

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th March, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.45 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, C.B.E., J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); (Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B., and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

REQUEST BY Hon. J.C. TUDOR

Hon. J.C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask Mr. Chaplain to circulate his prayers so that we may study them after. I need not say any more.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am supporting that because it is very rare that we get that.

Mr. SMITH: If I am in order, Sir, I am aware that the Leader of the House was serious when he asked that because certain hon. members would not return in here after they read that prayer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would convey the request to Mr. Chaplain.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, 6th March, 1968, have been circulated, I am informed. Unless there is any objection, I declare that these Minutes will be confirmed. (A PAUSE).

Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of the meeting of 6th March this year to be duly confirmed.

LETTER OF THANKS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter dated the 18th March, this year, from Mrs. Wilkinson, widow of the late John Hadley Wilkinson, thanking hon. members for sending her a copy of the Resolution which was passed by the House on the 6th March on the occasion of the death of her husband. She says that this copy was very much appreciated.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the Barbados (Overseas Officers Retirement and Compensation) Regulations, 1968.

Also, the Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1968.

And also, The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968.

Also, on my own behalf, a Bill to amend the Solicitors' Act, 1896, and to declare my intention to ask leave of the House later in today's meeting to deal with this Bill in all of its stages, copies of which will be circulated to hon. members immediately.

NOTICE OF ORAL REPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, also to say that Oral Reply to Question No. 148, asked by the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. Thomas is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are, I understand, certain Questions which were handed in on Thursday of last week - that is, well in time, by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I am advised that those Questions have not yet been fully processed. I give the undertaking, assuming they are ready at any time during the course of this meeting, that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph will have my permission to give notice of those Questions.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James. His Question re certain persons or firms being granted the facility of renting lots in the new car parks.

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

Is the Minister aware that certain persons or firms (other than persons connected with diplomatic representatives of foreign countries) have been granted the facility of renting lots in public car parks in Bridgetown upon a monthly basis?

Does the Minister consider this practice to be in interest of the travelling public?

Will the Minister see to it that an end is put to this iniquitous practice?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Question re compulsory acquisition of land.

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

Will Government acquire (compulsorily or otherwise) the lands adjacent to the St. Judes Mixed School, St. George, for the purpose of providing a playing field for the inhabitants of the area?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Question re a playing field.

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

Is the Minister aware that there is no playing field at or near Bourne's Village in the parish of St. George?

Will the Minister see to it that such a playing field is provided to service the needs of the inhabitants of Bourne's Village and the Flat Rock area?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Query re the construction of a road at Campion Castle.

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

Will the Minister have a road constructed at Campion Castle, St. George so as to connect the two existing roads in the said district?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Query re roads in the parish of St. George in need of repairs?

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

Is the Minister aware that the roads of Drax Hall and Parish Land in the parish of St. George are badly in need of repairs?

Will the Minister have the said roads repaired as soon as possible?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query re electricity in St. George.

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

Is the Minister aware that there is no electric service in Drax Hall nor in Parish Land in the parish of St. George?

Will the Minister use his good offices to see that electricity is installed in the said districts as soon as possible?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John. His Query re fishermen.

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

Is the Minister aware of the hardship experienced by fishermen from time to time in the sale of their catches of fish?

Will the Minister see to it that the storage space for fish is increased at the Barbados Marketing Corporation so that fishermen may receive a guaranteed price for their catches?

In the alternative, will the Minister consider the removal of the Item "Fresh Fish" from the Scheduled Price Control Order?
2.55 p.m.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Solicitors Act, 1896, be now read a first time.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time and I am advised that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 148, standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas has been laid.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

1. Is there a shortage of staff at the Government Information Office?
2. Will the Minister state why the normal practice of revealing information on Government activities and plans through the medium of the Government Information Office has recently been broken in that Press Conferences have been conducted by Ministers at the Headquarters of the Democratic Labour Party?
3. Is the Minister aware that no invitations were issued for these Press Conferences to the "Beacon" and the "Truth" Newspapers?
4. Will the Minister agree that the moneys being spent to carry out the activities and plans of the Government are the taxpayers' moneys, and not the funds of the Democratic Labour Party?
5. Will the Minister make representation to the Cabinet that the Government Information Office is fully capable of publicising Government activities and the Ministers' first duty is to Government, and not Party organs of information?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:

- "1. Yes, sir.
2. The normal practice of revealing information on Government activities and plans through the medium of the Government Information Office still continues.
3. The issuing of invitations to Party Press Conferences is not the concern of the Minister.
4. Does not arise.
5. The Minister does not consider any such representations either in order or necessary."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister inform us how the question of his agreement that moneys being spent to carry out the activities and plans of the Government are the taxpayers' money and not the funds of the Democratic Labour Party does not arise? How is it possible to say it does not arise? The Minister does not seem inclined to rise. Is it true or is it not true that the Government's plans are carried out with the taxpayers' moneys? What kind of ignorant answer is that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, my reluctance was not a refusal to answer. I just did not follow the

drift of the hon. member's argument. Do I understand him to be saying that the answer to (4) as given here did not logically connect with the answer to (3) or with the Question?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Question (4) reads; "Will the Minister agree that the moneys being spent to carry out the activities and plans of the Government are the taxpayers' moneys, and not the funds of the Democratic Labour Party?" How can any Minister answer that that does not arise?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, Question (3) which was answered being "Is the Minister aware that no invitations were issued for these Press Conferences to the "Beacon" and the "Truth" newspapers, I take it that Question (4) logically arises from Question (3), not only numerically but in point of logic. The answer to Question (3) being that "the issuing of invitations to Party Press Conferences is not the concern of the Minister", it is considered that the answer to Question (4) logically hangs on the answer to Question (3). This would not arise because the Minister is not himself concerned with the issuing of invitations to party Press Conferences. That is how I took it; I do not know if the hon. member sees it differently.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I know this is not the Minister's answer, and I hope he will take the same steps with whatever ignorant Civil Servants drew these answers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary Question on the way?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is a point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think the Minister appreciates what I am saying. It is not his answer; so the fact that it does not make sense we should not castigate this Minister for. There is another Minister responsible, and there are other ignorant people responsible for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid this is more like a speech.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I share the hon. member's regret and sorrow.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And I am sure all hon. members will share the regret that so foolish an answer should have been allowed to disfigure the papers of this House.

Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, are any steps being taken to remedy the shortage of staff?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I can answer that affirmatively. The proposals from the Ministry are

now with the Chief Establishment Officer for an increase in the staff and for general amplification of duties. These proposals will shortly be made known, and I think that within three months' time this situation will be remedied.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is it contemplated that the increases at the operating level, so to speak, will be Established increases or non-Established posts?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot answer this with any certainty, but I should think that most of them will be Established increases.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister say if there is any truth in the statement that has been made that the Organising Secretary of the Democratic Labour Party and/or Mr. Tony Vanterpool has already been offered positions in an expanded Information Service?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have not heard that statement, Mr. Speaker.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Question was answered generally. This is the fifth part of it. Will the Minister agree that the Minister's first duty is to Government and not Party organs of information? Does he agree that Minister's first duty on Government activities is not to Party organs of information?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I could answer this by giving an opinion, but this is surely not a question which will come within a Minister's official competence. This could only be a matter of opinion; it cannot arise out of a Minister's duty, because he must know what his duties are. If you want a personal opinion, I would say: "Yes, one's prior duty is to Government because one serves the Government."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Since one's first duty is to Government's organs of information, in the opinion of the Leader of the House, what can the Minister say about the fact that a number of Government projects, such as prospective legislation, have been first made known via the medium of these Press Conferences and not via either introduction in this House, or an official release from the Government's organs of information?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will find in most, if not all, cases that prior intimation of Government's programme and policy is given in its Manifesto, and Manifestos are usually produced when Parliament is not meeting, or when there is not a Parliament.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister say when the Government has ever published a Manifesto, or what Government? The question may be rhetoric, but the Minister is always confusing himself. Will the Minister consider it appropriate that, for example, a proposal to bring women into the jury

system of Barbados should first be made known out in Roebuck Street when various organs of the Press were not present? Is this not discrimination against the genuine Press? (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: The questions are being addressed to the Hon. Leader of the House and to no other Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not agree with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that no other replies have been laid, and this completes Questions for today. It is not yet 3.15 p.m., but we may proceed to Private Members' Business. The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. When this matter was last discussed in this Chamber on the 5th December of last year, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was speaking. If there is no other hon. member desiring to contribute to this debate, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown may now exercise his right of final reply.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND LIMITED (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. MOTTLEY: In God's good time it had to come, Sir. Some people thought I would never have an opportunity of replying. The first thing to which I would like to draw hon. members' attention is the fact that this Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited Act does not prevent, if the Bill is read carefully, the Government from collecting any funds due and owing to the Government. I want that made clear. This Bill will not prevent, if repealed, the Government from collecting any funds due and owing to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will have to do something today that I am not in the habit of doing and I never like doing. I have heard and read quite a number of speeches on this Bill. I never like to reply to anything a member has said in his absence, but I am going to crave your permission - in fact, it is not craving permission, Sir; it is my right. I was not in here when some hon. members spoke on this Bill. I note that some members spoke while I was here and confined their remarks to the Bill without going into personalities, and I shall do that myself while making my remarks on the Bill.

I also notice that - and anything I have in my hand I am prepared to put it in as a document of the House. I say that before any member catches himself and thinks that he can knock me off the ball. The Advocate of Saturday, November 18, in very bold headlines, in referring to the Prime Minister's speech in dealing with the Hospital Bill, strayed and was allowed to stray, Mr. Speaker, into a lot of things. I look around and notice that those who were responsible for the headlines are out of the House now.

Sir, there is a lot of room for a school for reporters, at least, to teach them journalistic integrity in dealing with factual reports in this House instead

of taking sides. I suppose, Sir, having given notice of this Bill for such a long time, and the course it has taken, will prevent us in the Opposition and those possibly of the Government backbenchers, who may feel as we feel, from expressing their views because of Party loyalty here in this House.

The Advocate of November 18 said:

"\$225,000 BENEFIT TO NATION. PRIME MINISTER DEFENDS THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL SWEEP."

Instead of dealing with the Hospital Sweep, the Prime Minister took the opportunity, when I was out of the House, to deal with me. This is what the newspaper said, and I have not heard - neither have I seen - it corrected nor denied; therefore, it is my right to draw it to the attention of the House. If the newspapers choose to publish it, they can. If they do not, it is a matter entirely for them. I am still not looking for a job, and I have never been looking for one. The Advocate stated:

"Mr. Barrow, who was speaking on the motion for the second reading of the Bill to repeal the Hospital Sweep, a motion tabled by E. D. Mottley, senior member for Bridgetown, unleashed a scathing attack on members of the Opposition in general and members of the former Bridgetown City Council in particular."

This, of course, was done in my absence. When you are ready to call for this as a document of the House, Mr. Speaker, you can call for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member of Standing Order 26 (1):

"A Member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."
3.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you have known me in here for over twenty years. Have you even seen me reading a speech when you were Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not dealing with that part of Standing Order 26 (1) which says that a member shall not read his speech; I am drawing to the attention of the hon. member - in fact, I am reminding him of that part which says that he may read from books or papers other than newspapers.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that you are aware of the Standing Order, but I know that hon. members will suddenly get up and say: "Make this a document of the House," and I am drawing to their attention that I will make it a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise. A member may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument.

Mr. MOTTLEY: These are in support of my argument. Are you saying, after you sat in the Chair and allowed the Prime Minister to make this type of speech in here, that I am not entitled to defend myself on it? This is referring to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, I take it, is assuming that this is an accurate report of what was said.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In the absence of a denial since it was published on November 18th, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if the hon. member has consulted Hansard.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have consulted Hansard, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Hansard in respect of that meeting has actually been printed. The hon. member will be surprised to hear that; so am I.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We will all be surprised, but I was not really surprised when I saw it. Anyhow, Sir, it says: "Especially the former Bridgetown City Council, particularly the latter, for saddling the taxpayers with \$80,000 interest on loans made by the City Council from Commercial Banks."

On this point, I want to say that this was a man who could get the facts and who would be in a position to get the facts. He made this statement and it went on further to say: "Mr. Barrow admitted that when the Bill had been passed in the House, there were reservations by Mr. Mottley and Mr. Lloyd Smith, the senior member for St. Joseph," but he said that the Bill had been passed unanimously. This is true. We did have reservations and we actually went to a Committee; but, as my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City will tell you, when we were informed of the money which it would be bringing into Barbados, we thought that we would throw our lot in because it was a question of bringing half a million dollars a year into Barbados. Now, Sir, I quote from the third column where Mr. Barrow recalled the conditions under which the Sweep had been permitted to operate, among them a tax at the rate of 20% calculated on the sales of tickets and a 25% tax on prize winnings, as well as a licence fee of \$500,000. All that is correct; this part, at least is correct. My argument is that it has not been received. I will soon be finished with this part and I will get on to the most relative part as to the repeal of the Act. Mr. Barrow said, that there had been crocodile tears shed with the abolition of the Local Government. In his absence I want to say this. If he does not know this, I will tell him that to abolish Local Government, as far as Bridgetown is concerned, he did me a favour. When I go to do anything, I put my whole heart and soul into it, and possibly it will save my life a little longer. I had no crocodile tears to shed at all; so if he thinks that I had shed any crocodile tears, he is wrong, because if there is one person who got down and prayed that night and said that she was happy about it, that was my wife who thought that I was never given a chance, since day after day from 7 o'clock in the morning un-

til midnight, people wanted me to do all sorts of things.

Mr. Speaker, I go on to this part: "What has not been said was that the City Council was not only \$2 million in debt, but was in debt to Commercial Banks by over \$1.2 million because of the rate of interest possibly between \$80,000 and \$90,000." "It went further", said Mr. Barrow, "while the Government" - and this was allowed in the House in dealing with the repeal of the West Indies Hospital Act; this would not have been allowed to one single member over here. "It went further," said Mr. Barrow; "while the Government had proposals for collecting \$52 million a year, the Bridgetown City Council had arrears in the payment of taxes of \$2 million for the past fifteen years and the total arrears for the three years was about \$3 million." I challenge the Prime Minister of this country to give him this seat which I have in here; and I want to say this - this is all I have to say on this now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to tell the hon. member this; I was quite satisfied that my understanding of Standing Order 26(1) was correct. I have had certain research done by both Clerks at the Table, and I am entirely fortified in my view of the meaning and interpretation of that Clause which says that a member may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument. A member cannot read extracts from newspapers. The usual practice is for an hon. member to have something which appears in a newspaper copied and he refers to that as part of his notes. That is the procedure which I certainly followed when I was around the Table.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am fully acquainted with that, Sir, but it has been reported - and what I want to say is this, that such references to the Bridgetown City Council with its indebtedness and the \$80,000 a year and the \$2 million and the three million, when you think of any man who is in the position of the Prime Minister, whose respect for the unvarnished truth makes him respected in dealing with this matter, you would consider him as one who is quite easily to be believed. I think that I am mild in putting it in that way. Mind you, he is in position to get all the facts and instead of getting up and trying to draw a red herring across the line about the Hospital Sweep and making these stupid statements, he should have dealt with the Hospital Sweep. What he said about Mr. Smith and Mr. Mottley reserving the right is absolutely correct, but he failed to say that when we went into Select Committee, I questioned the Solicitors: and when the Prime Minister said that the operators of this Scheme owned \$72 million, I made it quite clear then that it did not matter to us if they owned \$172 million; what we wanted to know was what this Company was capitalised at, and I got the Solicitors for the Company in here and they could not tell me. They said that the Bank of Nova Scotia were the bankers and they could not tell me, and then we were persuaded that in view of the fact that \$500,000 would be brought in annually, we did vote for it. But the Prime Minister was right; we voted for it with certain reservations.

3.25 p.m.

As far as that is concerned, I just want to clear the air. No crocodile tears with me at all; there is absolutely no truth in what he said. I challenge him; I will give this seat up to him challenging him as to the veracity of the statement that he made here. He could have got the correct statement if he wanted it. Anyhow, let us forget that, Mr. Speaker.

The Bill which is before us, Mr. Speaker, is one which I believe every decent-minded Barbadian would like to see repealed and for this reason: this Bill was brought in for the purpose of providing \$500,000 a year. I am not going to be personal, but as far as the statement which the hon. senior member for St. Michael made in here is concerned, all that I would say is that if you are going to get a silk purse, you can only cut it out of silk cloth. That is as far as he is concerned. I have nothing more to say about that, but in making a job for somebody, I am not doing it at the expense of the good name of Barbados for over three hundred years.

This Company has been fortunate. We heard a lot in here about how many people it employed and what they are doing. When I was Mayor of the City of Bridgetown, I received several letters from abroad. Several lawyers in this country also received several letters, and nearly every newspaper editor in this country received letters from abroad about this Company. I "caught fire" on this matter and I tried to find out something more about it, but I came to the conclusion at that time that I would give the people concerning this Company a chance to see what would happen.

Well now, Sir, since that has happened, what have we found? I would like the newspapers to publish this since they can publish what the Prime Minister has said. I categorically say what he said was absolutely untrue about this Company. I also say this further. The statement made in here about money being paid in as income tax is absolutely untrue. These are figures which cannot be cooked up, but what do you find? The senior member for St. Michael who is Secretary or Manager or Governing Director or whatever it is to this Company said we should give the Company a chance, and if you gave it a chance it would be able to pay off its indebtedness.

This is what I am worried about, Sir. I hold here in my hands a document which I am prepared to surrender to you. I am not reading any newspaper. It is "West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Draw List", date of draw, December 12, 1966, and at the bottom as you know, Sir, it is marked: "printed at the Advocate Commercial Printery". Under the law, you must say who printed it. This is the first thing which I would deal with. It reads: "Date of Draw, December 12, 1966 and tickets sold on Golden Gate Handicap. Drawn and substituted Bright Memorial in connection with the Fifth Sweepstake held in aid of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Bridgetown, Barbados."

Mr. Speaker, I would like hon. members to listen to this: it is within your knowledge that I challenged the Leader of the House and other hon. members over there. The document goes on to say that 20 per cent

Barbados Government tax will be deducted by the Company before prizes are paid. All prizes based on \$1,000,000 sales unit, and if the unit is less, then the amount of prizes will be reduced proportionately. Prizes will be paid in the currency of the country where the prize winner resides.

I am quite willing, Sir, to put this in as a document of the House: that is, if the Ministers would like to see it. They may not have seen it. They may think that I am attempting to repeal the West Indies Hospital Fund Bill because I have something against some person. I have reached an age; I have lived in Barbados. I was born in Barbados and all I have is in Barbados. I know what it is to come from a country with a good name. You say that you are running a sweepstake for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This is No. 1. If you go to Seawell Airport and the Harbour, you will see these tickets sold to people. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I am reading from a Toronto leading newspaper. It says:-

"Tickets pay \$175,000 (U.S.) money." That is O.K. So says Mr. M. P. Toronto. "They may be sold in Barbados; but if you sell any of these tickets here, you may earn a special prize trip to the eastern country of the Morality Bureau. No sweepstake is legal in Canada."

That you can see for yourself, Mr. Speaker, I am not worried about that. They can put what they like there. I come to the point which is of much importance to us. This is a book of the Sweepstake which was sent to me. Listen to this very carefully. "P.O. Box 1287". Mr. Speaker, it is significant that nobody can find P.O. Box 1287 and I am going to give you numbers of other P. O. Boxes too. This reads: "Dear friend - several purchasers of our tickets for previous draws have written us asking for tickets, as the persons from whom they bought tickets originally had not offered them any more for various reasons. We believe you will still be interested in helping our cause but may not have had the opportunity of purchasing our tickets since the Winter Stakes in August 1966 of the Golden Gate Handicap of December, 1966. We are therefore sending you two books of tickets for the seventh race of the Winter Stakes which will be run at Saratogo Springs, New York, in August. We have no intention of cutting across the seller, but this gives you an opportunity of taking part in the draw."

Now as regards the seller's instructions, it gives all the seller's instructions and those are sent out by the Barbados Sweepstake itself. This book of tickets got back to me in Barbados. But look, Mr. Speaker, at the one most important thing! I have in my hand a letter stating "P. O. Box 1287" and there is no P. O. Box 1287. This is a serious matter, one which the Police should go into. In actual fact, there is no such P.O. Box if you go there. Who, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is drawing this money?

It states: "You have been recommended dear friend, by a mutual friend, as a trustworthy person to help our worthy cause to sell the enclosed tickets for

the Fifth Sweepstake, the Golden Gate Handicap. Now the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake carried the largest first prize of \$175,000 (U.S.) plus several other big cash prizes.
3.35 p.m.

I want hon. members to really listen to this because this is what annoyed me, and I am rather sorry that the Hon. Prime Minister and the hon. senior member for St. Michael are not here. "The principal benefactor of the Sweepstake is the new \$8 million Queen Elizabeth Hospital dedicated by Prince Phillip of England." I would like the Marshal to pass this around. Could you honestly sit down there, after you took the hard-earned money of the taxpayers of this country and built our Hospital, and allow somebody selling a Sweepstake to send out that it is operated for the benefit and welfare needs of the Caribbean Islands, and that the principal benefactor is the new \$8 million Queen Elizabeth Hospital dedicated by Prince Philip of England? My God have mercy! Could anything be worse than that? You are using Prince Philip's name and the name of the Hospital in this matter. I voted for this Sweepstake because I would have supported anything that brings money into Barbados, but not this racket. This is a nasty, worthless, depraved racket. "The principal benefactor is the \$8 million Queen Elizabeth Hospital dedicated by Prince Philip." Who is Prince Philip? The Queen's husband. And you are sending this out to England.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. I went to the Post Office to locate these post boxes and there are no such boxes, but one person goes down from the Hospital Sweepstake and collects the letters. I have here a letter from a sister and a friend of a school teacher and an auditor in Barbados. These people merely go to the Tourist Board or to Pan American or Trans Canada Airways and get people's names as soon as they arrive here and send them these letters. Do you think this is fair? They use a false name like Rudy Simpson; so the obvious thing is for somebody to say he does not know anything about it. If you think I am reading something that is not here, I would like the Marshal to pass this around and let members of the Government see it. You do not have to believe me. I cannot support a thing like this. Carry this around to the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may address the Chair only.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Who else do you think I am addressing, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not addressing the Chair if he asks somebody to carry something around. The Chair will carry nothing around to the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thought the Chair would allow that to happen.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not think you would come down to carry it around. I know you are very courteous in matters of this sort.

I have here another one with the name "Ivy Reid" The Sweepstake is using these names and the P.O. Box is 1027. Go to the Postmaster and find out what is happening. I have come here armed with the facts. This says: "The new West Indian Hospital Sweep carries the world's largest first prize \$175,000 plus several other prizes" and so on; "The West Indian Hospital Sweep through special legislation is authorised and supervised by the Government of Barbados". Is this true or is it not true? Can you let a thing like this go out of Barbados? The Government of Barbados does not supervise any sweepstake. I have more to give you which will shock you. Who is the Minister supervising the Hospital Sweep? The "Advocate" can publish all the bloody headlines they want; they cannot disregard that this is dishonesty. They can put headlines in the paper drawing a red herring across the line talking about the City Council; but they cannot say that I carried away the money. "Supervised by the Government of Barbados and is operated for the benefit and welfare needs in the Caribbean Islands. The principal benefactor of the sweepstake is the new \$8 million Queen Elizabeth Hospital dedicated by Prince Philip of England." Do you think this is a good thing for Barbados? The recipient of these letters were to send up \$35, but I advised them not to send it because it is not for the Barbados Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because it is not run by the Barbados Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am as loyal a Barbadian as any person you have ever found and more loyal than possibly half the members on the Government side, but I have reached the age now where I do not want to go anywhere. When you get a thing like this going out of Barbados telling people that this is being run for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which was dedicated by Prince Philip, argue as you like: this is a surreptitious means of using somebody's name. They have not got enough post boxes; so they hold the letters and one messenger from the Hospital Sweepstake goes and collects the letters when this money is returned. I have friends in Barbados and people write me these things. I had a friend who was working on a train between Saskatchewan and Montreal, I believe, and he told me he was so ashamed because he had sold so many tickets only to find that he could hear nothing. This man was from Speightstown. He wrote me several times; he wrote the "Advocate"; and he wrote the Hospital Sweepstake, but to no avail. Could any honest-minded man and member of the House say that this is the correct thing to do to get money out of people, by telling them this is for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? The envelopes are sent up typed "Return to Ruby Simpson, P.O. Box 1272 Bridgetown, Barbados W.I."

Now I am going to tell you this: Marcus Garvey got locked up for less than this. This adverting to the mail and doing this is a serious thing. Getting money from people in this way is doing Barbados no good. I thought we could have got the \$500,000 and I voted

for this then, and I would vote again if I thought we could collect the money, but when I know for a fact that the few dollars paid into the Court and the money paid over..... Mr. Marshal.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member like me to request the Marshal to await him?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, if you want to do it this way.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the only decent way to do it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It might be the only decent way, but there is another way then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member would like the Marshal to wait upon him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Take that around to the Government members.
3.45 p.m.

Even in the Estimates you put in nothing last year, but you expect \$25,000 this year. If you can get \$500,000 a year here to relieve housing conditions, the feeding of school children and so on, I will vote for it again; but I cannot vote for something just to keep somebody in a job. This is corrupt business. Any Government that would prostitute themselves in such a manner as to support something of this sort when they know they would not get anything from any Hospital sweep - I say this is corruption of the highest calibre. How does this read in England? You are prostituting this in the name of Prince Philip, the Queen's husband. You come in here and talk a lot of nonsense, and throw a red herring across the trail by saying that the City Council owes this money to people and that sort of thing.

There is another one, Sir, from Fred Spencer. It says the same thing. Most people will gamble in order to help a Hospital. If this Sweepstake was run on a proper footing - as a matter of fact, if the Government want to run a sweepstake, I would be the first to support it. To gamble is human nature. I would support it tomorrow, if we were going to get money for all the various things we have to do in Barbados. Do not tell me, just for the sake of getting something, Mr. Speaker, for a person, that we are going to do this. I hope that the Government will crave the right, and I am sure you will grant it, to say it is not true that the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake is supervised and run by the Government. I did not print these documents. It is one of the fellow-traveller's tricks to say he has printed them himself. You will try the Post Office first; try the Police Department; try the Commissioner of Police, and find out how many they have.

This one, here, deals with the price-selling of the sweepstakes and tells you how much you will get. I can go on ad infinitum on a matter of this sort because I have the data which I can use, but I only want to bring the Government to their senses. I know that the Leader of the House made a half-hearted speech. It was part

of his duty to make a speech, if somebody was introducing something to repeal a Bill.

Mr. Speaker, they were unable to get you to rule that it was out of order, because somebody was trying to take money out of the Treasury, and then the next thing would be for Government to try and bring their Party together and vote against it. I have listened carefully to the half-hearted speech of the Leader of the House. Unfortunately, I was not in here all of the time. Let us look at another document, Sir. This is Mr. Fergusson - not the member of this House. It states:

"October 18, 1965. First Prize Winner - \$175,000 American money. Ticket J 21497.

Dear Mr. Fergusson,

I am in receipt of your letter dated September 27 to Mr. G. G. Strawbecker, senior Vice President of the Bank of Virginia.

In your letter you stated that your company is presently being re-financed and funds have been deposited and only waiting settlement also. You believe it would occur in about a week." Are you listening to this? I do not know by whom this company was being re-financed. All the time they are talking about the Barbados Government. I will continue;

"As of today I have not received the said funds, which is more than three weeks from the date of your letter."

I am sorry the manager of the company is not here to dispute these things. The letter also stated:

"I trust that first prize payment is on the way, or will be on its way within the next few days. If payment is not received within 10 days from the date of this letter, I will be forced to seek other measures to obtain the said funds.

J. W. Thompson, P. O. Box 368, Virginia." Do you believe I wrote this? I have not written these.

The Company is being re-financed, and yet I am told in here that all the money has been paid in. This is not fair to the good name of Barbados. When will the Company be re-financed? I did not go to Expo, but my friends at Expo told me that all you could hear at Expo was: "Mount Gay; tell me something about the West Indies Hospital Sweep." The people wanted to know how we were getting along with the funds for building the Hospital. That is all you can hear there. Now a copy of this letter was sent to the Mayor of Bridgetown; the hon. Winter Crawford, and the British Embassy, for your information, Sir. Mottley, Crawford, and the British High Commissioner's Office; so you can see how far this is going. These people are sending out letters and using the Queen's husband's name with a Hospital or with a Company which is nothing but a fraud.

Now, therefore, having given you some of the facts, would not I have a right - Fergie, do not tear up that; bring it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard a strange name mentioned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a man who is supposed to have won the \$175,000, and not a member of this House. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if, on the face of these documents and the facts I have produced to you, any hon. member including the Minister of Communications and Works - you should not write when I am speaking - would say that any hon. member who got hold of the facts would be right in going about saying this is a worthless Government, and they are doing it in truth. Can I write back and tell them that the Government backs this Hospital Sweep, and that the benefits will go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? No. I am doing an honourable and an honest thing; I come into this House and draw things to the attention of the Ministers. If they want to be dishonest let them vote against a repeal of the Act.
3.55 p.m.

Let them vote against it. It is a matter entirely for them. If they know that the Sweepstake is being run by the Government, if they know that it is financing the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, that it was dedicated by Prince Philip, if they know that that is true then let them vote against the repeal of the Act; but if you know that it is not true, then I would like to know what side will you take. Mr. Speaker, even the most ardent supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, the strongest supporters, even those supporters who are blind and slavish to patriotism, will acknowledge that if these facts have been so clearly put and they have been bolstered up by documentary evidence, it would be impossible for any member of the Government Party with a clear conscience to vote against the repeal of this Act. I say that I voted for it - nobody can throw this at me - I voted for it because of what I felt was represented to me at the time; but a man is very small when he is led up the path by someone else and he realises that a mistake has been made, and he cannot say: "I have made a mistake." I believe that the Prime Minister, in good faith, brought in this Bill and we all supported it in good faith. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph and I were responsible for sending it to a Select Committee. We all supported it; but if you find that this is going wrong, you cannot keep a man in a job - as I said before, I do not consider the hon. senior member for St. Michael - I will not say anything disparaging about him. I said what I said and that is enough as far as I am concerned. He is young, he is running it and he thinks that that is the best way to run it. I could say a lot of things, but I am sticking purely to documentary evidence and purely on the facts as they are. You have not collected even one-third of the money which you anticipated you would collect. If I am wrong, surely the Hon. Leader of the House will correct me, and this is from 1965, 1966, 1967 and now 1968. This means that you would have collected \$2 million, but have you collected it? No. As to the argument used about finding work for people, you can find work for people by hanging people. That is work too. Have you collected \$2 million? Have you collected this percentage. I know when the \$22,000 was paid into Court, I know when they were sued. When I made the first noise in here, they went

and paid in this money. They have been trying to pay. The argument used by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is: "Give them a chance and they will be able to pay off their indebtedness." You will be able to pay off your indebtedness by telling people that the Government of Barbados is running the Sweepstake, by telling the people that after the Hospital was built with the hard-earned money of the taxpayers of Barbados, you are running the Sweepstake and the chief beneficiary of this Sweepstake is the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Are you really going to sit down on a matter like this? Are you really going to sit down and allow Her Majesty's Post Office - are you going to allow the Government of Barbados to use the Post Office as a place for blackmailing people? Are you going to allow a Sweepstake Company to use fictitious names and then use somebody to go to the Post Office and collect the letters and whatever money you get and then the people do not hear anything at all about it? How do you expect I got in possession of these facts? Are you going to allow the Postmaster General to tremble in trepidation and fear that somebody will report him or something like that? Are you going to allow this thing to go on? Because the Police feel that the Government is running this thing, are you going to let this thing go on? After all, they will talk.

When the Head of the Police Force or other persons high in the Police Department receive mailed communication in this matter, what can you do? They know as a fact that it is nothing to do with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Do you mean that you must just write back and say that the Government is not running any such thing? I suppose you thought that I was coming in here to vilify or abuse or say some ill things about somebody. No, I have come in here to deal with facts. My facts are there, and when the Hansard is written, it must go down in history that I have presented these facts. Whether you like it or not, these are facts and facts are very stubborn. You can hardly remove them. (A PAUSE)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot hear the hon. member now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir, you will hear me in due course, in good time. I have presented the facts; the facts are straightforward and stubborn and they can hardly be got around. Whatever a Government in power likes to do, they can do because they have the majority vote; but, in the circumstances, I counsel hon. members that you cannot go on exposing the Barbados Post Office which, I am told, from a legal point of view (ASIDES). As I said, Sir, if we were running a Sweepstake in support of a new hospital or of any hospital or a fund which the Government would direct, none of us could have any grouse about it; but having seen for yourself what the position is, are you going to sit here today and vote against this Bill? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they could sit here and vote against this, what would happen with anybody who was charged with murder and they saw that a case was not made out against him, that he was not even near there, what would they do? This is shameless. This argument about employing people and about bringing down machinery and employing people and how much

the "Advocate" made out of it and the like, all of that is beside the point.

4.05 p.m.

Everybody knows, Sir, that this Company actually used the picture of nurses in uniform to send it abroad to make believe that it had something to do with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Nurses were used in the draw as well as policemen who were asked to stand by. All this was done because it was published in the U.S.A. and Canada, and even in England to make believe that the chief beneficiary was the Hospital. I wonder if the hon. member can tell me if the Hospital has got any money out of this Company yet. I categorically deny the statement which the hon. member made that money was paid in.

It is true that you cannot get information from the Income Tax Commissioner. It is secret. Whether the Government can get it, I do not know, but you cannot get information from the Income Tax Commissioner. However, you cannot stop me from getting information from the Courts.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The only time in which I would interrupt the hon. member is the time which arose out of what the hon. member has just said. He said: "Maybe the Government can get information." Those are the exact words. I hope the hon. member realises that this is improper.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, if this is improper, I have had the information from the Courts. It is impossible for you to get information from the Income Tax Commissioner. How did you make those categorical statements in here that this money was received? You said that you received nothing last year. How then have you made this statement about \$220,000? When I say "you", I do not mean the hon. member. You admit that Government members cannot get this information. All of us can get it from the Courts. How have you made this dogmatic statement that all of this money was paid in? If this money is paid in, then something is wrong with the Estimates. If the money is paid in, it has to be shown in the Estimates. I think the Hon. Leader of the House would agree to that. Which Estimates can you find that in? You cannot find it in either Estimates at all.

I do not know if the hon. member wants me to refresh his memory about the figures. I can refresh his memory. I would like the Hon. Leader of the House to know that there were \$225,000 to the benefit of the Nation. If you can get that, we ought to have it. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Mr. Errol Barrow, said that today. This was the 18th November, 1967. I am reading from my notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did have that impression, although I realised that the hon. member would not have done it; but it appeared to be a newspaper at which he was looking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am looking at a picture.

Mr. SPEAKER: I accept the assurance of any hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. It is all right, but the Hon. Prime Minister goes on to say - my note says - \$225,000. If the Prime Minister was misled, I do not believe he misled us. I believe he conscientiously believed that he could have got it, and this sort of thing is going on; do you think we should sit down here and allow those things to go on? I certainly do not think so, Sir.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which hon. members should take very seriously. What are we getting from it? What are we getting from it but a bad name for Barbados?

(A VOICE: What about the tamarind barrels?)

I am not worried about the tamarind barrels. They have to ship them out somehow. Everybody in the country know that within six months after the Sweepstake started two of the big officials here were sent to prison in Canada because it is illegal to sell the tickets in Canada.

I am just reading something here on the tickets. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not making this statement dogmatically because I am not a race fan; but I have been told on good authority - an authority which I accept in a matter of this sort, by a person who is very strongly in favour of the present Government - that some of these races stopped running about five years before. They do not run them at all now. Maybe, the Minister of Agriculture would know something about this, but I understand that such races are not run at all now, and this caused suspicion immediately in the State of New York as to the amount which they would pay out as the first prize.

Even if hon. members feel that they should not vote for the repeal of this Bill on the facts as have been disclosed here, they should now attempt to set their house in order. One of the facts is that the State of New York is now running a legally organized Sweepstake monthly. Mayor Rockefeller has agreed - I think it was started by Mayor Lindsay - to a legally organised Sweepstake. How then are you going to push the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake into New York now? How are you going to push them across the border? I really do not think quite honestly that you have got a chance with the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake now.

4.15 p.m.

How do you think you are going to push this in the United States now, when just across the border there was a legally organised Sweepstake in 1967! If for no other reason, you have not got a chance. You were to receive \$500,000 which was nothing to do with the percentage which you would get from the tickets sold, because there was a flat agreement of \$500,000 a year. I had this Bill before the House for a long time. I have presented the facts, but the strength of the Party and the organisation will make hon. members who see, know and read these facts as I have presented

them, vote against their consciences and make them do something that would send Barbados further and further down.

I regret the Hon. Prime Minister was not in here to take me up on what he said when he drew a red herring across the line, and instead of dealing with the facts of the Hospital Sweep dealt with the City Council and how much taxes were not collected. If I open my mouth on that, I would never want to be personal or anything of the sort. I came in here to deal with the Hospital Sweepstake. If you look around here, everybody has a job and you have to find some job for the hon. senior member for St. Michael, but you cannot keep him in a job at the expense of the integrity and honesty of Barbados. I am not one of those people who object to a Party finding a job for its supporters, because if you do not help your friends when you are in power, you are not going to help them when you are out of power. You do whatever you like, because whatever goes up comes down; but too far East is West. You cannot keep a man in a job in a Company which is sending things through the Post Office telling people in matter that is printed by the "Advocate" that this is principally for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Hon. Leader of the House can play with words. What does "chief beneficiary" mean? Does it mean you are going to give them a hospital bed? How have they become the chief beneficiary? This says: "Queen Elizabeth Hospital dedicated by Prince Philip". They have used the Queen's husband's name to make it known in Canada, in America and in England that he dedicated the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the Hospital is getting most of the money. This is not fair. Through the Post Office you are sending out and collecting money, and people are writing me such letters as I have read. They have also sent a letter to Mr. Crawford and to the British Embassy here; so the newspapers can write whatever they like and be as corrupt as they like in this matter. I say here and now that I have a copy of a letter which says that the British Embassy in Bridgetown was sent a letter also. Let them try and hide as much of this as they can. This matter was on the front page when the Prime Minister spoke and defended the Hospital Sweepstake. Let them be corrupt and say that only the Prime Minister can defend the people; let them say that the Opposition has not made out a case here today; let them report as they like.

Mr. Speaker, the mighty should not use their might unfit, neither should they deem that their prosperity will last forever. This is wrong, and I can see from the hang of their faces that they know it is wrong, but Party allegiance will prevent them from voting for this. Anybody who decides that you can allow people to send a Sweepstake out of Barbados saying that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the chief beneficiary is not true to himself. Suppose they never report that I read a letter written to me from Virginia, U.S.A. and noting that Mr. Crawford and the Embassy in Barbados also got a letter, it does not matter. This is something bad.

I remember well enough when we were told that the man behind this project had \$72 million. From

my little experience I said it did not matter how many millions he had; I wanted to know how much this company was capitalised at. Mr. Turney, the Solicitor, was brought into the Lobby of the House and he could not tell us anything. He told us that Nova Scotia was the Bank. Nova Scotia could not tell us anything, but we were persuaded that \$500,000 a year would come to Barbados, and any sane or reasonable man, knowing that \$500,000 a year was coming to Barbados, would vote for it. Do you mean that now that the Prime Minister and his Party have found out that this is wrong and they have not collected the money, they are still going to keep it?

When I said in passing that I thought they might be able to get it, the Leader of the House objected and I withdrew it. They said the nation benefited by \$225,000 from it. This started in 1965 and they were to get \$500,000 a year. It was a gamble. We did not get it the first year nor the second year. (Mr. CORBIN: You don't always win in gambling!) You do not always win in gambling, but if anybody puts loaded dice on you or works a double card or a marked card on you, you do not like that. This is what is being worked on us today. We are not getting any of the money, and if the Prime Minister has said that we have got \$225,000, that is the total for all the years of operation. Last year you had nothing in the Estimates, and this year you have included \$25,000.

4.25 p.m.

I have been told to give them a chance. For how long do they want a chance? All a man has to do is to break a couple of stores in Bridgetown, and every time he breaks one he can ask for a chance. Then we see: "Beneficiary Barbados Hospital Sweep." How can you honestly support a thing like this?

I have shown you the documents to read; I have told you that the numbers do not even exist in the Post Office; I have told you that people are going in there and asking for letters coming to the Hospital Sweep; I have told you that money has been sent in. From one of these letters you will actually notice that money was sent here to a friend of mine, and I was asked what to do. I said: "Bring it to me and let me see it." When I went into the matter, I realised that something was wrong when I saw that they had an invitation to sell sweepstakes or to buy sweepstakes.

Look at what they are doing! They go to the Immigration Department and get a list of the names and addresses of people as soon as Trans-Canada lands here. They get the name and address of every Canadian who lands here, and as soon as he returns to Canada he will receive a letter asking him to support the Sweepstake. It will be pointed out that it will be in the interest of the Hospitals in the West Indies, but that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Barbados will be the chief beneficiary. Mr. Speaker, I do not know English too well, but I wonder whether the Leader of the House will tell me who is the chief beneficiary.

That is a fraud of the greatest magnitude. You can use it in whatever legal term you like. If the Government vote for it today, then they are supporting this fraud; they are acquiescing to this fraud; they are allowing a fraud to be perpetrated in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, this is something which we all regret. This is a bad case. You cannot get jobs for people by doing this. But on the 18th November you can publish and get glaring headlines: "THE PRIME MINISTER DEFENDS THEM - \$225,000. MOTTLEY LOOKS LIKE AN ASS. MOTTLEY IS DOING SOMETHING THAT SHOULD NOT BE DONE."

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Private Members' Business has expired, and Government Business is the instant Order of the Day. The first Item under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 67

A Resolution for \$2,100,000 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement Head 104 - Education - with a new item, item 19, Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The sum of two million one hundred thousand dollars is being required to make an advance to this Corporation to enable it to revise its financial structure. The amount is to be repaid in a 10-year period by quarterly instalments, the details of which hon. members, I believe, are familiar with, or at any rate with the proposal. The general purpose, apart from restructuring the finances of the Corporation, is to enable the Corporation to liquidate its loans and to make itself, other things being equal, a more viable entity.

Mr. Chairman, by Resolution, I think, No. 77 of 1963, the House of Assembly guaranteed the borrowing by the Governor in Executive Committee of a loan not exceeding \$300,000 for the setting up, for financing and establishing, of the Radio Station. This money was used principally for the purchase of equipment.

By another Resolution in the following year - I do not quite recall the number now - in 1964, the House approved of a subsequent guarantee - this time for \$510,000 - for the purchase of a transmitter and studio equipment for the establishment of the Television Service.

I believe, again, by a subsequent Resolution there was another guarantee of I think, \$250,000. The position, therefore, is that like some other Statutory Authorities the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was not established with equity capital. This, I believe, can be justified and defended on the ground that if you are going into a new venture, it is, perhaps, as well to hold it on the tightest possible rein until you see its possibilities, and then after a certain number of years you can consciously re-plan and re-devise its finances either along the same lines or, perhaps, along different lines. These are two alternatives. It is nothing to do with internal management, or operational efficiency, because you can give and devise the best kind of financial structure and yet have every advantage thrown away if operational efficiency is not 100% or is not nearly 100%.

I was just making that point, Mr. Chairman, merely to emphasize that there can be more than a single method of financing a Corporation. You can either give it some money and say: "Here is your operating capital," or you can do the other thing which was done in this case as with some other Statutory Authorities. We can say: "We are going to guarantee you a loan of \$x million, as the case may be, and out of this you will have to purchase your capital equipment as well as maintain and service your operating expenses." In other words, it has been undoubtedly the case with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. Chairman, that when it was set up it used, should we say, the same funds, or drew on the same funds, for the purchase of the radio transmitter as it did, should we say, for the purchase of a postage stamp. It had no other means of financing itself.

Now, even so, at the inception there were two alternatives which Government could have pursued. It has pursued one of these two, and I think rightly. It could either have set up a Station with the smallest and only most necessary service - a Station, perhaps, run by less than a dozen people with very little programming initiated outside of what is mass-produced. It could do this. There are hundreds of Radio and Television Stations in North America and, possibly, in other countries which are run on what I call the shoestring basis - small operations, with perhaps as much as 90% disc-jockeying, and the minimum proportion of live programmes - a closely knit Corporation very tightly financed with no possibilities, perhaps, of expanding or any conscious expansion except what lies within the compass of that kind of Station.

I think we could have done this, and we should probably not now be in this situation, which calls for the re-structuring of the Corporation's finances. We might have done this, but I think it would have been a great drawback if we had done it.

4.35 p.m.

After all, radio and television are in no different position from any other concern in which you quite rightly expect growth and acceptability; but the moment you set up something which you are consciously fostering and developing, certain disadvantages

necessarily accompany its growth and its acceptability by the community which it serves. If your operation expands rapidly, your expenditure expands rapidly; and even with the best will in the world, if you try not to let expenditure rise to meet income in every case, even if you do this, it is still a necessary consequence of the growth of an enterprise, and it is being accepted by the community that certain necessary disadvantages will accrue if the growth is rapid. We had radio established in 1964, and within a year to the date, television was established. You could argue that it was a bit unwise to start the second phase, if you like to call it this - the television - before we had perfectly digested radio, I mean from the operational point of view; but you can also argue, and I think it is a much more sensible attitude to take, that if you are going to have the two of them, you may as well have them close enough to one another in order that they may grow together, instead of continually planning for two separate operations. Why not treat both of them as two aspects of a single operation and let them grow together, and watch them grow, and finance them accordingly?

There is another point also. When you look at the projections made for these services - I am speaking now of the composite services - when you look at the projections which were made, say, at the beginning of 1963, and you compare them with what has actually happened, the differences are really instructive. On the projections made for the first four years, first on the revenue side, the difference is only \$32,938. I will explain what I mean. Before we started, it was thought that revenue would be something like \$2,485,000. The actual outturn in that period was \$2,452,062 - a difference of \$32,938 - and that is not a wide difference between what was projected and what has actually been the case. That difference is not so wide. The width of the difference is more manifest in the operating expenditure. Whereas there is a narrow gap in projecting the actual revenue, there is a wider gap in the projection of operating expenditure over the same period. It was projected, for instance, that the operating expenditure over that period would be something like \$1,862,000, and it has turned out to be \$2,805,758 - a difference of nearly \$1 million, a difference of \$943,758. I think that, immediately we get the point of what I am trying to say, if you have to finance bank charges and other necessary commitments, in short, if you have to finance your whole operations out of the loan capital, and if, as must necessarily be the case, the servicing of your loan must be the first charge on your revenue, and that has got to be the case, the gap in the operating deficit is bound to be as wide as has actually been the case. In short, if C.B.C. or any other Corporation - it does not matter which one - had been financed or had started off with a lump sum grant from Parliament - we have never come into Parliament to ask for money out of the Treasury for C.B.C.; what we have done in the Estimates is, as you will see, we have given to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation an amount which is thought to be annually equal to the duties collected on the importation, the import duties on television receivers. In addition to this, we allow for the licence fees and if, as the latest set count appears to show,

that there are 10,000 or 11,000 television receivers in the Island, the revenue from licences ought to be \$100,000 or \$110,000 as the case may be, and it should be the Corporation's business to collect all of their licence fees, and not \$41,000 as appears to be the case in 1966.

4.45 p.m.

This may be a dereliction on their part or, may be, some defect in the legal or administrative process which does not enable them fully to reap the advantages of getting all the revenue from licensing fees. But this is something incidental that they will have to look after.

Therefore, as I said, Mr. Chairman, apart from the subventions, if you like to call it so, to be reaped from the hand-over of Customs Duties and the revenue which should accrue if the licencing fees were fully collected, nothing else comes out of the Treasury for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. Obviously, everybody knows that the original concept has been very much over expanded.

Mr. Chairman, you can call this an extravagance if you like, but this is a point of view like any other, and I do not say this to denigrate any other territory or the television operation in any other territory. You will be surprised to know that last week when an important religious ceremony was being televised in Trinidad, they had to establish closed - circuit television so that people, not in their homes, but outside the Cathedral, who could not get in the Cathedral, would be able to follow the service. That is exactly what happened because their outside broadcasting equipment is nowhere as good or efficient as that which exists here.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Would the hon. member agree that a closed-circuit system is at all times preferable to an outside broadcast? These are technical matters. We may be technically misled; but if you can use your coaxial to have a closed circuit system, it is in every case superior in having an open broadcast. Therefore, he should not say that theirs in Trinidad is anything inefficient. I am sure he would not want, himself being misled, to mislead the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I do not think that I was misled. As I said, I did not say this to denigrate anybody; I am only saying it to make the point which I am now making that we expanded our operations so early that problems which other people now have we just do not have. Technical problems which other people now have, we just do not have.

Apart from certain areas in this island - let us say hilly, I dare not say mountainous because probably it would be an exaggeration to talk about mountainous areas in Barbados, certain risings in that part of the island's hilly areas, you can get a reasonably good signal from the television O.B.U. service in this Island.

Now, this is not something that you must actually have, and this is the point which I am making; but from

the very beginning we had this, so that the service should not be in any way inhibited for want of anything which would be useful for it to have. You can argue that if you did not have the television O.B.U., you would be \$100,000 to the good today; but when you see it going along the streets; it is \$100,000 worth of equipment which you see, and it can be called upon at any time to do public service broadcasting. You cannot therefore say that merely because this kind of equipment cannot always earn its own money it is an extravagance to have it, because although the community itself might resent in some instances extravagance, nowhere should we grumble in hearing that a Statutory Corporation is spending a lot of its money when it can understand the community nevertheless wishes to have certain services at its disposal and, quite frankly, is willing to compliment the Corporation when certain public service achievements are to the Corporation's credit, and they are just as likely to blame the Corporation as to the quality of transmission during a Test Match or any other community event if it is not what it should be.

We expanded the original concept, rebuilt studios which not only by our assessment but by common consent of people who know these things are among the finest in the area. We have done all these things, and I am saying this quite frankly now - I sometimes wonder why the Corporation does not charge the Government. I do not think this would matter a great deal; it probably is only book-keeping; but when we take into account the operational difficulties of the Corporation, I think that we ought also to remember that a tremendous amount of lucrative broadcasting time is used not only by Government but by organizations for benefits. I mean, for instance, if it is Red Cross Week and the Corporation gives up ten minutes twice a week for an appeal or something just like that during peak listening time, this represents a sacrifice of revenue; and it well may be that if the Station was purely a private station, it could be calculated that time given up to Government might be worth something like thirty, forty, or even fifty thousand dollars worth in time.

Still, I am not saying that the C.B.C. should be so meticulous to make us go into the Treasury to pay cash for the time Government or other organizations use. I am only saying that when public service demands are met, the Corporation meets them at great sacrifice to its revenue and capacity. That is the point which I am making and this ought also to be taken into account.

Now, it would also be unfair as well as impertinent for a Statutory Corporation - or any business for that matter - to ask to have its finances restricted or eased and not give a convincing exposition of what it expects to gain from the advantages which it is asking for. This I know the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is quite willing to give. When the question of reconstructing the finances of the Corporation and of providing for the first time operational capital was being examined, projection was made as to how it was thought that the Corporation would be able to operate once it was offered some financial ease.

4.55 p.m.

It was forecast, for instance, that in this year, 1968, assuming that the operating deficits are cleared off and some operational capital is made available, the trading deficit would be \$184,000, that in 1969 that deficit would be \$81,000, that in 1970 that deficit would be converted into a trading surplus of \$162,000 and that by 1971 the trading surplus would be \$286,000. Now on the other hand, since the increase in revenue..

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, if the Minister would give way, could he say what he said about 1967? Could he say what the actual loss was in 1967 and what is the projection for 1968? I did not catch these two.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The 1967 accounts are not yet to hand, but it is projected that it would be \$336,000 net for 1967, for 1968 \$184,000, for 1969 \$81,000, for 1970 a surplus of \$162,000 and 1971 a surplus of \$286,000.

Now I would also like to say that there is another side to this picture, because you could not project, at least if you are sensible and serious, an operating surplus of \$286,000 in 1971 unless you could say something also about the possible increase in revenue through the sale of advertisements. Now in 1966, if you take the total amount spent in this Island on advertisement, the advertising take in the Island - that is to say, what is earned by Rediffusion, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, the newspapers and the various advertising agencies, the total earnings were approximately \$2,320,000. It is estimated that this figure will increase by 5 per cent per annum over the next five years. Now Caribbean Broadcasting's share of the advertising take in 1966 was 32 per cent. It is estimated that this figure will increase gradually over the next five years to reach 45 per cent in 1971. For instance, in 1967 Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation's share of advertising - this is the progression - Mr. Chairman - was around 35 per cent; this year it is likely to be 39 per cent; in 1969, 41 per cent, in 1970, 43 per cent and in 1971, 45 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot of course anticipate in these remarks every possible criticism or question which can be raised. I think therefore I ought to await the comments and contributions of hon. members, and then I will try my best to meet their objections and to answer, because I have nothing to hide. I just want to say that there is no doubt that you can make criticisms perhaps of operational methods; you can make some criticisms of methods of financing the Corporation at the beginning; you can ask why we did it one way and not another. I think any of those criticisms could be made and they would probably be genuine criticisms; but I say this without fear of contradiction, that any person who makes a close study both of the present situation of the Corporation and what is projected for its future can have no doubt whatever - and I say this and would stake the seat I hold in this Assembly on this because I am convinced of it - after a careful study both of the present position and of the future projections, that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is going to be a money spinner and a revenue earner for the people of this Island in less

than ten years' time. This is my conviction, but it is also my conviction that with the best will in the world, and the most careful management that could exist anywhere in the world, you could not have got better results - I mean better in quantum - than can be shown here, because the defect has never been in the quality of management, has never been in the lack of expertise or anything like this. It is my opinion, and I think the facts will bear me out, that the defect has been in the fact that no equity capital was made available to this Corporation, and therefore it has had to meet its Bank charges and its other overhead expenses out of revenue. If you have got to do this, you cannot do much more than limp along.

The proposal now is not to take money out of the Treasury to give the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation; the proposal is to borrow to lend to C.B.C., to be repaid by C.B.C. and to repay the Bank from the C.B.C.'s revenue. This is the proposal and I would like this to be made quite clear. This is no attempt to substantiate or rather to insist on one policy when in fact it is another policy we are pursuing. If the Government - I know the Prime Minister certainly feels this - were not itself convinced that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation would be a viable economic concern once it has been refinanced, the Government itself would recommend to Parliament that it be disbanded and sold out for whatever we could get for it. If we were not convinced that it is going to be a money spinner..... (Mr. HINDS: It is spinning money now.) Not in the way the hon. member may mean. I mean a money-making affair. It is because we are convinced of this that we are recommending this course, and really in the last resort, Mr. Chairman, the argument must rest on this: if people who know more about these things than most of us know would be more than anxious to make a good offer for the whole operation so that they can reap the advantages in the near and far future which they know this Government and this country will reap, this I would think is the best argument for it, when those who know better are not as afraid and not as apprehensive as some people who think that what is now the case must necessarily always be the case. With more money at its disposal for operating capital and freed from the incubus of the overheads which it has had to meet, those charges it has had to meet out of current revenue, there is no reason why Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation should not be in the quickest possible time a profit making concern and an example to every such Statutory Authority in this Island. 5.05 p.m.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this whole business has a bad smell. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was established, I think, four years ago with certain Regulations as to how its accounts should be prepared, as to how its reports should be laid before the House, and as to how its financial business should be transacted. There are certain facts about the accounts of C.B.C. to which I would like to advert, but I am going to refer to them at a later stage. I am going to talk of the general conduct of C.B.C. just as the Ministers.

Now, first of all, the question of the submission of the accounts. Hon. members will recall that last week the Minister of Finance stated that certain accounts had been laid on the table of the House. It turned out that this was not true. We went into this last week. Nobody is blaming the Leader of the House. I am not blaming him, and I am sure that nobody else on this side is blaming him. He is no longer the Minister responsible, and whatever his sins may have been in connection with the carrying on of C.B.C., I do not believe that they include the fiddling of the accounts.

Now, the accounts were circulated to hon. members for 1965 and 1966. The Act, Mr. Chairman, the Caribbean Broadcasting Act No. 36 of 1963 says in Section 12:

"The Corporation shall establish and maintain sound financing and accounting procedures and where such procedures relate to the following matters.... they should be subject to the approval of the Minister of Finance."

Section 18 says:

"The Corporation shall keep proper accounts and other records in relation to the business of the Corporation and shall prepare annually the statement of account in a form satisfactory to the Minister of Finance being a form which will conform to the best commercial standards."

Subsection (2) says:

"The accounts and the records should be kept in such a manner as to secure the provision of separate information as respects each of the main activities of the Corporation and to show as far as may be the financial and operating results of each such activity."

It says that -

"The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited by an approved auditor appointed annually."

It also says:

"So soon as the accounts have been audited the Corporation shall send the statement of accounts referred to in subsection (1) of this Section to the Minister for transmission to the Governor in Executive Committee" and so on.

Mr. Chairman, Section 19 directs the Minister to lay the Report and the Accounts on the tables of both Houses of the Island. This is point No. 1. The accounts for 1965 were ready on the 21st July, 1966. It has taken a year and a half for them to come here. The accounts for 1966 were ready on the 1st June, 1967. It has taken six months and a lot of argument in here before we got those accounts at all.

Now the Act directs that these accounts be kept in a form to show the separate activities of the Corporations and that these different accounts be audited. I am making a definite and positive accusation that

these accounts that have been submitted to the House not only do not agree with themselves, but they are not in the form in which the auditors finally approved them.

Now, the first part. The accounts for 1965, just to give you an example, which is the Second Annual Report, states:

Sale of Air Time - Radio
Sale of Air time - Television
Total

Now in 1966 the figures for 1965 are given as a means of comparing them with the 1966 figures. The figures which appear as \$613,000 in 1965 has been reduced in the accounts laid in this House to \$422,149. In other words, there are two sets of accounts here purporting to deal with the year 1965, and these are the figures which are different between the two accounts which purport to deal with the same year. The combined Sale of Air Time; Sundry Receipts just amount to \$600; the expenditure in the Programme Department; the expenditure on sales, and the expenditure on administration - all those are different although the net loss remains the same.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is significant that the Balance Sheets are signed by Fitzpatrick Graham & Co., the Auditors, but the Profit and Loss Accounts are not. The reason for that is that these Profit and Loss Accounts have been extravagated from Fitzpatrick Graham's audited Report and presented to this House in order to present a fraudulent picture of the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. I am not accusing the Auditors. I believe that the Auditors have made out the Reports in the appropriate form and they have complied with Section 12 of the Act. I am not saying that the Accounting Department at C.B.C. has done it, because it is well known that the accounts were in the most fantastic mess in 1965 and the Auditors had to return over and over again to have the 1965 figures made up.
5.15 p.m.

I believe that if the figures which, perhaps, the Minister had in front of him now, were genuinely laid in this House, you would see that what appears as a gross in one year is given as a net in the next year without an explanation. You will see that the re-allocation of expenses which has been carried out without any explanation, has an explanation in the original Auditor's figures. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for anybody to be a lawyer to know that if a company secretary submitted this as a report of the figures, it would be naked fraud. Where, in conformity with the law, do you find such figures as would give us, as far as may be, the financial and operating results of each activity? Where is the provision of separate information as respects each of the main activities of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation? Instead, we have figures which cannot even agree with themselves; they cannot even agree with other figures laid on the Table of the House. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly something which is so serious that no House should be asked to vote on something like this, and

certainly I cannot vote for this Resolution. (Mr. St. JOHN: Stop right now and let the Minister give the true accounts.) Although hon. friends on this side are saying that I should stop right now and let the Minister give us the true accounts, unless the Minister is going to interrupt me now and say: "All right, we will adjourn the House and come back after the vacation," or something of that sort, I have to go on. I really have to say that political life here reminds me of political life in the eighteenth century in England. The Government is supported willy-nilly by obsequious votes, not always by voices, by obedient majorities just casting their votes, sometimes not even for Party interest, sometimes we really have to think for personal interest, because the forms of corruptions are everywhere observed by this Government.

I do not necessarily mean stealing; I mean corruption as it is existing in political life. You buy allegiance by the use of the taxpayers' money. Here, in this House, Mr. Chairman, we have seen examples of political allegiance being bought by the creation of Parliamentary Secretaryships. The Minister himself, in answer to a question, said quite frankly that you have to buy saucepan scrubbers in the School Meals Service.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that that is relevant to the Resolution before the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. Edward Gibbons said that corruption is the most infallible symptom of constitutional liberty. If that is so, the Opposition has a lot to answer for, because we fought so hard for constitutional liberty that, obviously we now have a Government which, since it cannot rule by tyranny, has to rule by corruption. It is not always the corruption of stealing; it is the corruption of incompetence, the corruption of wills and the corruption of ignorance sometimes, because nobody who is not steeped or imbued with the spirit of contempt for correct financial procedures, could lay these Papers before the House. They do not correspond with each other. Mr. Chairman, no doubt, the Hon. Leader of the House will investigate these matters; all he has to do, let me repeat, is to look at the figures for 1965 as they appear in the Second Annual Report and as they appear in the Third Annual Report and he will find that they do not correspond. I will return to this subject later; I will return to it when whoever is to be sent for is sent for.

As to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation itself, we have to take issue with the Minister on the question of the financing of public companies. The Minister reminded me, as he spoke there, of an occasion when he came in a private capacity to address the Acton Club at Harrison College on Kant. I do not mean cant hypocrisy. I mean Emmanuel Kant, the philosopher, because the Minister revealed that although he was profoundly ignorant of anything that Kant had ever written, yet he was familiar with some person or book who was familiar with Kant. In this case, I am impressed that the Minister is totally ignorant of company financing although, perhaps, he listened to the Prime Minister's speech last Tuesday

and has had put into his head some aspect of company financing with which he has attempted to justify the position of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation today. Companies are formed with a capital of \$100 and there are ways of operating capital by means of debentures - which are loans to a company - and there are ways of operating capital by overdrafts at the Bank. That is not the case, even although the Minister may have said so, and persons such as the junior member for St. Thomas who does not understand whether he is standing on his head or on his feet, may have believed him, but he could not even understand what he was saying, perhaps. He talks about people being authorities on every subject, but, at least, he can rest secure that he is an authority on nothing. It is not the case that when you start a public company with a share capital of \$100,000 that the shareholders are giving your capital away. That capital is to be represented by fixed assets and in a liquidation, in a properly run public company, the shareholders will share a proportion of the capital they own of the assets in liquidation. The Hon. Leader of the House is, I am sure, unconsciously and seriously misleading the House if he suggests that the C.B.C. should have started life on a basis of share capital, and it would not have been in this position today. If it has lost \$1 million, then it has lost \$1 million, no matter how it is financed. Shareholders in a company do not say: "All right, we are shareholders and not debenture holders and we do not mind if our money is lost." That is not the way that companies are carried on, and the Minister cannot get out of the very serious financial trouble in which the C.B.C. finds itself by saying that it had to start on a basis of loans. Many companies start on that basis.

This Resolution is to appropriate to the Estimates the sum of \$2.1 million and, incidentally, a greater sum of last year's Estimates than any Department spent. The nearest a Department came to spending that money last year was the Ministry of Communications and Works which spent \$2,022,000. We are seeking to appropriate, in other words, as the largest item of Capital expenditure, a loan to the C.B.C. and the return which the Government is seeking to get for that item is not a return such as the Government gets daily on the money which was spent to build the Airport or the Deep Water Harbour. The return which it was hoping to get is the expectation that the loan could be paid off - incidentally we have not heard word as to the rate of interest which the Corporation is going to pay the Government. We are getting a series of projections by the Minister as to the hopes C.B.C. has of repaying this loan in ten years. C.B.C. is obviously going to have to make an enormous amount of money between 1971 when it starts to make a proper profit, and 1978 when it hopes to pay off this loan, if it is going to pay off the \$2 million when its projected profits are in the region of \$200,000 for seven years. I think it is seriously misleading the House also to speak of paying off this loan. This is a straightforward appropriation of capital to sink the debts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. There will be no compulsion on the Corporation to pay off; there will only be a simple, straightforward contractual liability. What the Government is really

asking us to do is to attach to last year's Estimates a sum of more than twenty per cent of the total capital spent last year, more than was spent on schools, more than was spent on roads and twice as much as was spent on Seawell Airport. It is more than was spent on the Prime Minister's Office, and more than was spent on Home Affairs that we are being asked to give to C.B.C. on a speculation that in ten years they will be able to pay it off.
5.25 p.m.

It cannot be done and it is wicked of the Government to suggest that it can be done. That is Point one as to what this Resolution means.

We have been asked to say that in 1967-68 the most important single item of Government's expenditure is the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation - not housing, not schools - but the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The sum of \$2.1 million is to be appropriated to last year's Estimates of \$8 million.

Mr. Chairman, there is also a lot of danger in here of being misunderstood by reporters from outside. On the last occasion on which I had to talk about the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation in here was that when a reporter came in here, he falsely reported that we on this side of the House were opposing the Sugar Industry Bill. They falsely reported that on television and in passing I may mention that this was reported at all levels of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, but neither this House or any member of the Opposition has been graced with a letter from the Chairman, or any of the officials of C.B.C. apologising for this serious piece of misreporting. I heard the voice of an hon. member to say that it was not misreporting, but that it was misreported purposely. Knowing the reporter, I can believe it. He combines partiality with ignorance in a malaise that not even Mr. Vanterpool at the "Advocate" can match.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a financial matter. The Hon. Leader of the House is not the Minister of Finance; therefore I would not expect him to be able to understand.

(Aside by hon. junior member for St. Thomas.)

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I keep hearing other voices so loudly that I have to reprove my junior colleague sometimes. Now, Mr. Chairman, the only enemy which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has is his doctor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We are being asked - this is strictly finance now - to approve a loan of \$2,100,000 to reconstruct the financial structure of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The fixed assets of the Corporation as shown in the last Balance Sheet as at December, 1966, are \$940,313.65. In other

words, you are being asked to put \$2,000,000 into a company that has less than \$1,000,000 in assets. Now, if there is a Balance Sheet for this year in the hands of the Minister, I would be glad if he would tell me if the assets have increased greatly during the past year. My belief is that they have not; they appear to have gone down because depreciation has to be written off. On the basis that the assets of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation are less than \$1 million, I have to approach this matter of a loan of \$2 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if an ordinary bank is being asked to put money into a company, it would expect that this would be a company which has some holdings of some sort. If you are lending money to a company, you lend it on its prospects as shown by its record or its assets as shown by its Balance Sheet; but the assets of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation as shown by the Balance Sheet are less than \$1 million and its losses up to 1966 are more than \$1 million. If the projection turns out to be correct, it would be \$1 1/2 million in four years of operation. Its losses are more than the assets that it can command today, so it is not that its losses have accumulated in building up assets. How can any serious commercial basis be found for this loan?

I mentioned the losses. Now, as to the trading losses of the Corporation for 1963, I have not got them, but the trading losses in the three years which were reviewed by these accounts are \$1 1/2 million. Let us get this quite clear. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has lost at least \$1 1/2 million up to the end of 1966. Add on 1967 and it would be found to come to more than \$1 1/2 million.

Now, these are facts. I have little doubt that when all this debate appears in the Press, the acolytes and proselytes that parade with the Democratic Labour Party would find ways of distorting or concealing these facts. But it is a fact that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has lost \$1 1/2 million and no amount of sympathetic words can conceal it. So with assets of \$1 million and losses of more than \$1 1/2 million, they are asking for \$2 million in new finances.

Mr. Chairman, nobody for a moment, I am sure, would expect that to be considered a commercial proposition, and it is only a question of criticism to the effect that you could have done it this way or another. In my mind, we do not have many ways of criticising it. This Report makes it clear how much wastage there was in the early days. The Report which is laid before the House tells us that they have been reducing expenses in respect of a number of different items. All departments have shown a reduction in expenses except engineering, and I am just going to say something, Mr. Chairman.

I have not got a word to say against the engineering department of C.B.C. - not one word. The outside broadcasting work was mentioned by the hon. member although I do not regard the outside broadcast unit as being entirely above reproach - not by any means. What the Minister was saying about closed circuit

television, I do not want to press into these technicalities. I picked up these technicalities by hearing them as I was doing slightly different work in the days when I was connected with this kind of business. But if some system of closed circuit land lines can be laid in Barbados and not only those that join the studios with the transmitters at Sturges, we would have very much better work on television in Barbados because the Minister may not understand that when an outside broadcast unit, for example, to deal with something that is dear to us all, whether it deals with cricket at Lords or it deals with baseball at the Yankee Stadium, a broadcast going into a closed-circuit station comes over the coaxial cable or a land line to a proper transmission system and then goes out from that transmission station, which is an extension of the closed-circuit principle. That at least is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, and we would never really gather quality outside broadcast work in Barbados until I imagine a system of land lines can be in fact operated. But I do not know, Mr. Chairman, I am not a television engineer.

I believe, for example, at St. Lucy which is only fifteen or twenty miles away, you cannot get outside broadcast, or St. Lucy is not covered. I am told by people who should know that the outside broadcast unit was in fact of a sort not exactly built for Barbados because it cannot go too close to overhead electric lines because it gets interference from high tension cables. If you carry it anywhere to do a job, it has to be placed far from high tension cables. So I am told.

I would never myself have chosen the efficiency of outside broadcast unit here as a reason for lending C.B.C. \$2 million. I would never compare the outside broadcasting unit here; I would never have selected that as the principle item that made our television service better than Trinidad's. But there are other important matters of opinion and I would respect his opinion on important matters. Whether the outside broadcasting unit operates effectively or not is neither here nor there. The point is that we have it and it costs \$100,000. It may add to expenses every year \$20,000, but it is part of the equipment of a properly furnished television station. You are not running a hole-in-the-corner station, or we hope you are not running that. You have an outside broadcast unit; but that is only \$100,000 out of a large loss, and that unit is represented as an asset in the Balance Sheet. 5.35 p.m.

That is one of the \$1 million in assets which you can legitimately point to as justifying extra financing for C.B.C. That unit is there; it is not a pure loss. It is shown in the Balance Sheet as a capital asset; so do not let us forget that.

Mr. Chairman, whenever the Government comes to the House and asks for money to carry on any activity of Government, as is firmly established now in everybody's minds, we have a right to criticise any or all of the activities of the Department to which the vote relates or the purpose for which the vote is wanted, and C.B.C. as an operating unit, finance apart, must to some extent come under our lash. Now, first of all,

Mr. Chairman, C.B.C. radio, I believe, is run perhaps on a slightly less unprofitable basis than C.B.C. television, but the Minister should not be misled by his brief again. C.B.C. radio in quality is very small, compared to radio stations as radio stations go. All this talk about other stations in the United States where there is no originating material and is all disc jockey and so on - C.B.C. radio is exactly the same position. It is gramophone records, canned religious material that costs very little, it is B.B.C. programmes, programmes of the Caribbean Service - in my opinion, by far the best material to be found at C.B.C., and there are one or two a week, small discussion programmes which, when they are not carried on on a political basis, are carried on on a basis of really very slight competence. There is one good programme - this again is a matter of opinion - "Fifty Years Ago" which has a wide audience and which is the sort of programme that the planners of radio should be seeking to duplicate much more widely than they are at present duplicating. C.B.C. radio is a slight station, and that is reflected in the advertising figures and the listening figures, for let us not ignore the recent survey of listenership which revealed that although obviously a radio station is much more available to listeners than a wired system such as Rediffusion, yet C.B.C. is falling behind in the race with Rediffusion, and advertisers are going to recognise that.

I am willing to forgive C.B.C. radio a lot of its incompetence because I presume that the effort is being concentrated on C.B.C. television. Television stations are expensive things to run. It would not be fair to criticise C.B.C. television too extensively or to measure it against the standard of European and South American television systems, because naturally much of the material must be non-original; but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we live in an English speaking country. English is the language *par excellence* of availability of television material, and there is no other language which has anything comparable to the amount of television material available in the English language. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I am at all satisfied with what we get on television. The News Department makes an effort to cover news, but even there of course we cannot give unstinted praise because by the standards of acknowledged news media, the bulletins are sometimes a little disjointed, and I fear that in many instances we see the old political bias which ties the hands of the C.B.C. News Department as it ties so many hands in Barbadian life today.

I recall, Mr. Chairman - it may be false, perhaps, and the Minister can correct me - that when the Barbados Labour Party had a protest march from its headquarters to the precincts of this Honourable House, it was suggested that C.B.C. should not cover it. We know that. We know that the Minister said so, and the Minister is a boy who should know better. It is one of the penalties of youth sometimes to be too impulsive, but, Mr. Chairman, it will not be out of place for me to say that I have worked in a radio station that has had political pressure and that has resisted it, and that I myself have been in a position where I have been able and had been supported in being able

to say to political pressure: "Know your place." To me, Mr. Chairman, once fell the reporting of a first race riots in Britain in 1958. I can reveal now that there was outside pressure to modify the manner in which we made the reports of the race riots in Notting Hill, and I can also report that even in so small a department as the Caribbean Department of the B.B.C., we could not be dictated to by persons who for political or perhaps other reasons did not wish us to report exactly as we wished to report, and that nothing in our coverage was ever cut.

I was also at the B. B. C. during the Suez crisis when very serious efforts were made by Mr. Macmillan and by Sir Anthony Eden. I remember the day Mr. Lennox Boyd came to Bushe House to say that he objected to the tones of the Arabic broadcasts that were going out to the Egyptians while they were fighting British soldiers. I saw Mr. Lennox Boyd the very day that the noise was going on over the broadcast, and this was a matter of a war, not political survival, in which Great Britain was engaged, and Mr. Lennox Boyd's protests in nearly every instance were successfully resisted by people whom ultimately he could "fire" because the Foreign Office controls the vote of certain of the B.B.C. Overseas Services, and is in a position to cut off the vote, as it has done. The only instance I can remember where in fact I would have said there was political pressure was when I recall the Head of the B.B.C. Russian Service was removed from his position, but that, many people feel, was because he was going mad - a position in which I dare say the Minister of Communications will soon find himself if he goes on making those noises, because really, Mr. Chairman, I have forgotten whether it is Standing Order No. 29(6), but I think there is a Standing Order in this House that is directed to the behaviour of members who are not speaking.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, at the B.B.C. we went through all this. I could sit down and hear from people who during the War were under pressure to falsify the news to occupied Europe and would not do it because they said the B.B.C. has to be believed and it has to be respected, and if you broadcast false news and it is proved false, people will not take you on any more than they take on the Deutscher Rundfunk and the other German Stations. So I have experience of what it means to be in a radio station in the relation of C.B.C. to the Government. I have experience to know what kind of political pressure there can be. 5.45 p.m.

We know of this. These are not the only Ministers, Mr. Chairman, who are afraid of what will go over the air about them. These are not the only Ministers who want to exercise political pressure about things. I remember that Mr. Macmillan did not like an interview with Robin Day; he did not like being asked questions the way Robin Day asked them, and he was forced to answer them at London Airport because the television cameras were on him. He rang and made a noise and said that he would never be interviewed by Robin Day again. At the next election Mr. Macmillan was in the Opposition, and Mr. Robin Day who had been a Liberal

candidate was still in the B.B.C. All of these things happen. These are not unique to Barbados, and I am urging that the Minister set an example. He is a young man and he can think about these things. He must set an example, because in the long run everybody will benefit.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to deal with political broadcasts. There was a system of political broadcast evolved when the members on this side of the House were fewer in number. Immediately we became more in number, the question of political broadcasts stopped. How can we understand that, other than now that more of us are here to talk, nobody is going to talk at all? At the British Broadcasting Corporation when the parties began to get trouble with political broadcasts, they put it into the hands of the B.B.C. in consultation with the Whips of the Parties to decide who would get Air Time and how it would be divided. That was what was done, because the political parties knew that some day, if it was left in their hands, they would have been unable to resist the temptation of terrorizing with their majority and this could only result in tits for tats.

The Minister Senator Sandiford, undoubtedly gets more publicity in the Press and C.B.C. than any other Minister except the Prime Minister. This may well be the Prime Minister's wish, but in the long run, Mr. Chairman, is it a good thing? When we are in power we can do it, too, and that would not be a good thing either. That would not be a desirable course of action for any political party to have to be forced to take.

Mr. Chairman, C.B.C., leaving out the political aspect, has some good programmes. I do not think that the work of Miss Gale and Mrs. Bernard could be bettered anywhere in the world. She could get a job anywhere in the world doing that kind of programme. Mr. Gerry Richards, although I have heard him reading the Italian football scores and helping us with some pronunciations that would have defied any phonetic dictionary to discover, as far as we can judge, does the Sports Programmes in a sensible way. The News Department evidently does its best; if it could resist the pressure of reporting our march, it could resist most things. I believe that there is a collection of people at C.B.C. who genuinely do their best.

There are persons at C.B.C. - I could mention other names, Mr. Chairman. There are two young gentlemen in the News Department who genuinely appear to be making the effort to give everything they can to a television service. This is not a matter of politics, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe that the people whose names I have called are supporters of the Government, or supporters of the Opposition. I am not interested in that. I know that there are supporters of both Parties up there. In any walk of Barbadian life there are supporters of both Parties, but if I think that Mr. Richards or whoever is a broadcaster is doing well and is making an effort to get on with his work, I am going to say so. I do not care what Party this or another member of the C.B.C.'s staff supports.

The Announcers, Mr. Chairman - well I really put down some of the faults that we are supposed to find with the announcing sometimes to the fact that training facilities are not as available in Barbados as in other countries. The Announcers are underpaid by the standards of T.V. Announcers anywhere. Pronunciations go astray. The B.B.C. has a Pronunciation Unit where no strange word can have a pronunciation set against it unless by somebody's authority for that particular pronunciation. If an Announcer mispronounces a proper name, he would be called before the Duty Operational Assistants at the end of the Bulletin and asked why he did not find out how to pronounce it properly before he went on the air, and should he two or three times in the course of a week mispronounce proper names, he would be back turning knobs as a Studio Manager. I am telling you that as a fact. Nobody can mispronounce even a foreign name at the B.B.C.

I will never forget once, when I was covering the London end of the cricket from India, when the West Indies were touring India, seeing how an Announcer had annotated the Bulletin of proper names. For instance, a name like Bynoe, which no Barbadian would think twice of pronouncing - that Announcer had gone to the trouble of telephoning our department, asking how it was done, and writing it out phonetically next to the name.

On another occasion I remember Mr. Victor Sylvester's Secretary ringing me and asking me how to pronounce Gall Hill, St. John. Was it "Gal Hill"? I do not know if Mr. Victor Sylvester got it right when he did the request, but at least he had the means of knowing how it is pronounced. All of these things are matters of training and matters of procedure, and I would not expect the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to have an operating system of pronouncing proper names and other pronunciations on the same level as the B. B. C. It is mere illiteracy for Trevor Simpson to be pronouncing beleaguered, as "be-la - greed." He did that week before last, but other examples of illiteracy have come from that particular Announcer before now. I would not expect C. B. C. to be perfect with all of that. C. B. C. undoubtedly does its best, but it has not always had its best done for it by its Directors.

Now, if there is one thing I believe, Mr. Chairman, it is that you should try to give a Board of Directors to a Corporation like this that really know something about its business. I am forced, Mr. Chairman, although I am friendly with numbers of these people - I am forced to take the Board of Directors and have a look at them. The Board of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation the people that we have to lend the \$2 million to -

Dr. Keith D. Hunte, Chairman. His qualification for the job is that he chairs D. L. P. meetings; so they think he can chair C. B. C. as well. Mr. Clifton White, Deputy Chairman. The most that can be said about him, as far as I am concerned, is that he is an accountant. If it is suggested that his qualification for being on the Board is because he is an accountant, then he should hide his head in shame.

Mr. Ellison Carmichael is a nice, decent man; he is a close colleague in one or two respects, because we both work for a particular set of clients. But what, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Carmichael's qualification for the Board of Directors of the C. B. C.? How many generalised members are you going to have on the Board? His chief qualification is that he is no longer the senior member for St. James and he is not Senator Carmichael - neither he nor his brother. The Chief reason why he is on the Board is that there is no Senator Carmichael, and there is no Carmichael as senior member for St. James.

Mr. John Fletcher is a very accomplished musician, and I would not quarrel with Mr. Fletcher's position.
5.55 p.m.

Mrs. Cyralene Gale; apparently she is the only journalist on the Board and I believe that there should be a place for a journalist. Many people would be prepared to say that one of the reasons why she is there is because there is no more Senator Gale. Many persons would be prepared to say that this is a sop for losing her position in the Senate. Nevertheless, Mrs. Gale is a journalist and I am not going to quarrel with her; as far as the Public Relations aspects of C. B. C. are concerned, Mrs. Gale can fill them very well. She is a person of good presence pleasant manner and no doubt, a good advertisement for the Board of C. B. C.

Mr. I. C. M. St. Hill is the Librarian, an obviously essential appointment. Dr. N. L. Hope; Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Minister does not think that because Dr. "Bunny" Hope has Hi-fi sets that he can advise C. B. C. what to buy, I very much doubt that, Dr. Hope is a first-class dentist but his best services in respect of radio engineering, in my respectful opinion, are to point to setting up D. L. P. equipment in Independence Square. He does that well. He and the Fire Service together, and "Coloured" in the intervals between the massaging of "Who Say", have given us some valuable hints as to how to keep our Party equipment. He came to a meeting which we had at the Garden Land and gave us some good advice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to know if that is really relevant to C. B. C.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a possibility that some day this gentleman "Coloured" may be appointed to the Board as well. I am not indicating that the Opposition would regard that as a retrograde step. I am not saying a word against the gentleman. I have always found him to be polite, very pleasant and an extremely straightforward person to deal with, and I wish that we, in our political Party, could command his allegiance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see anything about "Coloured" anywhere at all in this Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mrs. Angela Zephirin; what are her qualifications? Is she an authority on the Catholic Church and its doctrines (Asides).

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am not going to sit here and allow the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to leave his seat and come up here and make us miserable. Speak to him or do something with him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been fully made.

Mr. SMITH: Try and teach him some sort of manners.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I really think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was on a bad wicket when he talked about manners. You must have the equipment with which to learn manners. I recall somebody saying that if the junior member for St. Thomas had been born in Chatsworth and had grown up to be the Duke of Devonshire, he would still be an uncouth lout. (ASIDES). I am quoting, Mr. Chairman; I am not calling him an uncouth lout.

Mr. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Board of the C. B. C. is undoubtedly a straightforward organization for satisfying the dispossessed of the D. L. P. It is not a Board in which, as a whole, you can have any confidence. The Permanent Secretary, Mr. St. Hill, Mr. Fletcher, Mrs. Gale - all may represent something; they may represent music, journalism and if Mr. White represents accountancy, although we could never have much confidence in him, if it is an example - a Librarian, journalism and music, there are legitimate interests and the Government is entitled to choose its own supporters if it wishes to enjoy all of these interests. I am not against that; but not the rest of this Board to administer a Corporation which is spending more money than any other single Department of Government on the Capital account! When Mr. Carmichael was rejected by the electors of St. James and by his own Party for a seat in the Senate, he had to be shuttled off to the C. B. C. That is not good enough and they have not always chosen the best material to operate it. Mr. Chairman, we have to think of the period under review.

Mr. Dennis Vance, I know Mr. Vance was a talented T. V. Producer in a field where neurosis was one of the principal requirements of talent. Mr. Vance stabbed a woman in a T. V. set and went to prison for nine months, and was in such bad odour that he could not get a job in TV in London; so we gave him a job out here at \$2,000 a month. That is part of the haste of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. He was so neurotic that he could not even stand up to his operation, and he picked up a knife and drove it into a woman. Suppose the Barbados Labour Party had ever put anybody with a prison record of that sort in connection with the very work which he was doing! Just think of what would be said of us! Think of what the hon. junior member for St. Thomas - think of how, when he goes to Sturges and tells the people how Grantley Adams defended a man for shooting a boy, what would he do now if, we had put somebody in a job, who was in a previous job of that sort, and stabbed a woman and had gone to prison for it in England? What would be said? I will tell you something else. I expect not only the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but many per-

sons might say that this could be justified. People may have wanted to spare Mrs Vance's feelings when they were here because Mr. Vance showed people signs of the same neurosis when he was in the job - signs of being a neurotic man, but perhaps governed by something going around in his head, not amounting to ordinary commonsense and intelligence. We may have wanted to spare Mrs. Vance's feelings; but not \$2,000 a month!

Mr. Chairman, that is why we are losing money. Now, Sir, we come to the very fundamental structure of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. We, on this side of the House, believe very strongly that one of the principal reasons why the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is losing money is because it was set up on an unsound basis. We may have to be calm in our approach to this, but Thomson put one over on the Government. There is nothing more or less to be said about that. The Government was deceived into believing that the services of a Management Consultant would be of advantage, and that these services were worth fifteen per cent of the gross advertising revenue for the first five years and reducing percentages hereafter. Mr. Chairman, fifteen percent of the gross advertising revenue of the C. B. C., is a lot of money for this Station newly starting.

6.05 p.m.

I cannot say what the exact figures are. I believe that the accounts of 1966 have been fiddled through so as to exclude the realization of how much money Thomson is actually drawing. I believe the figures showed the gross and net figures and that which has been presented to the House has fraudulently omitted what Thomson is getting. I challenge the Minister to deny that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must emphatically deny this because I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What a sweet reply! I really appreciate it. The hon. junior member cannot deny it; he can only say that he does not know. Well, we know.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, no I said that I must deny it because I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I must ask the Hon. Minister not to retreat. Let us look at the figures. Use your commonsense. The true figures shown for 1966 are these. Where he has shown us \$529,000, it should be \$738,000 and the difference is what Thomson got. We are saying to the Hon. Minister to work that out. He said that he has to deny that because he has no knowledge of it. Look and see if that figure should not be \$738,000.

Mr. Chairman, according to my calculations - it may be wrong - the Minister should agree that Thomson got \$110,000 in 1966; \$90,000 in 1965; \$40,000 in 1964. Those are the figures. They may be a little hay-wire. I would like to see what they were last year, but they must be more than \$100,000. However for doing what, Mr. Chairman? For doing absolutely

nothing; for pulling the wool over the eyes of the Government. What is there in that television station that owes anything to Thomson? C.B.C. paid Mr. Vance's salary; C.B.C. pays Mr. Shaw's salary. He is a very competent engineer. C.B.C. pays the salary of the men up there - not Thomson.

Thomson gets money from the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation in three ways. There is an agency called the Thomson International Agency of which Colonel Sterling, a war time hero - and Britain must support its war-time heroes - operated long range desert work behind Rommel's lines during the war; so he must be given a job; he cannot be allowed to starve; the Colonel's pension is not enough for him. So this Colonel Sterling who was actually a member of the Board of C.B.C. at one time is interested in the Thomson International Agency which does advertising and promotion. That draws money from C.B.C. I believe it draws certain commissions on advertising which it places.

Thomson Television International supplies the T.V. programmes. This can be checked. Even B.B.C. programmes get them from Thomson Television International and they have to pay for them. I would really suggest to the Minister to try writing to Bushe House. There used to be a unit there with a studio which used to process these programmes for overseas use. I would suggest to the Minister to try writing and see if he cannot get programmes a little cheaper.

Thomson also gets a gross percentage off the advertising revenue, so that if the Government is losing as it has been, Thomson is winning. Thomson cannot lose; Thomson gets money everywhere, whether the Government gets money or not.

Let us look again at the losses; in 1964, \$172,000 in 1965, \$540,000; in 1966, \$411,000; in 1967, \$336,000. That is what C.B.C. has been losing. As against that what Thomson has been getting is \$40,000, \$90,000, \$110,000, and some figures over \$100,000, which I believe the Minister can give us, but he is not going to do so. What does Thomson do for all this money? He supplies somebody called Higgs, or he is paid by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. Apparently Williams and Cordeau are the only two persons supplied by Thomson. They came down here for a few weeks to do something.

Mr. Chairman, do not let us fool ourselves. If you can make money in television in Britain or New York, you are not going to come to Barbados. I remember the "Elite Standard" running a series once on all the performers on Television who were making more money than the Director General of the B.B.C. The series ran for weeks. I myself and my little pittance - I cannot even remember what I used to get, probably around \$700 a month, would be employing people who would be getting two and three hundred a month. Therefore, do not believe that the people who are coming down here as actors, producers, and so on, are men of the top water and top calibre. There are people like Mr. Vance who could have commanded

a salary. There are people like Higgs, a broken down actor who exists by dropping around from this television system to that television system.

I still remember the time when I was at the B.B.C. There was a job going in Tanganyika as Personal Assistant to the Director General or something like that. Nobody would apply and they asked two of us to go and apply. We applied and we discussed the job and when we realised the conditions, we said that the conditions were just not good enough. Nobody is going to Tanganyika to work for \$800 a month under these circumstances. I remember the Hong Kong radio advertising a job at over £3,000 a year and they said that it was for Heads of the B.B.C. services, Heads of the Arabic services. They could not get one to reply, even though their salaries were over £2,100 or £2,200 per year depending on their experience. You must not believe that working in radio and television in a small place like Barbados offers any attraction to persons of quality. It cannot be; so you must look with suspicion on anybody who comes down here from London or New York. Remember the first Manager, Watson of C.B.C., left after a few weeks or a few months, or whatever the question was despite his salary because N.B.C. could not agree to the racketeering that was going on in connection with the purchase of certain equipment.

Now, Sir, we are getting back to Thomson. What has Thomson done? He has supplied the trainees for a week or two. Tuition in England is free. C.B.C. had to pay for its staff to go to England, and they would be taken around the Thomson studios. I do not know what is done, Mr. Chairman. I think that Mr. Rudder got a B.B.C. course. The B.B.C. does not have any shares in Thomson, but they still give courses to Announcers who want to be trained. Thomson is drawing money because of a gigantic confidence trick which he was able to pull on the Leader of the House and on the Prime Minister because Senator Sandiford was not in this.

Rediffusion would have done the job for nothing and Rediffusion, compared with Thomson, has a station of major importance in the television world with an important London franchise. Important programmes are originated and have a substantial part of the English speaking audience in London.
6.15 p.m.

I hold no brief for Rediffusion either. They can be as politically cowardly as anybody, and in the days when the hon. senior member for Bridgetown's Party was perhaps on better terms with the Government, Rediffusion could be every bit as prostituted against the Barbados Labour Party as other organs of information then were and still are. So I hold no brief for Rediffusion as such. I am not in here as any spokesman for Rediffusion, but Rediffusion at least offered to do the job for nothing, and their offer must be respected. It would not be costing us this money. Do you know how there is going to be an improvement in the trading position of C.B.C. at the end of this year? It will be because Thomson's percentage is going to be reduced. That is immediately going to give

an improvement. In another five years it will be reduced again, or whatever the years may be, and there will be another downward leap in C.B.C.'s expenses depending on how the accounts are drawn, because it is excluded from these accounts, and no matter what foolishness the Minister may say, you cannot tell anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, I could never vote for this Resolution while this racketeering with Thomson is going on. I do not go so far as some who said that Thomson actually assisted in financing the D.L.P. during the last election. I have no evidence of that.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the fact that the people who were receiving money from C.B.C. are giving it to the Democratic Labour Party has nothing to do with this Resolution, I am sorry. I will follow your rulings at all times, but I do not think the implications could have been seen by you. If the people who are receiving money ultimately out of the taxpayers' pocket, as part of the consideration for that money are financing the election campaign of your own Party - I would not suggest you got any - that must be a matter for discussion. But Mr. Chairman, not while Thomson is drawing one cent can they get my vote. Where has the figure of \$2 million come from in any event?

Before I sit, I said I would return to the accounts. I do not want to steal the thunder of hon. members all of whom seem to be armed with this information, but let us look through here. Sale of Air Time in 1966 account not divided, bad accounting procedure not in conformity with the Statute. Licence Fees; Sundry Receipts - \$1,080. I would like to know why they took out the figure of \$640 for 1965. Where did the Sundry Receipts for 1965 go? The Second Annual Report shows \$640; the Third Annual Report shows nothing. If the Minister can answer, let him get up and answer. Where did the balance between \$422,149 and \$613,000 go to? Let us get a little further down. Programmes - \$342,189. Where is the division? Where is Schedule 4 or 5 of the Reports which were actually certified by Fitzpatrick Graham to show hon. members how this money was spent? Fitzpatrick Graham submitted his Schedules and the Government is concealing them from the House fraudulently. Engineering - \$142,021. We believe that Department is properly accounted for. We have no complaints with engineering. How come Sales in the Third Annual Report can be shown as \$30,000 for 1965 when they were shown as \$100,000 in the Second Annual Report? Where are the \$70,000? I think it is more than that. Let me get these figures precisely. The Minister knows enough to get up and say he denies that; he has no knowledge of that. What he must tell the House is that he has no knowledge of accounting. In 1965 in the Sales Department \$126,000 were shown in the Second Annual Report, but \$30,000 were shown for the same year in the same Annual Report. Who has the \$96,000? Is that Thomson or who? The Minister is going to get up and say it is not true that what has been taken out is the

Thomson amount. They want to hide from us that somebody has this \$96,000. Administration - \$309,000. There is no breakdown of that. Where is the interest on the Bank? I have not even worried with this. You have a figure in the Balance Sheet of \$1.1 million; where is the interest? Do you mean it is borrowed interest free? Does the Minister know that if he were a Company's Secretary he would be standing in the dock on a criminal charge if he showed a loan and then provided accounts which did not show the interest? (Mr. MOTTLEY: Lord Kysant!)

I heard the name of Lord Kysant mentioned. Lord Kysant was a man who had been here working. He used to work at Gardiner Austin prior to the War as a Shipping agent, and he went to England eventually prosperous. He made money out of the War, bought a peerage and in 1931 he did something very similar in concealing from his shareholders the true position of the Royal Mail, and he had to get somebody to ring up his wife from the Old Bailey and tell her: "Don't keep dinner for me tonight, darling; I won't be home for the next seven years." That was Lord Kysant, Millionaire, Royal mail agent, and he went to prison for seven years for falsifying Balance Sheets. That is what can happen when you are like the Minister and get up and deny when certain figures are not there. No interest is shown on the Profit and Loss Account.

Mr. Chairman, I just ask hon. members as one final mark to look at the account and see if they see Fitzpatrick Graham's signature at the bottom of the Profit and Loss Account. That is all the commenting that is needed on these accounts. It is a wicked piece of fraud on the part of the Government, and when I think of how they used to talk about members in the last Government being corrupt and we have something like this naked open fraud, and begging for \$2 million to cover it up, the only thing, Mr. Chairman, is that unfortunately we can only tell the Minister what would happen if he were a Company's Secretary. It could not in fact happen, because of the particular position of C.B.C. That is the only thing we are sorry for.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this debate arising out of this Resolution allows us on this occasion to reflect upon the standard of public morality, honesty and probity of the Government, and what we as individuals are going to be prepared to tolerate in this country, what we as members of the Assembly are going to be prepared to set as standards to the younger generation of people in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation Act in section 19 says that the Minister shall cause a copy of the Report with the annual Statement of Accounts and the Auditor's Report thereon to be laid on the Table of both Houses of the Legislature. Mr. Chairman, I want to know categorically from the Minister whether he is saying that these documents - and I have the originals of the documents that were given to the Clerk of this House by the Minister himself and which came out of the Minister's bag - which were given to the Clerk are a copy of the Auditor's Report on the Corporation's Accounts as transmitted to the Ministry. I want the Minister to stop me now and answer that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is what I am saying, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. St. JOHN: We have it clear now that Fitzpatrick Graham as professional auditors have sent to the Government fraudulent accounts, and if the Directors of Fitzpatrick Graham do not answer these charges tomorrow, I am charging them now with professional incompetence, professional negligence and condoning fraud and presenting false accounts to the Government.

6.25 p.m.

If what the Minister on the floor of this House says is true that the accounts circulated to members are a true copy of the accounts as audited by and sent to the Ministry of Education by Fitzpatrick Graham, then I charge Fitzpatrick Graham with (1) Professional incompetence; (2) Professional negligence; (3) Condoning fraud; and (4) I suggest to the Government that Fitzpatrick Graham should be fired from auditing any public bodies at all.

It is a serious thing. Journalists write in all the Journals of this country that the Opposition is not doing its duty about supervising public expenditure. I am going to answer them here and now on the floor of this House, and let them have the decency when they are dealing with the accounts of public bodies to publish this tomorrow. The Public Accounts Committee of this country cannot meet on these accounts here, because the Government has a majority of 4 of the 7 members. I got my "dope" today.

The members of the Public Accounts Committee are:

The junior member for St. Joseph (DLP) (1)

The junior member for St. James (BLP)

You, Mr. Chairman, the junior member for St. John (DLP) (2)

The junior member for St. Philip, the Deputy Speaker (DLP) (3)

The senior member for St. George (DLP) (4)

The senior member for St. Michael (not in his place), and the other member is the senior member for the City.

Now, Sir, Rule 54 says:

"There shall be a Select Committee to be designated the Committee of Public Accounts for the examination of accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the Committee may think fit, to consist of not more than seven Members, who shall be nominated at the commencement of every Session, and of whom four shall be a quorum. The Committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time."

I checked with the Clerk today. Three attempts were made to summon a Public Accounts Committee by the Speaker, because the Public Accounts Committee has no Chairman. Any journalist who writes and says that the Leader of the Opposition is the Chairman is an ignoramus and a dishonest journalist. There is no Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in Barbados. Three attempts were made to summon that meeting and on each occasion no member of the Democratic Labour Party turned up.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take that to be an inaccurate statement made by the hon. member.

Mr. LOWE: On a point of order. I categorically deny any statement in which he has made relative to the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. Sir Grantley Adams.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon.....

Mr. LOWE: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has called a meeting. (Mr. St. JOHN: He cannot call a meeting.) He called a meeting. Mr. Chairman, I was present; the Leader of the Opposition was present, and it was from this meeting that we knew the Leader of the Opposition was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. It was his intention that he would.....

Mr. St. JOHN: That is not a point of order. It is a speech in reply to my speech.

Mr. LOWE: All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, it is as simple as this: the Speaker of this Chamber called a meeting, and from that meeting the Leader of the Opposition was made Chairman and he made it known there and then that he would call a meeting at some future date and the meeting was adjourned.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, you gave some indulgence to the hon. member to talk nonsense on the floor of the House. If I am wrong, I checked with the Clerk two minutes before I spoke in the presence of the Speaker of this Chamber, and the Clerk informed me that no meeting has ever had a quorum for the Public Accounts Committee and that no Chairman has been appointed. The Clerk of this Chamber, who is a paid servant of this Chamber, informed me of that two minutes before I spoke. Do not come to me with that nonsense. Let us get this matter cleared up now. I challenge the hon. member who has just spoken to bring any record on the floor of this House and prove that this is so; then the Clerk would be fired in here tonight. The Clerk will be fired in here for incompetence and for lying to me today. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Can you fire him?) If what he says is true the Clerk would be fired. Can anybody sit in here and tolerate that an hon. member on an important subject like this checks with the Chief Officer of the House and is going to be misled? Nonsense! I checked with the Clerk two minutes ago, and the Clerk informed me that the Public Accounts Committee has no Chairman, because there has never been a quorum. I checked with the Speaker.

I will not let you get away with this. This is the propaganda that the Democratic Labour Party and members on the other side have been publishing. It is a lie to say that the Public Accounts Committee - the trouble is that people like the hon. member cannot even understand the Rules. At first he said that the Leader of the Opposition summoned the meeting. What absolute ignorance and nonsense! Do you call that fit to represent people? I heard you, too, Mr. Chairman, say it is not so. Are you saying that the Public Accounts Committee has a Chairman? Nonsense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I were to correct the hon. member, I said it was not so when the hon. member said that not one hon. member turned up at a meeting when it was being called.

Mr. St. JOHN: If there is no quorum there is no meeting; so how are you going to have a meeting?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I corrected the hon. member on. Only two Saturdays ago I attended a meeting and only the member was there.

Mr. St. JOHN: Two Saturdays ago I came to a meeting in an attempt to get it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. The hon. member has just said that he came to a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. I was not aware that he was a member of the Public Accounts Committee! I refer to the Senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. St. JOHN: This is the specious attitude, because this is exactly the trap that we put you in. When the Leader of the Opposition was going away, we informed the Speaker that I would act for the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I really regret crossing the hon. member. The hon. member is generating really more heat than light. The Leader of the Opposition cannot make the hon. member a member of the Public Accounts Committee. The House has elected the Public Accounts Committee, as it does any other Committees. If he cannot serve, he must say so, and then the House will declare its pleasure in respect of the hon. member or any other member. If the hon. member thinks that there is delegated authority in this respect, it cannot be done. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House is making a point of order.

Mr. St. JOHN: That is no point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, it is a point of order. I am finishing the sentence I was making. The hon. member cannot be a member of the Public Accounts Committee unless the House makes him a member; so if he attended a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee he was improperly there.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am not saying that I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee. I am not saying that. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are so many noises around this Table that I can hardly hear the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am speaking on this tonight and getting it threshed out, because there are a lot of letters in circulation about this matter. I took the trouble to check with the Clerk. I took the trouble to get the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to write to the Speaker asking him to summon a meeting. I took the trouble to come over here and I watched myself, and none of the Democratic Labour Party members, with the possible exception of yourself, Mr. Chairman, was present because I believe that when I came here you were somewhere around. I checked today with the Clerk of the House and he informed me, a member of this House, to whom it is his duty to speak the truth - he informed me that there was no meeting because there was no quorum. Let us get this straight now. The quorum is in the hands of the Democratic Labour Party; they have never appointed the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as Chairman of this Committee, and the dishonesty in this is that, unlike any other Committee on the Order Paper of this House - you will see every Committee on it; but if you check your Order Paper, you will see that there is absolutely nothing about the Public Accounts Committee on it. I am nailing them tonight on this, because it is a lie and I say it is a lie; and if the Hon. Mr. Lowe, I beg your pardon, the hon. senior member for St. George, can state the date and the time when the meeting was attended, I will sit down now and stand corrected. But he cannot, so that in the belief that Parliament does not have any opportunity to scrutinize the Government including the Ministry of Education - the Ministry of Education is one of the Ministries which have failed during the regime of the present Leader of the House when he was responsible for the destinies and the financial control of that Ministry, they never accounted to the Auditor General; so that it is nothing if one of their Departments, the C.B.C. fraud and crookedness go on up there because that Department has never reported to the.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member would probably be the most effective and the most competent debater in this House if he would generate more light and less heat. There is nothing to be shouting and screaming about. It is true that I was the Minister of Education and it is true that the Ministry and the Department under it had been defaulting in submitting their accounts. This, I do not deny. I do not like it and I must accept the responsibility for it insofar as I was there then, but this would not be an indictment against me in respect of what we are now discussing about C.B.C.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, some people do not understand Parliamentary Government because I think it is wrong for me to get up in here and criticise an individual Civil Servant. The blame must go on the Ministerial Head, the Parliamentary person who is Parliamentarily responsible for it, and that is where I am laying the blame tonight. I could mention the Auditors because they have to be approved by the Minister. Fitzpatrick Graham is a dishonest Auditor if he reports what the Minister says is correct. What do

we find? We find accounts presented before this House not showing a true statement of the expenditure of C.B.C., because if it showed a true statement of the expenditure of C.B.C., because if it showed a true statement, it would show how much money Thomson got of their share of the revenue. But they are afraid to concede that. The only person who has made money out of C.B.C. is Thomson. We cannot vote for this at all; we are not voting for this because, by now, the Government should be convinced in their minds that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation indulges in expenditure, on the advice of some people, far in excess of what is necessary. I said so when I was in the Other Place and the so-called Accountant was there. I will never forget him. He was a member of the Other Place, not now, because the Government found him out, in truth and in fact, and fired him off the Board. They fired him out of the Senate - I mean the so-called member, Clifton White. He had a big, long statement in advance and by that time he and Vance were together and he was the boss; but now he is on the Board, but I always say that there is a God in Heaven and the truth must come out. He was concealing them, and everybody was trying to conceal the true state of affairs at the C.B.C. - even the Ministry, because the reports were sent to the Ministry ever since but they did not want the public to know, so that they could keep them until the last moment. Even up to the last meeting, the accounts were not circulated to members and why do you conceal these things? It is because you know within your own heart and conscience that there is something wrong. Something is wrong; and if you look at the accounts, hon. members have pointed out the matters, and there is one thing, as a matter of policy, that the Government can do. It is obvious that the advertising revenue that you have in Barbados is not sufficient to support the large number of media that want to attract it. You cannot have Rediffusion, C.B.C. C.B.C. - television and C.B.C. - radio all fighting to compete for this advertising.

I am submitting that the proper thing for the Government to do is to form a Consortium. The Government should consider this as a matter of policy, and offer shares to the existing organisations, and the Government should get back some of the capital that they have put down the drain and still retain a shareholding interest. That is the only thing to do now. You are going to have two sets of engineering staff in existence, one at C.B.C. and one at Rediffusion. You have two sets of accounting systems set up to recover basically the same type of operation doing the same type of thing. What kind of nonsense is that? It would be economically sensible in relation to the total advertising revenue in Barbados, and why should you have Thomson as your Consultant? Thomson has been sending broken-down actors like Haynes; anybody who looked at Brian Haynes when he was here could see that he was a broken-down, cast-off actor. They say that the only people who have a better trade union in the world than the actors are the lawyers, because they are always looking out for one another; but the time comes when you have got to face realities. I ask the Minister what are the services that Thomson gave last year? None. How many engineers from the staff

of C.B.C. went on training? I do not see any in the Report; and when we talk about the use of C.B.C., I know, as a fact, that the Minister of Education tried to put pressure (A MEMBER: This one?) The present Minister of Education, the gentleman who has replaced the present Leader of the House. He tried to put pressure to stop them from putting on broadcasts. 6.45 p.m.

Well, they are so stupid that one thing they tried to suppress was the Barbados Labour Party, a genuine political Party that is interested in maintaining democracy and they get Tom, Dick and Harry, with all their beards on the radio, all the time projecting them; people who say that Parliament is irrelevant to the masses. That is the kind of nonsense projected. Those are people whom they have down there.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I must defend the Minister of Education on this. It would be improper to suggest that the Minister is responsible for the projects on T.V. or whether it is Mr. Calvin Alleyne or any of those people who wish to destroy Parliament. That is certainly not true.

Mr. St. JOHN: Look at this. I say that the Minister tried to put pressure with respect to the march from the Barbados Labour Party Headquarters. I notice the Hon. Minister did not defend him on that. Are you saying that that is not true?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No. I am saying that I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. St. JOHN: I notice that the Hon. Minister is very clever. He is not going to say on the floor of this House that it is not true. Quite well, I do not mind whether he knows or not, I make the charge and it is true. What is more. Everybody can see that somebody is wrong at C.B.C. Here you have a Permanent Secretary and he asked to be relieved of it. Anybody with an iota of sense would see, Mr. Chairman, that the terms under which the gentleman worked were, obviously, most unsatisfactory to him and so he asked to be removed.

But what we are concerned with here today is if we can find ways and means - and I throw this out to the hon. member to discuss with his colleague - for C.B.C. to improve. C.B.C. depends on its revenue from advertising. So does Rediffusion; so does Thomson; so does the "Advocate" so does the "Daily News". All over the world today there is great pressure on those bodies that depend on advertising as their revenue. You have mergers; you have large organisations. In Barbados, there is a lot of media which has to compete; so see if you can get a proper Consortium going, with Government maintaining its share but not carrying the burden of all the capital that is necessary, like the Hilton Hotel.

Can anybody in this country seriously sit down and see the magnitude of the financial stupidity pursued by this Government? The sum of \$10 million on the Hilton Hotel, \$2 million on this; that is \$12 million of capital expenditure; God knows how much more on

the Marketing Corporation and the Milk Plant. Think of these things! The major pieces of capital expenditure done by the Government in this country have all resulted in a loss.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Milk Plant made a gross profit last year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I advise hon. members that the Milk Plant is not being discussed in this Resolution. I would ask the hon. senior member for Christ Church to confine his observations according to 26(2) to the Resolution under discussion.

Mr. St. JOHN: I am accustomed to relevancy, and if you as Chairman cannot see that this Resolution has financial implications and one must judge it in its totality, in relation to the total capital expenditure of this country, God help Barbados if this is what we are going to get. People who cannot see relevance of \$2 million capital in the Resolution to capital expenditure of a country are saying that it is irrelevant to say that when one uses that and adds it to the other items of capital expenditure and all of them have a common feature, that they all result in a loss.

Of course, the Hon. Minister knows that to have a gross operating profit and a net profit are two different things. Eight per cent interest on \$2 million is \$160,000 a year. (A VOICE: Go higher than that.) The banks will lend the Government at 8 per cent. If one adds that to the operational loss, it means that the loss somehow or the other has got to be subsidised; so it is going to be well over \$500,000. Already you have \$400,000 from the Hilton Hotel. What then does that mean? It means \$1 million in losses through loans.

This is a serious thing. We on this side do not mind what the newspapers say as regards that we are not performing our duty, we are not going to vote for this Resolution as a mark of protest against the incompetent accounting and the dishonest presentation of statements by Fitzpatrick Graham, if what the Minister says is true. If the Minister is telling this House a lie, we categorically charge and accuse this Government of fraud, corruption of any order that you can think of, corruption of any order of any magnitude.

The Minister says that these statements are a true copy of the Report and Statement by Fitzpatrick Graham. He said that on the floor of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have very little to add to this. I am not quite satisfied, never was, from the beginning, as you know, about this matter. I am not going to rehash all of the facts as brought out by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, but let us get down to some serious thinking. I would be glad if the Minister would listen to me. Last week or week before, I was very proud to hear the Prime Minister who is supposed to be a big economist - and a big economist is one thing, but one with practical experience is another - say that the reason why the Government was buying tickets from travel agents was

because the Government got no taxes from the airlines directly, but it got taxes from the travel agents.

Well, taxes are very important to the running of this country. I will repeat what I said. When this matter came before this House on the first occasion - and I have never changed my view - I make no apologies for being a Conservative: but even then, you must see that the most avowed, ardent Conservative will agree that there are certain services such as Water, Post Office and even transport which will have to be run and possibly subsidized by the State.
6.55 p.m.

Today we are asked to back another loan for \$2 million. For four or five years running you have collected not a cent. This is hard sound commonsense; this is not book economics. Not one cent have you collected by way of trade tax or income tax. You cannot argue that a service like C.B.C. is an essential service which you can even begin to say it is necessary for the State to subsidise and run. It is not an essential service such as Water, Post Office or Transport; therefore I could never understand this, especially when Rediffusion offered to run a service for television and radio as against bringing in Thomson and finding the money, paying interest, losing money and not collecting either trade tax or income tax. I am still at a loss to understand why it was done. Any Government in power granting to Rediffusion the right to operate this service in Barbados would also have the right to say that the Government claims so much time on the radio, and furthermore your charges must be submitted to the Public Utilities Board, although this is not a public utility, so that the people would have a fair and reasonable charge.

In the face of all this, how can you ask me to vote? You voted money and loaned them; they have thrown it away. There is another point, Mr. Chairman, which neither of the previous speakers touched on. The assets which they have must depreciate, but the Minister talked about what they would expect to make in ten years, forgetting that the assets which they have - machinery and so on - are going to depreciate. To me it is nonsense and stupidity to begin to run something when you had an offer by Rediffusion to put it up, pay taxes and do everything.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the hour, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was addressing the Chair. That member, I observe, is not in his place.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to this Resolution sets out that the amount is required to make an advance to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to enable it to revise its financial structure. The amount will be repayable within ten years by quarterly instalments beginning on 31st March, 1970 at a rate of interest equal to the prime lending rate charged by commercial Banks from time to time.

Now sir, this Resolution is asking for \$ 2.1 million. If one had listened to the Hon. Prime Minister last Tuesday speaking on this Resolution - in fact I do not think it was on this because that Resolution was withdrawn for what reason I do not know. I do not know if after the Prime Minister withdrew himself, the Resolution followed suit, because he spoke and withdrew, and soon after the Resolution was withdrawn.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I would just like to explain that this was done because we discovered that it would be proper to have two separate Resolutions, one passed in Committee of Supply to appropriate the amount, and then another abstract Resolution guaranteeing the loan. We understood this was the proper way to do it, and therefore we withdrew one and substituted two.

Mr. SMITH: That is very good, because that makes me feel we had started wrong from the beginning, but the Minister tried to correct it before it went further. It is operating in my mind that this Corporation started off wrong from the beginning, and the former Resolution, as you have heard from the Hon. Introducer, was wrong. As a very small businessman, I cannot understand this Resolution at all. They are asking for this amount and they are to begin to repay on 31st March, 1970; but at the spending and losing rate of this Corporation, I doubt that by 1970 something will be there to start to repay anything on, because as soon as I get a little further on, I will prove to this Committee that the losing rate is so great that unless we continue to give the green light and vote money to carry on this Corporation, it would not be able to survive. Now this Corporation is no help to the people who have to subscribe to it. We were told about broadcasting in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party, and I will read it for the benefit of hon. members. 7.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, this is part of the Manifesto of the D. L. P., and it states;

"The D.L.P. believe that democracy can function properly only when there is the widest possible dissemination of political information and machinery for expression and publication of different viewpoints. To this end the party proposes to set up a Wireless Broadcasting Station which the Government will either own outright, or become a major shareholder. Broadcasting of debates of the House of Assembly will therefore not have to be secondary to advertising revenue considerations. The party will ensure the prompt publication of the printed debates and the circulation at a cheap price throughout the Island."

Now, Sir, this was the promise made to me and the people of Barbados relative to broadcasting. Sir, how much broadcasting has been done from this House? How many speeches were broadcast from this House to the people of this country? Although they were promised throughout the length and breadth of this country that they would be kept well informed through this broadcasting system, nothing has been done. What has happened with it, Sir? The Government have taken it upon themselves to set up this Broadcasting Station for themselves, because you can only hear members of the Government coming over the air, or anything pertaining to the members of the Government. The Ministers with their shirt tails out and their shirt tails in - you can hear them coming over the air and see them on T. V. The Opposition has no chance of doing anything like that. The people of this country do not know what is happening other than the little bit that appears in the newspapers.

The newspapers are so much afraid of the Government; Rediffusion is so much afraid of the Government, and in view of what took place last week there will be less information given through the Press. When you get a responsible person in this community getting up on a platform and telling lies to the public - I say lies in capital letters - a newspaper prints it, and then it has to pay for it. The person who maliciously did it is free, but the newspaper has to pay for it. It should have been the other way round. "The soul that sinneth," the Good Book says, "must die." In this case you cannot expect a newspaper to give much publication to anything, because the people do not know when they are wrong or right, or when they will be penalized.

This is a Station that is run by the taxpayers' money, and yet the taxpayers cannot and, as far as I can see, will not know anything through this Broadcasting System. It is not fair; we have to pay for it through our noses, and yet it is no earthly help to us. I cannot blame the Introducer; he is out of it now; if he were still the Minister in charge, I would have to lay it firmly on his shoulders.

What do we find now? I am talking to the table or to the chairs, as far as a Minister is concerned. The Minister who is responsible for this is nowhere to be seen, and he does not care either. I will always say on the floor of this House that it is unfair to us, representatives of the people, that inasmuch as it is in the Constitution the Prime Minister can do as he likes by nominating whoever he likes to the Senate as a Minister.

I am still saying that it is not fair to us in this honourable Chamber, and it is not fair to the electorate to be nominating one to an office who does not have to care anything about the office. He can just do whatever he likes, but the Hon. Introducer will have to take a part of it now. In some cases he will have to take the blame for it. In other words, he will have to try to patch some things, because it is not everything he will know about now. He is no longer in the Ministry, but yet we are called upon to give the green light for a loan of \$2,100,000 to the Corporation.

I said just now that the Prime Minister, one of the biggest economic experts one could ever hear about, got up on the floor of this House last Tuesday and tried to throw sand in our eyes, as far as this Corporation is concerned. Sir, the blindest man on a trotting horse can clearly see that something is definitely wrong with this Corporation - too wrong to be right. The Minister was very vague on the introduction of this Resolution.

Here it is: the Minister and the Ministers of this Government are the Directors of this Company, and I am the Manager of the Bank. They are asking me for a loan of \$2,100,000. They were running the business for a fair time. Now the Manager of the Bank is not an idiot. He can sit in his chair at his desk and run any business that he has to finance. This Corporation was working for about three or four years. This Corporation is doing nothing but losing money. It is throwing away money faster than it can get it. It now wants to borrow money, but the Directors cannot convince me that they are going to expand in such a way as to offset their operational losses. To continue at this rate and to borrow this amount of money, it will be impossible for this Corporation to pay back one cent. 8. p.m.

They would have to satisfy me now that they have a certain object in view, certain expansions, they expect more sales, more income and this money is to help them to expand and to help them to pay their debts. Mr. Chairman, he would be a foolish Manager who would give them this amount of money to carry on at the same rate. I do not know if the Minister has in front of him what plans are on foot for this particular business to get this money, but, in my opinion, I am wondering, and I believe I am right, if this amount is only to pay bills and to clear off debts. That is the only thing I can see. This money, I believe, has already been spent because we do not have a breakdown. In the Report we cannot see the real operational costs, how much interest there is on the money, nothing at all. It is only asking us to enable it to revise its financial structure. I believe that when this Company was first started - and as I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Thomas mention one Thomson, I understand that these Thomson people were to put in a certain amount of money into this till, and I doubt if they have ever put in one cent. They only started off with what this Government handed over to them. If they have put in any money along with the amount the Government started them off with, they could not have been so far down in the red. These people, so far, have seen that they can take this Government for a ride, and I do not know why this Government so much likes

foreigners to carry away the money. It is better to let the people here carry away this money, but they believe in allowing foreigners to carry it away.

These Thomson people will pull up their sticks. The milk people at the Pine are going to pull up their sticks, and the Hilton people are going to clear out and leave everything with this Government. This Government is going into business with foreigners, and the taxpayers' money is pushed away; and since these people cannot see how the tide is breaking, they are going to break for themselves. They must have heard when the Prime Minister said sometime ago that there were some other boys who had to break for themselves. It is not fair to the taxpayers of this country for this Government to be looking in all the avenues to carry away the money and not to bring in one cent. Now these Thomson people are supposed to be shareholders or partners, but nothing at all has been mentioned or shown so as to show you what they have put in and what they have taken out, and I am very suspicious over this auditing business. The Auditor can only audit what you have put in front of him. The Auditor cannot sit in his office and tell you directly: "You collected \$100 and you have only entered \$25." He can only do that by checking the receipts and the expenditure and tell you that you are out so much; but if you are clever to make the receipts measure up to how you would suit them and do it in your way, if you are a clever one, the Auditor cannot find you out. I am not saying that that has been happening in this case, but something is wrong because what has made me so suspicious in this case is this: you will notice that the Statement was finalised by these people in 1966, on the 1st June, and when was it circularised to us? Nine months after, and we had to press for it, because up to last Tuesday we did not have it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I should like to tell the hon. member that I make no excuse for the lateness of arrival of these statements, but I should just like to point out that although the Auditors' Report may have been signed on the 1st June, it would have been some months before it reached the Cabinet. That is a fact, so that while we can be blamed for the delay, probably between the time when it reaches the Cabinet and the time it is here, we cannot be blamed for the delay from the time the Auditor signs the Report, because it has never come to the Cabinet in less than four or five months of the handing in. That is a fact.

Mr. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would just give way, does not the Minister appreciate that he is talking about the 1st July, 1966, in relation to the 1965 accounts and that it is not four months but it is one and a half years?

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, I can see that the Cabinet has to take long to discuss these matters, but yet they wanted us to discuss this last Tuesday without seeing anything at all. We had to press for this and the Hon. Minister then had to agree to postpone it. If we had taken the time from the Hon. Minister and from one of the best economic experts in the Island or in the world, according to the D.L.P., if we had gone dumb, we would

have gone through with it without even asking for a Report, judging from the way he put it. There are so many things to create doubts in the minds of honest minded people!

8.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, you will find that the item, Sundry Debtors, is increased by \$82,000 in 1966 over what it was in 1965. I am no expert; I am no economist; I am no auditor; but in my little foolish way I can still sit down and take up an auditor's report and try to pick something out for myself. Losses for 1964 were \$173,658.29. Those were losses for one year. Now, Sir, you are telling me that in 1970 you are going to pay back or that you will begin to pay back this amount of money if I allow you to get it.

In 1965 losses were \$2,119,713.67. These are losses; these are not receipts; this is not income. In 1966, the losses were \$365,998.32. Now, Sir, tell me what for a business this would be, tell me any business, apart from the Government business, which would be able to stand these losses. Tell me any other business, any other firm in Bridgetown or anywhere else which would be able to undergo these losses and still want to go to a bank to borrow this amount of money. Tell me what Bank Manager, after he has seen these accounts would take such a big risk, because this would not be a risk; this would be a hand along with the wrist to be taking such a chance with all of this money when every year you are throwing it away or down the drain.

Now, Sir, in 1965 it took \$1,004,198.82 in expenses to manage - if I may use the word "manage", - I had better say "take care of" \$647,599.17. In other words, you are paying out a dollar to get a cent. That is the good management of this particular thing which we are talking about tonight. Well then, we would have to be more than careful, as I have said. I cannot or I will not blame the Hon. Introducer for this. He undertook too much on himself by coming inside here and trying to hold his shoulders for weight that does not belong to him. He should tell us straight that "I am not the Minister; I do not know anything about it. That only gives me the chance to read out these figures to you and I have done so." The hon. member has no right trying to make any kind of excuses; he cannot make them; he knows nothing about it; he is not in the Ministry.

These are figures of things, whatever you choose to call them, that were handed to him to come in here and read out and he should not try - I would not say to fool us because he does not know anything about them. He was in that Ministry before, but it was taken from him and he should keep away from it, regardless of the consequences. I say so because some person or somebody should be locked up or get his face made ashamed for actions to this House on this particular business. Nobody can tell me, or can convince me, that you are going to throw away money like this year after year.

In my opinion the Auditors, as I have said, can only audit what comes before them and members of the House, having heard what the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St.

Thomas had to say relative to this Statement, can clearly see that the Auditors only tried to make shift for this Corporation. The Minister said that it is a true Report. The Minister does not know; he is not the Minister for this, but it is a matter for him if he chooses to be saddled with weight that he does not deserve. He does not know anything about it; therefore I am saying that it is unfair to us and to the electorate. As far as this House is concerned, we do not have a Minister of Education.

Now, Sir, bear in mind in 1965 it took us \$1,004,198.62 in expenses while our receipts were only \$647,599.17. This is a first-class business. This can happen only because you can come in here and only because the numbers are over there. You have the numbers: so it is going to pass; but this is what I am going to tell everyone of the members over there. They must pay for this because they are going to vote for it with a heavy heart - if not all, some of them. They are not satisfied with it. I know it and I counsel them to see that, if it is one time in their lives for them to feel that they are men, this is the time. This is the time for hon. members over on the other side to convince their constituents that they are men because this is something which they of themselves do not know anything about, but they are called upon to vote.

They are going to vote but it is not fair to them; it is not fair to their constituents because a business of this sort would dry the Treasury. Do you know why I am hurt? Do you know why I would talk on this until tomorrow? I know the sufferings of the people. People cannot get their canes out of the fields for the sake of a little piece of a road and a dollar bill to be spent on it. The people have to try their best and meet all kinds of embarrassment in order to reap their canes.

8.20 p.m.

Tonight and at any time this Government can find any kind of money they want to throw away, and cannot find a dollar bill to spend on the people of this country. Mr. Chairman, I will appeal to you only to tell you this: I went home early one evening to go to a funeral, and through a lorry having to pull out of a difficult place because of a little breakaway, the canes slid back, and the driver had to reverse that lorry from Melvins Hill all the way past my home with five or six tons of canes, because if he had driven up the hill the canes would have dropped off. The Minister had promised me to get that road at Springfield fixed the following week, but it has not been done, and yet tonight money is being voted for something that people can live without. This Corporation is not like the Waterworks Department or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on which money must be spent and losses forgotten if they are losing. It is not an essential service. If that closes tonight, no harm would be done. I am not saying you should close it, but you are concentrating on things that could be laid aside. People cannot get six feet of road done to get out with their canes after they have grown and cared them for the last eighteen months. What is the cause of it? Why aren't these roads fixed? Is it money or lack of interest? Tonight the same Minister or Ministers are willing to say "aye" to this Resolution for \$2.1 million, and the

road to which I referred would not cost more than \$500, and still they cannot find the money to spend on that road after the people have paid their taxes.

Now let us take the Sales Department. As I have mentioned, there is too much expenditure for sales. Administration for 1965 was \$393,255.78 and for 1966 it was \$277,177.56. Why should different figures appear in the comparison tables for 1965 rather than the actual figure shown in the Profit and Loss Account? These accounts are not right. Some mistakes have been made in them, and I do not think that Fitzpatrick Graham should make out such accounts that we as laymen can find errors in them. Now what kind of firm is this? I think I had better go and put my name on that sign and remove Fitzpatrick Graham's, because Lloyd E. Smith is correcting Fitzpatrick Graham. I think I had better go to their office tomorrow and go through these figures with them. (Hon. J. C. Tudor: The figures are theirs.) The Minister says the figures are theirs, but if the Minister of Education has passed this to the Leader of the House and told him it is from Fitzpatrick Graham, he would have to believe him, because the Leader of the House would not expect the Minister of Education to lie to him.

Hon. J. C. Tudor: On a point of order, there is no question of my colleague, the Minister of Education, having lied to me. I said these are authentic accounts presented by the Auditors of the Corporation and I maintain that they are. Whenever I am replying I shall deal with that point which is being raised, but there is no question of my being misled by one of my colleagues because this has not happened.

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, I want to get this clear. The Minister said in answer to me that these accounts are a true copy of the accounts presented to the Ministry by Fitzpatrick Graham.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. SMITH: I believe the Minister, but nothing that he says in his reply I am taking seriously, because he does not know anything about the office now. He is not the Minister; he has to take the time from the boys out there and if he gets up here making any hanky panky

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the Moment of Interruption and I shall report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: To me the Chairman has reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

The Moment of Interruption has arrived and any business, if unopposed, may be disposed of between now and 9 o'clock p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we do the Solicitors Bill which was circulated earlier to-

day. That would be non-controversial as far as we are concerned.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Before I ask leave to take it, I would like the assurance from the other side that we can do it between now and 9 o'clock. If we cannot, there is no point. I am asking leave to take the second reading of the Bill to amend the Solicitors Act, 1896,

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand it has not yet been published in the Official Gazette, and the relevant Standing Order was not suspended.
8.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 40 states:

"Second Reading of Bills

1. No Bill shall be read a second time until it has been printed and circulated to Members and has appeared in the Official Gazette."
- Note the word "printed" and note the word "appeared."

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 40

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 40.

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

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

SOLICITORS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is what I understand is described as the Solicitors Bill of which I do not have the good fortune to possess a copy.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a general amendment which is designed to regulate and bring up to date certain exemptions and qualifications for people proceeding to Solicitors' finals. Briefly, it is not proposed to provide a period of articles for a person who becomes disbarred - by disbarred this means with a view to becoming a Solicitor in the following categories as follows:

For a Barrister of five years' standing, or for a Non-practising Barrister for five years there is proposed complete exemption from articles,

For a Barrister of less than five years of call or a Non-practising Barrister for less than five years, clerkship for eighteen months.

For a person who holds a degree in law which is not an honorary degree, clerkship for two years.

For a person who holds a degree in a subject other than law which is not an honorary degree, or a person who has been wholly exempted from Part I of the qualifying examination, clerkship for three years.

For any other person not mentioned in these categories, clerkship for five years.

As the objects and reasons show, of course, the opportunity has been taken to state the length of a person's term of articulated service, in addition to amending the Act so that any articulated clerk who has passed or has been exempted for the intermediate examination should be eligible as a candidate for the final examination.

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

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we on this side support this Bill. I have had an opportunity of reading this Bill; I know of its history, and I have checked the provisions of the Bill in relation to the latest Regulations in Great Britain governing articulated clerkships. This Bill brings the Act up to date.

One of the effects it will have is that it will facilitate the entry into the legal profession of a number of people who have taken, say, Liberal Arts degrees here at Cave Hill in Barbados, or at any other University. If one did not reduce the period of articles for them, one would discourage young people from getting a University qualification in another field and then coming into law and bringing to it a sense of maturity and a breadth of education which the legal profession could well do with. This is not a Lawson Bailey or Gollop Bill.

As I see it, Sir, it is well known that there is a shortage of recruits who have the requisite education and qualification to enter into the legal profession not only in Barbados, but throughout the West Indies and in Great Britain as well. Great Britain had to change her Regulations so as to allow people who have taken Part I of the Bar examinations, which is in essence the same as Part I of the Solicitors' examination now, so that people can change their mind half-way, so to speak, when they get a good knowledge of the respective work of the two fields. It will not lower standards because people will have passed the Final examination, and I will give my support to the Bill, and I have no doubt that it will get the support of this side of the House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is a layman speaking. I understand that you are amending the Solicitors Act or something of the sort. It would appear that you want more Solicitors, but some of them need locking up. Now that they are going into the matter, I hope whoever is responsible for it will iron out all of these things and put those in jail who should be in jail, or get rid of them. There are some Solicitors who will turn you around in a circle. Every day is tomorrow, and you will keep their chairs in the office hot for days and weeks. They will not do one thing and will make you believe that they are working on your matters. It is time to cry "halt".

Sir, if it is the Chief Justice, or whoever is responsible for pulling these people up, I am prepared and willing to submit names. After one leaves one's

business and goes into a Solicitor's Office, one finds that at times the Solicitor passes one as if one has leprosy. Sometimes one hears a lady's voice saying: "You cannot see him." One must be treated as a man. When one goes into these offices, one has to pay the Solicitor.

I hope that this will be a hint, and I also hope that somebody in here will pass it on to the proper authorities. I think my colleague should go into it, because he was very willing to push this Bill through tonight. I heard someone say that this must be a Lawson Bailey Bill, but I do not know about that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair. 8.40 p.m.

Clause 1 was called. It reads as follows:-

"This Act may be cited as the Solicitors (Amendment) Act, 1967."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I want to propose a slight amendment to Clause 1, that is, the change of the figures "1967" to "1968". The short title will therefore read: "This Act may be cited as the Solicitors (Amendment) Act, 1968."

With that amendment, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

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

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

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that earlier today you.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I gave the hon. senior member for St. Joseph the assurance that certain questions which had not been processed when we started this meeting today, but which had been duly handed in by him on Thursday of last week and well within the time, - I gave him the assurance that he would be permitted to ask those questions before the end of this sitting. *(After a Pause).*

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, somehow I do not know how these papers can get away from the Clerk so fast. He cannot find the questions. I do not want to hold you up, Sir; I know that you had a hard day and therefore I will leave the questions over until the next meeting of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I very much regret that these things so often occur that papers are mislaid.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 10.15 a.m. o'clock tomorrow (Wednesday).

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

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House would consider the position of His Honour the Deputy Speaker, that of Your Honour and ours on this side of the House. We are quite willing to come tomorrow at 12 o'clock (noon), the usual time. Another point is that I do not know what is the reason for it, but on the second page of the Order Paper you will find that it has the headline "Select Committee" but it does not have the Public Accounts Committee on it. That should be on the Order Paper so that the public can know who is a member of the Public Accounts Committee. *(ASIDES)* It is not a Select Committee! This is a special Committee of this House; it is a Sessional Committee of this House, and why should it not go on the Order Paper? I am asking, Sir, that you give a direction that that should be printed on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the matter my consideration and rule after so doing.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have drawn your attention to something else. Since the Select Committee on Pensions has reported, I would think that that Committee could be discharged.

Mr. SPEAKER: My only reason for not doing so - I have already given that matter some thought - is that the Bill has not yet been introduced and it may happen that the matter might be referred back to that Committee. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes).

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw this to your attention before Your Honour rules. I have heard it said that the Public Accounts Committee

is not a Select Committee; but if you were to look at the heading on page 50 of the Standing Order you will see "Select Committee; Sessional Select Committee" and Standing Order 54 says: "There shall be a Select Committee to be designated the Committee of Public Accounts....."

If that is not a Select Committee, I do not know what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I understand the Hon. and Learned Deputy Leader of the Opposition to move an amendment to the motion?

Mr. ST. JOHN: Yes, Sir, we are asking that we meet at 12 o'clock (noon). Your Honour has to come; His Honour the Deputy Speaker is not here, and you cannot have a meeting without a Speaker or a Deputy Speaker. Everybody knows that meeting at 12 o'clock (noon) is convenient.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of the hon. senior member for Christ Church that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock (noon).
8.50 p.m.

My reason for that, sir, is that most of us are business people. I have an important appointment for tomorrow, and for us to meet at 9 o'clock, it will frustrate my plans. Let us meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow and we will accommodate the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, His Honour the Deputy Speaker is not here today, but may I in all humility throw out the suggestion that we arrive at a compromise between 10 o'clock and 12 o'clock, namely 11 o'clock? *(A PAUSE..)*

There is an amendment to the motion. The amendment will be put first. The amendment is that the sitting of this House do now stand adjourned until 12 (noon) tomorrow. Hon. members who are in favour of the amendment will please say "AYE". Hon. members who are of a contrary opinion will please say "NO". Methinks the "NOES" have it.

A division was called and the question was resolved in the negative, the House voting as follows:-

AYES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. SMITH and Mr. ST. JOHN - 4.

NOES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C.E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN and Mr. WEEKES - 9.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until 10.15 a.m. tomorrow morning was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.58 p.m.