferred to hear that this question of extending the household use of natural gas would be matched by a corresponding expenditure on the exploration and exploitation of other gas resources. In five years' time, we will be the Government. *(Laughter and cheers)* I hear some hon. members suggesting that it will be long before five years, and therefore I will say that we will be the Government for some time. I would not like to think that such an essential resource will be strangled, that we would find ourselves faced with the necessity of explaining to the household users of natural gas that we are sorry that the gas is running out, that the D.L.P. have crashed the gas out of the households. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You will not live long enough). I know that we will not then be plagued with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. *(Asides)*. We will agree with his comments on that occasion. I will ask the Minister to give very serious consideration to the representations which are being made by the Natural Gas Corporation as to the necessity for the exploration of natural Gas in this island.
5.40 p.m.

Before you have a crash programme for natural gas you should see to it that the gas wells have gas in them for the householders to use all their lives.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Sir, what I want to tell the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is that the reason for the extension of natural gas to householders by the Government is that if natural gas falls short, it would be easy for the consumers to obtain this supply by leading it in tanks if he had no line. The present rate of bottled gas is twenty-four dollars or twenty-five dollars. Those who use natural gas pay between eleven dollars and twelve dollars for it. The use of natural gas is far less cheaper than bottled gas. It is about half the price of bottled gas.

Bottled gas is shipped here. Hon. members would remember that a few years ago, they were transporting natural gas here in bottles on board the ship "Darewood" and it caught fire and several of the crew lost their lives. In the running of gas through pipes this can be eliminated to a certain extent. All the natural gas can be put in one big tank and then the supply to householders can be distributed from lines.

The question that Head 43 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$19,800 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 5

RESOLUTION FOR \$4,129

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are two items under this Resolution which is for the sum of \$4,129 under Head 6 - Legal. They are Item 12 - Incidental - and Item 18 - Furniture and Equipment.

In the first instance, the amount of \$85 is required to supplement the provision for Incidentals consequent on the increase of the staff in the Department.

In the second instance, the amount of \$4,064 is required to meet the cost of additional furniture and office equipment required for the Attorney General's Chambers consequent on the increase of staff in the Department.

The House is aware of the need of this sum a few weeks ago when we dealt with this matter. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, the House is asked to pass this Resolution and we were made aware that only a few weeks ago we passed a Resolution by way of approving a Civil Establishment Order for providing more staff for the Legal Department.

It was envisaged that certain additional expenditure would have to take place and it is customary that we are given a breakdown of the amount needed instead of a blanket sum. The note says:-

The amount of \$4,064 is required to meet the cost of additional furniture and office equipment required for the Attorney General's Chambers consequent on the increase of staff in the Department.

As far as my memory goes, the provision of additional staff in the Attorney General's Office is of the order of six, so presumably one would need six new desks, and six cabinets. I do not see any kind of breakdown as to the other items which are needed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Sir, I can give the hon. member a breakdown. I did not realise that I had the information here. As the hon. member quite rightly thought, we need for the Senior Crown Counsel:-

1	Desk (mahogany)	\$250.00
1	Desk chair	85.00
3	Office chairs	60.00
1	Book-case	45.00
1	Side table (for placing books and so on)	55.00
1	Telephone table	15.00
2	Desk trays	24.00

514.00

Furniture for two Parliamentary Counsel:-

2	Desk	500.00
2	Desk chairs	110.00
6	Office chairs	120.00
2	Book-cases	90.00
1	Filing cabinet (with chassis)	122.00
2	Side tables	30.00
2	Telephone tables	30.00
4	Desk chairs	48.00

\$1130.00

Furniture for two Crown Counsel.

2	Desks	\$240.00
2	Desk chairs	110.00
6	Office chairs	90.00
2	Book-cases	90.00
2	Side tables (for keeping books)	110.00
2	Telephone tables	30.00
2	Desk trays	48.00

\$718.00

Furniture for two Stenographers:-

2	Typists' desks (steel)	\$330.00
2	Typists' chairs (steel)	70.00
2	Typewriters	740.00
4	Desk trays	48.00

\$1,188.00

Other items of Furniture required in the Department:-

2 Lounge chairs	\$102.00
1 Steel cabinet (with chassis for general Office)	122.00
1 Clock (for Department, there is none)	25.00
3 Venetian blinds (for office of Attorney General and D.P.P. and S.G.)	180.00
2 Desk chairs (for office boys)	14.00
1 Guillotine	71.00

\$514.00

Incidentals:-

Spares for filing cabinet	\$ 65.00
---------------------------	----------

Grand total \$4,129.00

Mr. St. JOHN: I thank the Hon. Leader of the House for the information I have been given. However, it shows what I anticipated is correct. It is that this Note, as it stands, is not one hundred per cent accurate. This amount is not only to provide furniture for the recent increase to the staff of the Legal Department but also to provide for other furniture.

5.50 p.m.

I would like to know from the Hon. Leader of the House whether any progress has been made in having these jobs which have been passed in here filled at the present moment, because we are seriously disturbed and concerned on this side that in order to fill these jobs in this department - we would hope that in the filling of these jobs here that the Government does not deplete the small number of magistrates, and I would warn that a serious crisis is going to develop in Barbados in the exercise of magisterial jurisdiction. I particularly want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in the money court in District A, the court that all the wives depend on for their support, grave injustice is being done because the Magistrate has to do the traffic court, which is heavy, and at that period of the day when lunch is necessary the Magistrate has to go to lunch and the wives are left there waiting. This is a sad state of affairs. Many people are avoiding their responsibilities to the mothers of children because there is no presiding court in Barbados. I would like to take from the Prime Minister back down there one of these mornings, so I only hope that in the filling of these jobs this state of affairs will be borne in mind. Do something quick.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We are very grateful to the hon. member for bringing this to our attention; I can assure him that the Attorney General has given priority to this matter and is urgently attending to it. We certainly do not like the situation which he described, and I think he can have the assurance that it is being attended to and will shortly be obliterated.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I heard the hon. member speaking about the furniture for the members of the legal department. I am going to suggest to the Government most seriously before there is a general public scandal that the Director of Public Prosecutions - I believe we raised this in London - should not be anyway near the Attorney General's Chambers. The Director of Public Prosecutions should not be subject to any wishes or comments of any Minister or of the Attorney General. I say quite possibly public scandal would arise because this is a small place and things get out. We know that the Director of Public

Prosecutions may feel himself compelled to do something that is not really just. It is not fair; he may have been compelled to do something against his conscience. What are the duties and functions of a Director of Public Prosecutions? It would be better for Barbados - already two scheming mistakes have been made in the prosecution box by the Director of Public Prosecutions against members of the community. A word to the wise is enough; I need not say any more.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we can allow the matter just to drop there. It is possible to agree with the hon. member as you could agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church in principle, for convenience sake, for reasons of propriety, for the better administration of justice, for all of these good reasons you could argue that the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions should be other than where it is, but I certainly could not accept the argument that you must move him because of the fear that the Director of Public Prosecutions, either this one or any other, would be influenced by the Cabinet or by the Attorney General. The member of this Cabinet, the Attorney General included, know what the Constitution of Barbados says and adhere to it, and there is certainly no question of any member of this Cabinet interfering with the proper functions or powers of the Director of Public Prosecutions because this is forbidden. It is not only forbidden by the Constitution, but would not be done by any of us. The hon. member therefore, I think, is quite wrong to make his plea for the physical separation of offices contingent upon the possible miscarriage of justice. We cannot accept that at all; I do not accept that there have been scandals in public prosecutions; I do not know that is so. The Leader of the Opposition said that to his knowledge there have been two already, I do not know this, we do not accept this, that there has ever been or ever will be any attempt on the part of Cabinet Ministers to interfere with the powers and functions of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

In the last Parliament, during the Independence debate, a member of this House no longer with us here it is true, made references almost similar to the one just made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we were not independent then and his remarks were challenged and refuted, so I say, Mr. Chairman, argue if you like but in order that it should be absolutely clear that there is separation of powers and of functions the physical surroundings of the Director of Public Prosecutions should be removed from where they are now, and you will get unanimous agreement because after all justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done. When the hon. senior member for Christ Church used this argument we accepted it. The Leader of the Opposition is using a different argument which seems to suggest that this has to be done because something may go wrong, and if his own knowledge of two cases is accurate something not only may have gone wrong, but probably has gone wrong. We cannot accept this because there has been no attempt on the part of this Government to influence the Director of Public Prosecutions, and the Leader of the Opposition is always, certainly in this House, making uncomplimentary references to the Attorney General. It seems to me very hard that you should make uncomplimentary references to the Attorney General on the floor of this House, and in a matter like this, even suggest that he is the sort of person who would so far forget himself or his own sense of duty as to fail to distinguish between his office as a Minister and the constitutional powers which are laid down for the exercise of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Certainly, knowing the Attorney General as I do, I can safely say for him that the distinction is very clear in his mind and that he would not allow it to happen that any pressure, influence or otherwise be even brought to bear or even hinted in the direction of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

6.00 p.m.

I should just like to make the Government's position clear. We accept the point that, for other reasons, the office should be removed, but we do not accept that it should be removed because something could happen. We do not accept that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, while I agree with some of the things which the hon. member has said, we, on this side, thank God for the existence of the present Attorney General and for leading the Cabinet. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the House with what he has said about the Attorney General and I say that we thank God for the existence of the present Attorney General as Attorney General and as a member of the Cabinet. We were not accusing him of anything. I do not accuse all the members of the Government; I do not accuse any member of the Government, except the Prime Minister, of giving instructions which he had no constitutional right to give. If he were in here I would have put it even stronger. I see that the Hon. Leader of the House is itching to get up and defend the Prime Minister. The Hon. Leader of the House is permanent Counsel to the Prime Minister. The hon. member misunderstood me if he thought I was accusing everybody. Even the Prime Minister did something which is a scandal and I said that you should avoid the possibility of a public scandal. The juxtaposition of the Public Prosecutor's office or Department and the Attorney's General's Department is not good, but there is nothing which any of us would say against the Attorney General. I know that the Hon. Leader of the House would be glad to hear me make a quotation and here it is: "How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds make ill deeds done?" That is a good reason for keeping the Director of Public Prosecutions away from the Ministerial Offices.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member in his last remarks ostensibly in answer to something which I said, agreed with me with respect to the present Attorney General but by inference reflected on the former one. That I pass over, because the past Attorney General is contemporary with the hon. member and the former Attorney General is certainly able to take care of himself. However, the hon. member went on to say that he would not accuse most members of the Cabinet in respect of influencing the Director of Public Prosecutions, that he would accuse none of them except the Prime Minister. I take it to mean that he is saying that it is within his knowledge that the Prime Minister has acted improperly in transgressing his proper constitutional limit in giving directions to the Director of Public Prosecutions. If the hon. member means that, then he should say it publicly, so that the Hon. Prime Minister, who is not now in his place, would have the opportunity to defend himself against what would be a most serious charge. I think that the hon. member should say publicly what he is accusing the Prime Minister of. I can say this, that from the time that we have been associated in Government with the hon. senior member for St. John, both as Premier and now as Prime Minister, we have never known of one single instance in which that hon. member has not acted with constitutional propriety, and we have not known a single instance in our whole association with him in which he has transgressed his constitutional authority, or that he has ever transgressed the constitution of this island. To say that against the Prime Minister is saying something which is just untrue. You cannot associate that with the Prime Minister who is the head of the Government. The Prime Minister would never transgress any constitutional rectitude or interfere with matters which are outside his authority. The Hon. Prime Minister can defend himself and what I say of him his colleagues would also say of him. I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should make this charge in such a way that the Hon. Prime Minister can defend himself. I can only say that we do not know anything about what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said about the Hon. Prime Minister. If we had that knowledge of him, we could not associate ourselves with that sort of charge. We deny it emphatically.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Counsel for the defendant has to say the best for him. That is all I can say. I said that in spite of the efforts justice has prevailed and it has prevailed in the case of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. No competent lawyer would advise that prosecution and the Attorney General could not possibly have had anything to do with advising them in bringing that case. That could be a public scandal especially when the defendant in the case happens to be an hon. member of this

House. It is time that the Director of Public Prosecutions be so placed physically and otherwise or so constitutionally that not the slightest breath of scandal could possibly arise. The hon. member has not discussed this case with me either before or after, but one could not possibly conceive how that case could have been brought against the hon. member except politics came into it.
6.10 p.m.

But as an outsider, however much you like the Director of Public Prosecutions, I cannot see how that case happened to be put on the Calendar.

It is things like that which we are determined to stamp out. Some individuals are saying that it cannot happen here. This total disregard for democracy; Government just bringing politics into everything. Does anyone of us sitting around this table disbelieve that if the Democratic Labour Party had a majority of two-thirds it would not happen here? We do not fool ourselves with that.

Mr. Bradshaw of St. Kitts is now acting like a South American or a far Eastern despot. Does anybody think that the present Prime Minister would not do the same thing? I do not know the Director of Public Prosecutions - I have seen him in the Court, but I do not know him. I know the Attorney General at the Bar and in politics before he was so misguided to leave the Labour Party and go over to the Dems. It is because of that I said what I did of him.

Sir, I am not saying anything more. I rose to say something which I feel should be said. I make the accusation that the Prime Minister interferes with what he should not interfere in respect of his view that so and so must go to gaol. Does the hon. member see that he should not do so?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Sir, I heard the junior member for St. Joseph talking about the interference of the Prime Minister and encouraging the Director of Public Prosecutions to bring a case against the hon. member.

(A VOICE: He did not say so.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He did say so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to observe Rule 29 (6)

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What I would like to draw to the attention of the House is that the case went before a jury and the hon. member was acquitted.

Between 1925 and 1926 we had a man by the name of Lorde who killed a woman by the name of Virgie and at the trial in the Court of Grand Sessions, the jury released Lorde. Therefore, there was no more miscarriage now than then.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member in the first place, trying to cast aspersions on a dead man? He said that the man murdered a woman. In the second place, is the hon. member in order to cast aspersions on the verdict of a Jury? I am asking you to tell the hon. member not to pronounce on a matter of that sort.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said Lorde was charged with murder and I said that it was a matter for the jury. Then when a young boy was shot at Welchman Hall for picking rabbit meat and was killed, the case went before the court and it was a matter for the jury.

If the jury finds a person is guilty, he is guilty; if a jury finds a person is not guilty, he is not guilty. It is not a matter of whether the Prime Minister asked to bring a charge.

I am trying to point out to hon. members in this Chamber that I am as vindictive as anyone and if they want to remember things, they must see me. I am sure there was no miscarriage of justice in a case against somebody.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, I would like to draw your attention to Rule 9 of Standing Order 26, Time and Manner of Speaking and Contents of Speeches, under the Rules of Debate, which is on page 25 and it says:-

"The conduct of Her Majesty, Members of the Royal Family, the Governor-General of the West Indies, the Governor, Members of either House of the Legislature, Judges, or the performance of judicial functions by other persons shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Apparently, Sir, they thought that this Chamber was asleep when the hon. member was ranting and raving about miscarriage of justice. The point is this. What is good for the gander is good for the goose. It was the Leader of the Opposition who said something about the Attorney General or Cabinet caused a miscarriage of justice and I say that in respect of the Government Servants to the Prime Minister, there was no miscarriage of justice.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I really do not think that this Committee realises what has happened in here this evening. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that in respect of the interference of the Prime Minister, there was no miscarriage of justice in a case recently concluded in court.
6.20 p.m.

I have already said that the Prime Minister has never and does not interfere in matters which are outside his own province and therefore it is improper and a gross misstatement of fact for the hon. member to say this, particularly in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister. I do not know if you realise what a serious thing this is to say; the case is nothing to do with this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While a member is speaking, all other members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones. I should like hon. members to observe that rule. Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I realise that some people's dislike for the Prime Minister is really enormous; it may be matched by his own dislike of them, but at the same time there should be limits to what is said in this House particularly in the absence of hon. members. From my own knowledge of the Prime Minister, he would not and could not because I know his attitudes towards legal and constitutional matters as well as of major aspects of public policy and one of the things the Prime Minister even for matters in which he need not emphasise is that politicians had every right and should always bear in mind the separation of powers, and I have never known a single instance in which he outstepped his boundaries to interfere in any way.

If matters come before the Cabinet that are appropriately matters of policy naturally he or any other Minister would give his views as a politician, but to say that he would interfere with judicial matters is an enormous misrepresentation of the true facts of the case and this is why, not because he is a colleague of mine in Government, but because of my own knowledge of what his attitudes and his outlook are on certain important matters that I can boldly say what the hon. member has said is just not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to observe rule 26(2). A member shall confine his observations to the subject matter under discussion and not introduce new irrelevant matters therein. We are now discussing furniture for the staff of the Attorney General's office and I honestly would like hon. members to stick to that subject. I have given every member quite a lot of latitude and I would like hon. members to try and co-operate in maintaining the dignity of this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I came in this House specifically to try and pull it back up from the mud in which it has sunk. The standard of debate, the absolute forgetfulness of Standing Orders and things of that sort, I could not respect the Chair more, I have counted four times that I have apologised or withdrawn remarks quite unnecessarily but in order to respect the Chair, however much I might despise the ruling, so as far as respecting the Chair is concerned, I am going by the Standing Orders and now that you mentioned that, the Hon. Leader keeps on talking about the absence of the Prime Minister; Standing Order No. 34, the Speaker should see that that rule is observed, and the Prime Minister would not be able to say that he can come in here when he likes. It is an old rule, in fact members in the old days used to be fined for being absent; their duty is to attend every session except through sickness or something like that and when they get the leave of the House. That is Standing Order No. 64 and when the Prime Minister gets up and says something about opinions coming from colonial legislation - when the hon. member talks about absence, all of them should realise who likes to talk - I do not want to say anything behind a man's back, only cowards do that, therefore do not let us hear anything more about attacking a man in his absence, if he is absent he is at fault. He is a coward; of course for once he has taken the advice of members of the Government. The hon. member is so.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader is on a point of order. He has risen on a point of order, that is what he has said.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Can you say, Mr. Chairman, of an hon. member whether present or absent that he is a coward?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member should take exception for himself.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He has had every conceivable latitude. I have asked you that question and it is for you to decide.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have not had an opportunity to contribute to this debate, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that members on the opposite side, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew had his opportunity. I have heard members express in somewhat far-reaching terms their attitude towards the Prime Minister and his interference with judicial.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I must warn hon. members, I have just appealed to hon. members to observe 26 (2). I said I have given sufficient latitude and I am not allowing any member to go off the subject matter. If you want to speak on the Resolution I cannot stop you, but let us do away with going outside the matter under discussion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I obviously am highly mistaken when I think I try to make my speeches in accordance with the matter under discussion. I began to speak about what was said about the Prime Minister and his relations with the judicial functions but I wish to speak more accurately in terms of the Resolution, and I am glad that Your Honour agrees that that is what I should be doing. What I was going to say is, this is a Resolution for furniture, a financial Resolution and we can talk about money and how it should be spent, but I only want to talk about the law offices. We have had our Resolution for increasing the staff of the law offices, now we have one for furniture, but what I want to say is this, I am not concerned with the Prime Minister, the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Attorney General and others, but I am concerned with the functions of the law officers in so far as they are related not to just one case which hon. members have spoken about, but a number of cases which the law officers themselves, whether directly or not, have prosecuted against the hon.

junior member for St. Peter. I am not going to be long on this, and I am going to stick to the terms of the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not now dealing with a case which went on out of this Assembly. I honestly would like hon. members to stick to the Resolution, we are now dealing with buying furniture for the staff.
8.30 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You must command our respect. The Chair is a servant of the House and he is not to give dictates either right or wrong.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, when a money Resolution comes down here in relation to a department, the behaviour of the department is the subject of debate. If the King was asking the burgesses to give taxation for a particular purpose, they would say: "We are not satisfied with the way in which the department carried out its duties" and they would not vote the money. I am not here to talk about the Law Officers and I can refer to any case when they refer to anything in relation to the department. I can refer to any aspect of the performance of the duties of the Law Officers under this Head; if they misuse all of their powers, I can refer to that. However, sir, I will keep within your ruling. All the talk about the Prime Minister is neither here or there with me. The fact is that it is considered that the Law Officers persecuted the hon. junior member for St. Peter. The hon. member has been charged with abducting an heiress, he has also been charged with criminal libel, something of which you will find that there is hardly a precedent, and it is time for the Hon. Leader of the House to tell the Minister of Home Affairs or whoever is responsible, that since we are giving them more furniture it is time to tell them that they should keep away from political prosecutions. Nobody could tell us for one second that any prosecution would have been instituted against the hon. junior member for St. Peter for the abduction of any heiress were it not for his politics. The Law Officers are getting their fingers burnt. I was in Court seeing these same Law Officers performing their functions in a recent case, and these Law Officers were performing their functions in respect of a prosecution for criminal libel by standing by jurors on the basis of what was the politics of the jurors. Let them forget politics. People were whispering in the ears of the Crown Law Officers: "He is a D.L.P. member" and a member of this and that. I say: let the Law Officers keep away from that.

It may be that these Law Officers think that they are pleasing the Government by instituting these prosecutions. It may be that they are doing that or it may be that the Law Officers themselves are pleasing them; but they are going to be in the Opposition some day and it works for all. Let all of us have an interest in keeping politics out of the Law Courts. Everyone is interested in that. No matter to whom we want to ascribe the blame where prosecutions are politically motivated, it is time for interference and interference in keeping politics out of the Law Courts. There is no thought of miscarriage of justice, what the jurors do and that sort of thing. We know very well, Mr. Chairman, that the present prosecution for libel is a relic of the days when Governments in England were afraid of the Press and had to seek to lock up a political opponent by suppressing him in that way. Let the Law Officers bear in mind that their duty is to try to prosecute efficiently in respect of criminals, thieves, robbers and persons who wreck death on the road in certain cases. Let them worry with these roaming robbers and other persons who are dangerous to the community and do not let them go free.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

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

6.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first time and agreed to.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to move the first reading of certain Bills at this stage since it was not possible to deal with them early in the Sitting.

There being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill relating to exchange control, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to make provision for the payment of fees in respect of the issue and renewal of Barbados Passports and other travel documents and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Registration Office Act, 1961, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Town and Country Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th July, 1967, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to make provision for the preparation and publication of a new edition of the Laws of Barbados and for the maintenance of the Laws of Barbados on a cumulative basis was read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am much obliged to hon. members. This concludes Government Business for today's Sitting.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday next, 25th July, 1967, at 3.30 p.m.

While I am giving this notice, I would just like to elicit from Your Honour whether it is Your Honour's intention to occupy the Chair during the debate on the Censure Motion and the query to which notice has been given on the Order Paper.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I absolutely have no intention whatsoever of presiding in any circumstances over any matter. I thought I made it clear on a previous occasion. I now reaffirm my irrevocable decision.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I did not exactly hear what Your Honour said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House on moving the adjournment addressed a query to me. It is for me to decide, let there be no doubt about it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I draw to the attention of hon. members that I can hardly hear him because of interruptions from the benches on his immediate left.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the motion for the Adjournment. I had no intention of rising to speak on the vote of Censure standing in my name but now that the Hon. Leader of the House has raised it, I am raising this on a question of fact. From my interpretation of Standing Order No. 20, the hon. member has no right whatsoever on any question to say that after Your Honour has laid a motion on the Order Paper, that it is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intention of hearing anything that took place in the course of today's Sitting.

But unfortunately, the hon. member may speak only on the question of the adjournment which has been proposed for next Tuesday at 3.30 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That has nothing to do with the adjournment and if it is in order in the hon. Leader's case it is in order in mine.

Mr. SPEAKER: I decide that. Let there be no misunderstanding.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have not.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind certain hon. members of the Standing Orders whereby members who are not speaking should conduct themselves in a certain manner.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On the motion for the adjournment, I would ask whether the hon. Leader of the House does not think it necessary - I think I have done this before soon after this session began - to say what the Orders of the next day's sitting are going to be. Sometimes we receive our Order Paper the night before and it is difficult then to be prepared for the Orders as they appear. Your Honour has been in this House long enough to remember that the Order Paper was always fixed on the adjournment; I have suggested it already to fix the Order Paper at the time the question of the adjournment is put.

The other point is I have given notice of a motion which was passed on to the Clerk in accordance with rule

20 and has not yet appeared on the Order Paper and I should like a ruling from Your Honour as to whether Order No. 20 can be ignored either by the Chair or by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the last mentioned point, objection was taken to it in the sense that I was asked to rule as to whether it was or was not in order. I undertook to give my consideration to the matter, which I have given, and on it I will rule. There have been two difficulties in the way; one is changes of Clerks and the research which it is their duty to do and present the facts to me for my decision. One is on holiday and they have not yet completed their labours, and secondly there are certain parliamentary debates where there are precedents in the House of Commons which are earlier than the library of the Barbados House of Assembly of English Parliamentary records began and that is the only reason for the delay; the matter is receiving instant attention.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I take it that Your Honour overrules that order which says that if it is out of order Your Honour returns the motion to the person making it. In short, you will either print it in the terms in which it has been handed in or as the Speaker may direct, or direct that it be returned to the member who put it in. Your Honour has not returned it to me, it was read, a copy was passed to the Clerk, the whole Standing Order No. 20 was complied with.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We cannot have a speech like that now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has made his point and I have replied to it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am merely asking Your Honour, does Your Honour's present ruling overrule Order No. 20 (5) (c).

Mr. SPEAKER: No ruling of a Speaker or no decision by the House can overrule a Standing Order unless that Standing Order has been duly revoked.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If Your Honour ordered it to be printed in the terms in which it has been printed and the language was strong, it must be speedily done. Here am I complying with Order 20, Your Honour has not returned it to me, therefore according to Order 20 it goes down on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House on a point of order rose and drew it to my attention and asked for my ruling, and I am indeed grateful to the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition for reminding me of Standing Order No. 20 which provides three alternatives.

The question that this House be adjourned till this day week at 3.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly this House now stands adjourned until this day week at 3.30 o'clock p.m. 7.00 p.m.

