

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th November, 1968.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (*Speaker*);
Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon.
J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Leader of the House*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN,
J.P.; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.;
Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*);
Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B.
SPRINGER;

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 22nd October, 1968, have, I understand, been duly circulated, and unless there is any objection, those Minutes will be confirmed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, in the Minutes of 22nd October, there is a minor error. I see that the hon. junior member for St. Peter has been made a "J.P." according to the Minutes, and not having been officially informed in any respect, I am asking that the letters "J.P." be deleted from behind his name.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention, and I trust that it will not be an error if it appears again. I will direct that it be deleted.

If there is no further objection to the confirmation of these Minutes as now amended, I declare those Minutes, as amended, duly confirmed.

As to the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 29th October, if there is no objection

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point I would like to draw to your Honour's attention, and it is that I am recorded here as having spoken, but nowhere prior to my speaking was my presence in this Honourable Chamber indicated in the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I notice myself. Present were certain names not including the name of that Hon. member, and it is not mentioned that the hon. member entered and took his seat. It is really regrettable that so many errors occur from time to time, sometimes trivial, other times great. I will give instructions that the Minutes of this meeting be done over after a check is made to discover what time the hon. member did arrive. Confirmation is therefore deferred.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) (No. 4) Regulations, 1968.

The Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) (No. 5) Regulations, 1968.

Annual Report and Statement of the Barbados Development Board for the period 1st April, 1966 to 31st March, 1967.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1968.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year, 1964.

Report of the National Insurance Board on the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme for the period 1st April, 1967 to 31st December, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Question No. 145, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and Parliamentary Question No. 247 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Question No. 105 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, Parliamentary Question No. 139 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and Parliamentary Question No. 180 asked by the hon. junior member for St. George, are ready.

I should also like to remind the House that at a previous meeting I gave notice that certain Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions asked by hon. members on the opposite side are ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS there is a dire need for financial help for hundreds of hungry and naked children of Barbados, whose parents are sick or incapacitated and extremely poor;

AND WHEREAS the sponsors of the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund are experiencing great difficulty in their effort to provide Christmas fare and cheer for all those children who really need such assistance;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to make a substantial amount of money available to the Rediffusion Needy Children's Fund to help at least 500 children or more.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Government consider taking advantage of the Canadian offer of three new schools, to give priority to the erection of a new school at Lammings Pasture, to replace the present St. Bernard's School that has become almost untenable and dangerous due to the instability of the land on which it is situated?

Mr. LYNCH entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it would be in order to make any comment on the Question, but I would like to give the hon. member the assurance that as soon as the Minister of Education heard of this gift, he had himself earmarked one of these schools for the purpose mentioned by the hon. member. However, the Question

may remain and be answered formally; but I give him that assurance.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a question on my Notice Paper in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John who I do not observe instantly to be in his place.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am in order, but I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Select Committee on the payment of pensions to members of Parliament has reported, and I do not know whether the Government is doing anything about it.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not discharged that Select Committee yet, pending further possible developments.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that the hon. member is enquiring after the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on what provision, if any, should be made for the payment of pensions to members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown, past and present. I think I can tell him that we hope we will be able, within two weeks, to bring down the legislation to the House. The matter is in its final stages now.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting. In doing so, I give hon. members the assurance that Question Time will be taken, and if the other side desires to deal with Private Members' Business, perhaps they will indicate.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Chairman of Committees is again indisposed, unfortunately. I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the hon. junior member for St. John.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an amendment and all the more reason because of the Chairman's absence today again.

I beg to move that the words "during the absence of the Chairman" be deleted, and the words "for the remainder of the Session" be inserted in their place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I could not let that go by as a solo. I am going to support it and I support it for the dignity and impartiality — it is not that I am accusing the Chairman of Committees of partiality (*ASIDES*) even although you are a master of English, you cannot convince me of this; you can talk until you are sick. Because I say that somebody is impartial, that does not necessarily mean that the other person is partial. How can that be? Because I say that somebody is intelligent and not ignorant, it does not mean that you are intelligent. The dignity and impartiality with which the hon. junior member for St. George appears to handle the Chair leaves nothing remaining for me to do but to second the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think that the Hon. Leader of the House should be proud that we feel so about a member of his party. Surely, you will have to put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid, I will not put the second question. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What second question?) The amendment, because in my view the correct interpretation of the Standing Order 4, and Standing Order 4 (2) is as follows:-

“In the absence of the Chairman, the House may elect any member then present to act as Chairman of Committees”.

It is my view, and I do not allow this motion, that there is a Chairman of Committees who was appointed at the commencement of the Session, whose duty it is to take the Chair in all Committees of the whole House, and that in his absence another Member may be appointed to act as Chairman; but we cannot have a Chairman who is absent and other than an Acting Chairman present.

Mr. MOTTLEY To that I bow.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat what I said last Tuesday. The House, like the House of Commons, can do anything except make a man into a woman and a woman into a man. We have just suspended Standing Orders. If my amendment by implication suspends that Standing Order, we are perfectly in order. I am going to be less diplomatic than the hon. member who has just sat down. We do not want the present Chairman of Committees to continue for the rest of the Session. (*Laughter*).

Mr. SPEAKER: May I make two observations on that? One is that the matter can only be dealt with, in my view — and it is my Ruling — on a substantive motion of which notice would have to be duly given.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I thank Your Honour; I have that in mind.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for this day's sitting during the absence of the Chairman of Committees was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

SAVINGS BANK (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 is the present Order of the Day and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914. It stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. John, the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. YEARWOOD entered the House and took his seat.

12.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR rose —

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member begins, am I in order in asking Your Honour for an interpretation of the present circumstances? I intend to move a vote of Censure against the Chairman of Committees for informing the House that he would be absent and then turning up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I, personally, have no knowledge of any such notification. Of course, the Whips do not communicate with me, normally.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the Leader of the House has misled this House today on this important matter?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I said that I understand he would be, unfortunately, absent — meaning by my observation. I did not say that I had been told this. I did not know and I did not enquire.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members will recall, you took particular pains in putting the question in the right way. You said: “To act as Chairman during the absence of the Chairman.” The Chairman is now present; therefore, he resumes his former role as Chairman of Committees.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Your Honour will thank the hon. member for going out of his way to tell you that you did well.

Mr. SPEAKER: So rare are praises given from either side of the House, that the Chair is grateful for small mercies.

SAVINGS BANK (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of the Bill in the absence of the hon. and learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is asking the leave of the House to take charge of the item which stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister, and, unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. Leader of the House to take charge of and to proceed with the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are two things this amendment seeks to do. Firstly, to make appointments to the staff of the Bank vested in the Governor-General, acting in accordance with the advice of the Public Service Commission; and that the salaries of the officers of the Bank specified in subsection (3) shall be subject to the approval of the Minister responsible for Finance instead of the Governor-General.

This is a recommendation which, broadly, has come to us from the Directors of the Savings Bank. They consider that Section 5 of the Act should be amended to give permission for these two things. Under Section 5 of the Act, which is, of course, amended by Section 2 of the Savings Bank (Amendment) Act 1966, it is provided that the staff of the Bank should be appointed by the Governor-General and should consist of a Manager, an Accountant, four Assistant Accountants, and such other officers, etc., as the Directors may from time to time determine with the approval of the Minister.

The Minister of Finance agrees with the Directors that it would be tidier and, perhaps, a more constitutional arrangement, to vest appointments in the Governor-General, acting in accordance with the advice of the Public Service Commission.

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that 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, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, I should like to say — I trust I can speak for the whole Committee on this point — how pleased we are to see you again in your accustomed seat. (Mr. HINDS: No.) I hope that you have returned to us much refreshed and invigorated from your recent illness.

I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

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

Clause 2 was called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

THE CURRENCY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Currency (No. 2) Act, 1965.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to proceed with this in the absence of the hon. and learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is seeking its leave to proceed with item No. 6 and take charge of the same in the absence of the hon. and learned Prime Minister. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. Leader of the House to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Currency (No. 2) Act, 1965.
12.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, under the terms of Article 27 (1) of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Agreement, 1965, the Government of Grenada has applied for accession to the Agreement. Hon. members, of course, will recall that they were not in the Agreement because after the break up of the Federation and the change of Government there, I believe they started to use, by some arrangement with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, Trinidad and Tobago currency. Anyhow, their application was considered at a recent meeting of the Governments participating in the Eastern Caribbean Currency Agreement, and it was decided that their application should be acceded to. This involves, of course, creating a supplementary Agreement which provides among other things that Grenada should take its turn as the last of the Islands which should nominate a Director in rotation; that Grenada will share in the profits as from the date of becoming a participating Government; that before withdrawing any profits from the authority Grenada will have to contribute from its share of profits to the General Reserve Fund an amount which bears the same percentage to the General Reserve Fund as the percentage of profits to which Grenada is entitled; and that there should be amendments to the principal Agreement to allow the East Caribbean Currency Authority to accept deposits from participating Governments, and to refer to arbitration any matter on which agreement of all the participating Governments is required.

Now to implement this supplementary Agreement, legislation in the form of this Bill is necessary, and, of course, this legislation has to be enacted in all the Parliaments of the participating territories. For us to proceed to provide for Grenada's accession to the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, this Currency Amendment Bill 1968, has been prepared and has of course already been circulated to hon. members.

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

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

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

On Motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 9 be the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as far as my recollection goes, was only circulated this week, and today is Tuesday. It deals with a matter of the jurisdiction of the Court, and I think it is a matter which the relevant professions would like an opportunity to study.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand it was circulated in time to be in hon. members' hands on Saturday, but do I gather that the hon. member, irrespective of that, is suggesting that it be not proceeded with today?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, since I do not think any ships would be sunk between now and next week, there is no need to rush this, and as the hon. member wishes, I will postpone it.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the assurance given by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works that he is not prepared to proceed with this Bill today, it having been declared the present Order of the Day, unless any hon. member objects, that matter will be postponed.

There being no objection, I declare consideration of this Bill to be postponed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 8 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION *re* ADVANCES FROM CONSOLIDATED FUND TO POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 8 is the instant Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the hon. and learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to authorise the Accountant General to make advances from time to time out of the Consolidated Fund to the Postmaster General for the payment of pensions.
12.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the hon. and learned Prime Minister.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose - I may be wrong - that hon. members would object to this. This is something which we have pro-

mised, and I believe that at least one hon. member on the other side, to my knowledge, has pressed and asked for it from time to time. This Resolution therefore gives effect to the new policy of paying Government pensions, not by voucher, but by cheques encashable at the Treasury, Commercial Banks and District Post Offices. I am sure that this will relieve a longstanding hardship, and hon. members will be as glad to see it enacted as the Government is glad to be able to do it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is one thing I had hoped for; I believe the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health sat on a Committee along with others including myself, and we discussed this matter. Having read that these pensioners will cash their cheques at the Treasury, Commercial Banks and District Post Offices, I would have thought that the Government cheques to pensioners would have been Order cheques, and they would be mailed as registered letters to such pensioners. I do not think that you are doing enough to relieve pensioners of 75 years and possibly 80 years of age who still have to get some letter to the Treasury to show that they are alive in respect of this matter. I believe that for a man in Checker Hall, St. Lucy, who still has to go to the Post Office, this does not seem to be relieving him of what we consider he should be relieved of. I believe that just as you have recognised shopkeepers or recognised Justices of the Peace in the parishes to sign the order or cheque to be paid, the old gentleman or the old lady could be relieved from coming from home.

I should like to hear the Minister on this, because we actually recommended that with recognised shops in the area, this could be done. Let us take St. Joseph; you are coming from Cane Garden and you still have to go to the Post Office. It is easier for a pensioner to go to town by transport than to go to the Post Office. I would prefer to hear the Hon. Minister say why they have not accepted the recommendations. The girl or the boy at the Post Office takes a cheque in, he presents it, it is signed; of course, she does not really know the pensioner. If the argument is going to be that the cheque is lost or something like that, what you do know is that Mr. "X" has been keeping a shop in the district for the last twenty-five or thirty years and if the cheque is cashed here at the shop and then presented to the Treasury, and it is checked and signed, it would be much easier. I would prefer to hear the Minister on this; why have you not allowed the pensioner to sign the cheque and cash it at a shopkeeper? For most of the time the small pension which a man is drawing he owes to the shopkeeper, possibly about two-thirds of the money, when he receives the cheque. I should like to hear the Hon. Minister say why they have left out the idea of cashing the cheque at the shopkeeper, and only use the Post Office. This does not really ease the situation.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see that the Government is coming around with some commonsense to the Opposition, and is trying to do what is lawful and right. This particular Resolution is one which I have been clamouring for long, long ago. I would not have said this if the hon. member had mentioned my name. He said an hon. member, but he did not say the hon. member. *(Asides)* I am not speaking to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say that he is not speaking to me?

Mr. SMITH: That is not to you, Sir. Relative to this payment, I cannot expect the Government to see everything at the same time, but this will be creating just a bigger hardship in some cases for these people. Some of them are very old, too old to be wending their way to the Post Office or to the Commercial Banks. As the hon. senior member for the City referred to St. Joseph - I do not know if he is representing St. Joseph, but I see that St. Joseph is in the limelight today, and I am very glad that the hon. member has mentioned St. Joseph; but when you come to Cane Garden and Fruitful Hill and you have these old people having to find themselves at the bottom of Horse Hill, it is creating a hardship on them to get their cheques cashed. In each district, the shopkeeper knows very nearly every pensioner and do you know why that is so? It is because that pensioner has to go and credit on account of his pension. 1.05 p.m.

It is only a question of the pensioner taking his cheque to the shopkeeper and telling him to take out what he owes and give him the balance. It is not on the bus route, and the pensioner has to walk across the country to get someone to identify him before he can return to the shopkeeper.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has given way, he will not lose his right to resume his speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if I say something now, the hon. member may not wish to continue. I merely wish to point out that the Treasury, Post Offices and Commercial Banks are mentioned because these would obviously be the three most significant places for the transaction of financial business, and since a cheque is legal tender, the person receiving it can, obviously, cash it anywhere he likes.

Mr. SMITH: I thank the hon. member for clarifying the matter. That is what we wanted. We are glad to know that the pensioner can cash his cheque anywhere he likes.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member for the City has already spoken.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, there is just a small point I should like to raise on this matter. We have the sad spectacle of school teachers who depend on their cheques being deposited in the Banks. They go into the Banks the day after pay-day to find that the cheques have not yet reached the Banks. I have to ask that an assurance will be given that these pensioners will receive their cheques on the day before it is actually due. In other words, that the cheques will be sent to the Post Offices, and postmen will have enough time to find these people, and give them their cheques so that on the day when they are actually due they will be able to present them to the shopkeepers and pay their bills. I ask that these people be so treated that they will not have to be running about looking for somebody to identify them before they can have their cheques cashed.

I am asking also that the Government should do all it possibly can by radio, television and, possibly by newspapers to warn shopkeepers, or anyone else, cashing cheques for these pensioners that they should not discount the cheques. In other words, some of these shopkeepers, I am sure, are likely to make a sort of levy for cashing cheques for some of these pensioners, and I would not like to know that pensioners are going to lose four cents or six cents in the dollar when shopkeepers cash their cheques.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear a point which, I believe, the hon. senior member for the City wishes to make, because it may be convenient for me to hear it and to deal with it in any reply that I may make.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now speaking and, unless he resumes his seat - he cannot even give way to the hon. member who has already made his speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members have shown a proper concern about this matter, but many of their fears are groundless. In the first place, as I understand it, and I have seen nothing to challenge this here, a cheque issued by the Accountant General on behalf of the Government of Barbados to anybody is legal tender anywhere in this Island and, perhaps, outside - I do not know about outside; therefore, you can offer it, apart from now, at a Post Office, or at a Commercial Bank, or at the Government Savings Bank, and get your transaction made on it. The difficulty is if a person to whom the cheque is payable is not well known to the person who is being asked to cash it; so that a question of identity then may very well arise. There is no question that the cheque could not be cashed anywhere; it is legal tender; it is acceptable as a means of transacting business, as Your Honour and hon. members well know. I think it is perfectly negotiable.

The point to which attention will have to be paid is the one raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, although I do not know that there are any

shopkeepers who would attempt to get a commission for cashing a cheque; but in case that there are any such - I do not know that this is so myself - certainly not in St. Lucy - it can only be done with the consent of the person who is the payee. If the payee literally and absolutely and firmly refuses to give any consideration for cashing a cheque, then it cannot be done.

In a case where the pensioner goes to a shopkeeper, most likely he will be paying for goods already bought and, therefore, the cheque would represent more than he owes and, perhaps, change would have to be given back to him representing the difference between what he owes and the value of the cheque. The practice mentioned by the hon. member would be entirely against the law, and I doubt whether there is any shopkeeper in this Island who would attempt to do it, but it will have to be done with the connivance of the payee. I do not see how it would be proper for the payee to pay for service which is no service at all.

Suppose a man's pension was \$100; he received a cheque from the Accountant General and took it to the shopkeeper to pay his debt, then he would get the difference between what he owed and the balance of money due to him. (ASIDES)
1.15 p.m.

I could see, however, that the other point which the hon. member mentioned is a point to which some attention should be paid, and that is to see that there is prompt - and this is from the point of view of the postal services - delivery of the cheques not later than the day on which the pension is due, and I would certainly draw this to the attention of the authorities who have to look after this, because this is not only the Government's desire, but it would be the only fair and honourable thing to do and not to keep people waiting two or three days. This is not on all fours with your money not being deposited in a Bank, because unless a pensioner specifically asks for his cheque to be deposited, it would not be deposited; it would be sent to him through the post; but we shall have a look at this and see that the best kind of service is done in this new development.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) (NO.2) REGULATIONS, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The instant Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the passing of

a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 1968.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 1968", have been laid in Parliament. The purpose of the Regulations is to revise the rate for hiring motor cabs as set out in the Second Schedule of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952, as amended by the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1964. The rates relate to the hire of cabs over specified distances and on an hourly basis.

Hon. members will have in their possession a copy of the new Schedule which it is proposed to use. I do not know if there is any need for me to go through the whole Schedule for hon. members, but the rates change from between Bridgetown and Seawell, between Seawell and Sam Lords and between Seawell and the rural areas. If there is anything that hon. members would like to know, I am prepared to answer, but I think it is straightforward.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said he would like to know if there is anything that hon. members would like to hear from him relative to this Resolution. This is what I would like to know from him. He is asking us to pass this Resolution today, but for some two or three months now these Regulations were in operation and the taxi people were charging these rates. I can remember that I had to call on one to do a job for me, and when he charged his rates, I told him he was wrong. He said I did not know what was happening and he thought I was a member of the House. I told him it was not a question of what he thought; it was a question of what I knew. He informed me that these were the new rates that were being charged ever since, and he took out a copy of the rates from his pocket and shew me. I did not feel too happy to see that I am supposed to be a member of this Honourable Chamber, and a person outside could tell me that I did not know what was going on. I felt that something was wrong, though I did not know whether it was on the part of the Minister, which I doubt. I do not think he would have given the O.K. to allow people to charge these rates when he in truth and in fact knew that he had to bring them here to get us to pass them, and it is only today that he is asking us to pass this measure. It is either that the Minister is disregarding us in here or whoever is responsible for it. I am asking the hon. Minister continually to check with his Permanent Secretary or whoever is responsible for these things, and do not let it always appear as if he is a boy in the yard. Now it will appear as if he is making us boys in the yard by asking us to pass something which was in operation long ago, because this Schedule of fares was in the hands of the taxi owners for some time and they were operating on the new fares.

I hope that the Minister will be in a position to let us know who is wrong. If they are going to pass their own rules up Bay Street, they can pass them and allow them to come into operation; but do not bring them to the House afterwards to make members of the Opposition at least look as if they are fools. People were paying these rates for over three months and today we are called upon to pass them. Imagine we are going to pass a law here today which was operating for the last three months. It does not look right, and I hope the Minister will be able to clarify it, as someone should be called upon or penalised for doing such things and making the Minister to look small although he is a big man, and making us in here to look foolish.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if I may put the record straight, in the first place the hon. member should know that this is a small island. He himself just told me something which he said came from inside. Mind you, he is outside and knows something that happened on the inside. Maybe the taxi rates came from inside. I am a Minister, but I am a man; and if a taxi driver charged a higher rate for taking him or a member of the public somewhere, it was his duty to call me and ask if the new rates had gone into operation, knowing that they had not come before the House.

I am not surprised to hear that some taxi driver told him about these new rates, because when these rates are being drawn up, they are not drawn up unilaterally, but with the Taxi Association, Johnson Stables and the other people. We generally notify these people and we come up with something that is favourable to everybody; so this may be how the person could tell him this. This is quite likely, but I do not think this is making me look small or making him look small. What he should have done, if he did not want to be made to look small, was to refuse to pay and let the man take him to Court or call the Police. 1.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I could not refuse to pay when the chap presented me with the Regulations printed by the Government. He had a copy of them in his pocket, and therefore I could not refuse to pay. I thought that the Minister used to make his own little laws, rules and regulations for certain things. That is what I was thinking.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if that is the case and the hon. member had his doubts, as I said before, he knows my telephone number both in the office and at home, and he could have called and asked me how this thing is operating, that a taxi driver could be charging something which he did not appreciate. Then I would have known to tell him not to pay the man that money, but he went ahead and paid him. I think that the hon. member should be charged with aiding and abetting the taxi drivers in overcharging the general public.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. Minister is making some very serious statements there. This gentleman presented me with

something signed by the Minister; he presented me with one of these same things. Knowing that the Ministers have this big amount of power, I was thinking that this was done by him because he is a Minister, and in certain cases the Minister can do as he likes; but it was signed by the Minister. How then could I be aiding and abetting or doing anything of the sort? All the man would have to do is to sue me because he was right.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. member to get scared. I am not going to ask the Police to lay any charge against him. I was thinking about it, but on second thoughts I will not do it. What the hon. member is saying is that the man produced this thing which was signed by me, but all he had to do was to ask me who authorised me to sign this thing, or if I had authorised the signature to this thing or if it had gone into operation. That is all he had to do and he would have been straight. As far as I can see, the hon. member was really taken for a ride, and he had to pay for this ride. I am extremely sorry that this has happened to my good friend, but he should not have accused me of amalgamating with anybody in this matter, because I really did not know anything about it until now I am hearing it from him.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. These fare rates were being sold and distributed from the Government Headquarters long ago. They are on sale.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: What has the hon. member risen on?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have risen to speak. I have not spoken yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Communications and Works was making the winding-up speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure that he would not mind or object to my drawing his attention to this.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a matter of the Minister objecting; it is a matter for the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think that the House would object to this. May I be permitted to say something, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City is seeking to address the House after the Minister has exercised his right of final reply.

Hon N. W. BOXILL rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is still on his feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection if you will allow the hon. member to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the Hon. Minister has given way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, I have given way.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was thinking, with my experience in here, that there is some irregularity. If this is read, you will see that these are Regulations made under an Act, Regulations which we gave the power to the Minister to make. Regulations are supposed to be laid on the Table of this House for forty days, and if there is no objection to those Regulations, then they become law. No amendment can be made to those Regulations; they must be either thrown out or passed as they are; therefore, there seems to be some irregularity here. This seems to be a waste of time or it is before the House wrongly. If we have the right to give the Minister the power to make Regulations and he makes those Regulations all he has to do is to bring them in and put them before this House. Within a period of forty days a member can discuss these Regulations and throw them out, because he cannot amend them, and if they are not amended, then they become law. What the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is saying is that they should not be in the hands of the taxi man. I am therefore arguing that this matter is improperly before the House today, and I would like Your Honour to rule on it before we go any further. If you will look at the heading of the Resolution you will see. We have given the Minister power to make these Regulations.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since the inception of the Ministerial System of Government, there are two different types of Regulations which become effective. Firstly, as soon as the Minister signs them, they become effective as such; and secondly, there are those Regulations which have to be brought in here and laid on the Table of the House for forty days. The question is, with which of these Regulations are we dealing? In my view, these Regulations having been made under a specific Act, from the time that the Minister signs them, they become effective. We do not even have to bring them in here; they are just brought in here as a matter of courtesy. That is all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister is absolutely correct there and therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is for you to rule whether this matter is not improperly before the House. The Regulations which were signed by the Minister are those which he has the power to sign, because he has the power to do so under the Act, the power which we gave him. Then there are the other Regulations. My friend, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is right. The Minister of Health has clarified the situation and I should like Your Honour to rule on it. This matter is not properly before the House. These Regulations have absolutely no right being before the House. Mr. Speaker, it is your duty to see that things are regular and in order in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister may resume.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Have you said that the Minister may resume?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister gave way. I rule that this Resolution is technically and constitutionally in order. That is my ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Without looking it up?

Mr. SPEAKER: Unlike certain hon. members, I do not have to look up everything.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You carry everything in your head.

Mr. SPEAKER: Everything that is important. Is the Minister who gave way going to continue his speech or has he completed it?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: There is a legal point there. I notice.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. Minister going to complete his speech?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not yet finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has not yet finished, then let him continue his address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am just looking up a point here.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member cannot hold up the House like that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, do you call this holding up the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is, yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is it time to eat, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, definitely not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that this is constitutionally and technically in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have so ruled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not rude, but I do not think that this should be before the House at this stage. I do not understand this term "technical" or "non-technical".

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I tended to agree with the hon. senior member for the City, but since you have so ruled, I want to take the ruling of the Chair. I do not think that there was any further point I wanted to make. I was only explaining to the hon. member that he has got himself into thinking the same thing as the senior member for St. Michael has thought, and I am also thinking myself.

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

1.35 p. m.

APPROVAL OF LEASE OF LAND TO SEAWELL AIR SERVICES LTD.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day is Order No. 4 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease to Seawell Air Services Limited of a parcel of land situate at Seawell Airport, Christ Church.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this in the absence of the Hon. and learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of Item No. 4 which stands in the name of the Hon. and learned Prime Minister. Unless there is objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease to Seawell Air Services Limited of a parcel of land situate at Seawell Airport, Christ Church.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have passed around the Plan, so that hon. members around the Table may see what is intended here. The proposal, briefly, is to lease to Seawell Air Services Limited an additional portion of land which is described in the Schedule and it is further described in the Addendum. It provides certain agreed services to Airlines operating through Seawell Airport, and it is proposed, subject to the approval of Parliament, to lease this parcel of land which is described in the Schedule.

All the airlines, or nearly all of them, are concerned in this venture: Pan American, B. O. A. C., Air Canada and Air France, and they themselves are spending considerable sums of money on their respective sections of the Operations Building. They would like to proceed with further development which, of course, this lease will provide. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire from the Minister whether this piece of land, in any way, entails the construction of a road leading to the Seawell Asphalt Plant. A road is being constructed, and there are no local purchase orders issued for the job. No requisition forms have been issued, and not even the Accountant of the Ministry of Works seems to know where the money is coming from. That is why I am inquiring whether this road leads to the Seawell Asphalt Plant. A lot of inferior materials are being bought for the construction of this Plant, because of the scandalous irregularities that are going on there.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder whether any other Member proposes to speak on this Resolution before the final right of reply is exercised. It would appear that

no hon. member wishes to speak, and the hon. member may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is becoming an old hand at parliamentary technique. Obviously, he must know that such a question addressed to me on this Resolution would not be properly so addressed because this Resolution specifically deals with the lease of land to Airlines Services, and not with the construction of a road. When these people get the land they will put up buildings, and this is nothing at all to do with the road which the Government is building. I take it that matters, eventually, though not relevant to this, are sufficiently important to make him desire to address substantive Questions to the appropriate Ministry which, I expect, he will do.

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

THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1 becomes the instant Order of the Day, and it is to resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill intituled the Wireless (Amendment) Act, 1968. When the debate on this matter was adjourned, on a motion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph further consideration was postponed. Does the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seek to resume his address?

Mr. SMITH: No, Sir.

The question that the Bill be now 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, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

1.45 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not in here, if I may say so. I thought it only right that members of the House should see the Netherlands Antilles Parliamentarians before they left finally, especially as, I regret to say, as Your Honour is well aware, yesterday so few of us turned up to welcome them, and I have seldom met Parliamentarians in the Caribbean area who are so willing and anxious to be friends and part of a Caribbean community. I am very sorry I had to go outside - the Clerk incidentally was with us - to give them a sort of official send off.

I say that as an apology for not being in the House to speak on the debate when it was in Committee. But I warn this House - I am not going to say much more - because as members on the other side guess and guess rightly perhaps or wrongly, this Bill as it reads is going to lead to Law Court work. I warned the House twice that this was rashly done, that this Act should be almost torn to pieces and a fresh Act written if the object of the Government or anybody else is to regulate radio reception and radio operation generally in this Island. I am not going to say anything more, but I do give the warning that the Government may find themselves coming down here and asking us to vote a sum of money to pay costs in some action in which it has been proved that some aspects of this Bill are unconstitutional. Members forget that this is a war-time measure. Barbados is now an independent country with a written Constitution. In the old days it did not matter what the House of Commons did or what the House of Assembly in Barbados did, and we were practically the only people in the world outside the House of Commons who used to pass all sorts of Acts or tear up anything; but as soon as you have a written Constitution, you have to go very carefully by every word you write into that Constitution. I think that already - I would not expand on this - we have done something or allowed something unconstitutional to pass. If you look at a written Constitution, you will see that you must keep within it, and it has happened every now and again with the Supreme Court in the United States or in any other country with a written Constitution, that people go to the Law Courts and ask the Court to set aside an Act. That was something inconceivable in the old days in Barbados, but quite conceivable now.

I am not going to say anymore except that I am sorry and I apologise that I was not in the House to again point out things that I think are wrong - things that even to a layman are wrong if you look at the original Act of 1940. I only do this, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want it to be asked, if I find myself later on attacking the Legislature of this country because of this Act, why I did not do it earlier, and why I am going into Court and acting in a professional way when I should have acted on the floor of the House of Assembly.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the misfortunes of living in a Colonial country and having a Colonial mentality, a concomitant all too often of even the most determined brayer of independence, of thought, action and indeed political status, is that what people who live in countries that have never been subjected to Colonial rule call "freedom" is not understood in the same sense by those who have lived in countries subjected to Colonial rule. What an Englishman or a Frenchman - and these arguments, Mr. Speaker, are directed to you and the members of the Government particularly - means when he says "liberty" is not what a Barbadian or Martiniquan means when he says "liberty", because there have been so many Colonial laws which have given arbitrary power to the Police and to the Government in Colonial countries, that things are taken for granted by their populations which would not be taken for granted by populations of the metropolitan countries.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who have lived abroad are aware, especially, for example, if you have ever driven a motor car or walked during active demonstrations of some sort in the streets of London or in Paris that there is a healthy questioning of arbitrary authority, which is one of the benefits of the population of Europe and of the United States and of the older countries which have never had to be subjected to arbitrariness. There is a questioning of authority which we unfortunately do not seem ready to accept. Here in Barbados I know that even we find ourselves subject to a belief that because the police put up a "No Entry" sign in the road that the "No Entry" sign is lawful, and that because a policeman tells you not to turn down this road but to turn down that, that he is giving you a lawful order, just to take a small example in the sphere of traffic. I am sure that these examples could be multiplied dozens and dozens of times over. You, Mr. Speaker, must have this experience. You go to the Courts and you demand something which the law says you are to get, and a Clerk in the Court says that the Financial Rules or the Registrar tells him he must not do that and he would not do it, and you have fortunately the people who are most in the position of being refused are also the people who are most aware of what "mandamus" means. There is too much unquestioning acceptance of authority and unquestioning giving to the Government of authority to interfere in the private lives of citizens throughout every single British colony, French colony or other foreign colony in the West Indies and elsewhere.

1.55 p.m.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not such an ideal preamble as it may seem because anybody who is aware of how Europeans or Americans think, would know that Section 11 of the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940, could never have been passed except on an emergency basis. There are no circumstances in which the English House of Commons would submit, or the population of England would accept, for tax purposes at any hour of the day or night, an official appointed by the British Broadcasting Corporation, which is what we are asking Barbadians to accept.

It may be hard for members, for people who have lived in Barbados for all their lives, to understand what it means to tell a Government or Officer of Government "You are wrong; you cannot do that. I do not care if you are the Government; you cannot do that." Once you do not have that questioning attitude of mind towards the Government, then you could expect that something like this could be passed. It is clear, if anybody looks at the Wireless Telegraphy Act of 1940, that Section 10 is the regular Section which provides for a Police Magistrate to be satisfied on oath that there is a reasonable ground for supposing that wireless apparatus has been concealed and so on, and it goes on to say that you apply to the Police Magistrate for a warrant and the Magistrate can order the forfeiture of the apparatus. It is clear that that is the Section which is intended.

Section 11 is the kind of Section which used to appear in Colonial Office draft legislation and be circulated to those Colonies which had either incompetent, inefficient or lazy legal draughtsmen who would just take what the Colonial Office draft legislation put out and assume that this is something put to them which could not be accepted in Britain because people believe in liberty, but they could accept it in the Colonies. Mr. Speaker, as to this Act, the constitutionality has been questioned. It is possible, in my poorly considered opinion, that as far as the collecting of Revenue is concerned, this Act, if passed, will be constitutional as far as the collecting of revenue is concerned, and nothing else. Is this not an anomalous situation? You can establish an unlicensed Wireless Station on your premises, and if we pass this Bill now, I believe that it will still not be constitutional, for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation or the Electrical Engineer to send somebody to seek for an unlicensed wireless station, but it would be legal for them to send somebody to search for an untaxed television set. Mr. Speaker, that is a joke. It seems that we are not only today taking the Legal Draughtsmen's opinion of what can be done, but we are taking their opinion of what should be done. I say that because nothing that the Minister of Communications and Works has said at any stage during the consideration of this Bill has convinced me that he has looked at what the true problem is - the liberty of Barbadians to live in their own houses without unreasonable interference with their privacy. Again, I appeal to hon. members of this House; is it desirable that in independent Barbados a man can come in your house at 3 o'clock in the morning and search in order to see if you have paid your television licence? That is the fundamental problem. I call on the Minister to turn back to the Act and he will see that Section 10 gives all the reasonable power that should be necessary to enforce the Act. The Legal Draughtsmen have so bemused themselves by giving their opinion as to whether Section 11 as amended would be constitutional, that they have not bothered to address their minds to the principles of liberty involved in passing an Act which says that at any time of the day or night somebody appointed by the Caribbean Broadcasting

no hon. member wishes to speak, and the hon. member may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is becoming an old hand at parliamentary technique. Obviously, he must know that such a question addressed to me on this Resolution would not be properly so addressed because this Resolution specifically deals with the lease of land to Airlines Services, and not with the construction of a road. When these people get the land they will put up buildings, and this is nothing at all to do with the road which the Government is building. I take it that matters, eventually, though not relevant to this, are sufficiently important to make him desire to address substantive Questions to the appropriate Ministry which, I expect, he will do.

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

THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1 becomes the instant Order of the Day, and it is to resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill intituled the Wireless (Amendment) Act, 1968. When the debate on this matter was adjourned, on a motion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph further consideration was postponed. Does the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seek to resume his address?

Mr. SMITH: No, Sir.

The question that the Bill be now 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, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

1.45 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not in here, if I may say so. I thought it only right that members of the House should see the Netherlands Antilles Parliamentarians before they left finally, especially as, I regret to say, as Your Honour is well aware, yesterday so few of us turned up to welcome them, and I have seldom met Parliamentarians in the Caribbean area who are so willing and anxious to be friends and part of a Caribbean community. I am very sorry I had to go outside - the Clerk incidentally was with us - to give them a sort of official send off.

I say that as an apology for not being in the House to speak on the debate when it was in Committee. But I warn this House - I am not going to say much more - because as members on the other side guess and guess rightly perhaps or wrongly, this Bill as it reads is going to lead to Law Court work. I warned the House twice that this was rashly done, that this Act should be almost torn to pieces and a fresh Act written if the object of the Government or anybody else is to regulate radio reception and radio operation generally in this Island. I am not going to say anything more, but I do give the warning that the Government may find themselves coming down here and asking us to vote a sum of money to pay costs in some action in which it has been proved that some aspects of this Bill are unconstitutional. Members forget that this is a war-time measure. Barbados is now an independent country with a written Constitution. In the old days it did not matter what the House of Commons did or what the House of Assembly in Barbados did, and we were practically the only people in the world outside the House of Commons who used to pass all sorts of Acts or tear up anything; but as soon as you have a written Constitution, you have to go very carefully by every word you write into that Constitution. I think that already - I would not expand on this - we have done something or allowed something unconstitutional to pass. If you look at a written Constitution, you will see that you must keep within it, and it has happened every now and again with the Supreme Court in the United States or in any other country with a written Constitution, that people go to the Law Courts and ask the Court to set aside an Act. That was something inconceivable in the old days in Barbados, but quite conceivable now.

I am not going to say anymore except that I am sorry and I apologise that I was not in the House to again point out things that I think are wrong - things that even to a layman are wrong if you look at the original Act of 1940. I only do this, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want it to be asked, if I find myself later on attacking the Legislature of this country because of this Act, why I did not do it earlier, and why I am going into Court and acting in a professional way when I should have acted on the floor of the House of Assembly.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the misfortunes of living in a Colonial country and having a Colonial mentality, a concomitant all too often of even the most determined brayer of independence, of thought, action and indeed political status, is that what people who live in countries that have never been subjected to Colonial rule call "freedom" is not understood in the same sense by those who have lived in countries subjected to Colonial rule. What an Englishman or a Frenchman - and these arguments, Mr. Speaker, are directed to you and the members of the Government particularly - means when he says "liberty" is not what a Barbadian or Martiniquan means when he says "liberty", because there have been so many Colonial laws which have given arbitrary power to the Police and to the Government in Colonial countries, that things are taken for granted by their populations which would not be taken for granted by populations of the metropolitan countries.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who have lived abroad are aware, especially, for example, if you have ever driven a motor car or walked during active demonstrations of some sort in the streets of London or in Paris that there is a healthy questioning of arbitrary authority, which is one of the benefits of the population of Europe and of the United States and of the older countries which have never had to be subjected to arbitrariness. There is a questioning of authority which we unfortunately do not seem ready to accept. Here in Barbados I know that even we find ourselves subject to a belief that because the police put up a "No Entry" sign in the road that the "No Entry" sign is lawful, and that because a policeman tells you not to turn down this road but to turn down that, that he is giving you a lawful order, just to take a small example in the sphere of traffic. I am sure that these examples could be multiplied dozens and dozens of times over. You, Mr. Speaker, must have this experience. You go to the Courts and you demand something which the law says you are to get, and a Clerk in the Court says that the Financial Rules or the Registrar tells him he must not do that and he would not do it, and you have fortunately the people who are most in the position of being refused are also the people who are most aware of what "mandamus" means. There is too much unquestioning acceptance of authority and unquestioning giving to the Government of authority to interfere in the private lives of citizens throughout every single British colony, French colony or other foreign colony in the West Indies and elsewhere.

1.55 p.m.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not such an ideal preamble as it may seem because anybody who is aware of how Europeans or Americans think, would know that Section 11 of the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940, could never have been passed except on an emergency basis. There are no circumstances in which the English House of Commons would submit, or the population of England would accept, for tax purposes at any hour of the day or night, an official appointed by the British Broadcasting Corporation, which is what we are asking Barbadians to accept.

It may be hard for members, for people who have lived in Barbados for all their lives, to understand what it means to tell a Government or Officer of Government "You are wrong; you cannot do that. I do not care if you are the Government; you cannot do that." Once you do not have that questioning attitude of mind towards the Government, then you could expect that something like this could be passed. It is clear, if anybody looks at the Wireless Telegraphy Act of 1940, that Section 10 is the regular Section which provides for a Police Magistrate to be satisfied on oath that there is a reasonable ground for supposing that wireless apparatus has been concealed and so on, and it goes on to say that you apply to the Police Magistrate for a warrant and the Magistrate can order the forfeiture of the apparatus. It is clear that that is the Section which is intended.

Section 11 is the kind of Section which used to appear in Colonial Office draft legislation and be circulated to those Colonies which had either incompetent, inefficient or lazy legal draughtsmen who would just take what the Colonial Office draft legislation put out and assume that this is something put to them which could not be accepted in Britain because people believe in liberty, but they could accept it in the Colonies. Mr. Speaker, as to this Act, the constitutionality has been questioned. It is possible, in my poorly considered opinion, that as far as the collecting of Revenue is concerned, this Act, if passed, will be constitutional as far as the collecting of revenue is concerned, and nothing else. Is this not an anomalous situation? You can establish an unlicensed Wireless Station on your premises, and if we pass this Bill now, I believe that it will still not be constitutional, for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation or the Electrical Engineer to send somebody to seek for an unlicensed wireless station, but it would be legal for them to send somebody to search for an untaxed television set. Mr. Speaker, that is a joke. It seems that we are not only today taking the Legal Draughtsmen's opinion of what can be done, but we are taking their opinion of what should be done. I say that because nothing that the Minister of Communications and Works has said at any stage during the consideration of this Bill has convinced me that he has looked at what the true problem is - the liberty of Barbadians to live in their own houses without unreasonable interference with their privacy. Again, I appeal to hon. members of this House; is it desirable that in Independent Barbados a man can come in your house at 3 o'clock in the morning and search in order to see if you have paid your television licence? That is the fundamental problem. I call on the Minister to turn back to the Act and he will see that Section 10 gives all the reasonable power that should be necessary to enforce the Act. The Legal Draughtsmen have so bemused themselves by giving their opinion as to whether Section 11 as amended would be constitutional, that they have not bothered to address their minds to the principles of liberty involved in passing an Act which says that at any time of the day or night somebody appointed by the Caribbean Broadcasting

Corporation can enter your house. I have asked hon. members on the other side if in times of emergency they would be satisfied to know that these powers exist if they were in the Opposition and we were in the Government; and members on the other side to whom I have put that, have readily agreed - of course, it is easier for them to agree that we would misuse the powers than perhaps for them to agree that they would misuse those powers; but, they have readily agreed that the powers under this Section as amended could be misused.

Mr. Speaker, why pass something into law that interferes with the liberty of the subject where it is not necessary to do so? What is the point in the original Act of having Section 10 which provides that you apply to a Police Magistrate for a search warrant, and then having Section 11 to say that you do not need to do it; you can go by yourself, that the Electrical Engineer can go himself or appoint somebody in that behalf, and now the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation can do it? What is the point of giving you a safeguard in the way of a search warrant and then passing another Section to say that you do not need it? What is the specific point in that?

Mr. Speaker, I return to the question of liberty. What are we freeing ourselves from when we become independent? Are we trying to free ourselves not just from political ties, but are we trying to free ourselves from Colonialist habits of mind? Did we become independent to substitute a tyrannical structure of Government for the tyrannical forms of Government which we endured not perhaps for the past ten or fifteen years, but which we were enduring at the time when this original Act was passed? I am obliged to His Honour the Deputy Speaker for pointing out to me that if you want to search a man's house for unlicensed firearms which can kill, you cannot do it during the hours of darkness. I think I am right in saying this. I have not checked the Act, but the powers given under this Act to search for an unlicensed television set will be greater than the powers given to the Police to search for an unlicensed gun. Mr. Speaker, I could easily make some side remarks perhaps, about members of the Government being on the side of unlicensed guns, but I am not going to get down to that. We know that members on the other side have a sense of balance towards these things. If they really believe that having an unlicensed television set is so serious an offence that it warrants your entering a house at any time, they could amend the Firearms Act so that any policeman could go into any house in Barbados and look for a gun. They may as well do that.

I wonder if the Legal Draughtsmen whom I say have been guilty - I used to think that it was only the Attorney General - but I have discovered since that it is the whole Department - of more than one, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said one - piece of legislation coming down here which sails very closely to the constitutional wind. In my opinion - and I know that it is the opinion of other reputable lawyers whom I have consulted including the hon. senior member for Christ Church and others - the Citizen-

ship Act is unconstitutional in so far as it refers to the provision for making citizens out of Commonwealth citizens who have been resident here for some years. I am not giving the names of the Constitutional lawyers; I am not sheltering behind the privileges of the House in this respect. The Legal Draughtsmen, perhaps, are not sent there to be the guardians of our liberty and that is the most charitable explanation that you can give for something like this. Any lawyer looking at Section 11 of the original Wireless Telegraphy Act, must know that that was a war-time Section passed in 1940 at a time when German submarines were thundering in Carlisle Bay. That is why Section 11 was found necessary in addition to Section 10; that is why you had to give people greater powers than just search warrants issued by a Police Magistrate. Now you come down to the stage that television sets are going to attract the complete invasion of the privacy of a man's house. I want to know which member of the Government is going to get up on a political platform and defend a Bill which they have passed and say that it is a good thing that they have given Mr. Ian Gale of the C.B.C. the right to send a man into your house at any time of the day or night. There is nothing in Section 11 about 'reasonable cause' or 'belief in the existence of an unlicensed television set'; all it says is that it shall be lawful for the Inspector; and now it is going to say, for any person appointed by C.B.C.

2.05 p.m.

In other words, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation - (ASIDES) I had hoped that the Minister of Agriculture was interrupting me to say that the Government was going to repeal Section 11 of the Bill, but I do not think that he is. Mr. Speaker, do we really want a Barbados in which a statutory corporation - irresponsible, it cannot pay its own taxes; it loses \$2 1/2 million of the people's money; when Television Stations in the rest of the world are licensed to print money, our Television Station is licensed to lose it, and these are the people, responsible to no one, into whose hands you are going to put the power to go into the house of any Barbadian whenever they feel like! Without cause? There is not a word in the Act to show that they must have good cause.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to take out a search warrant, a Police Magistrate has to be satisfied on oath that there is reasonable ground for believing the apparatus to be in a house. But who can believe that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is going to apply to a Magistrate to prove to him that there is reasonable ground for going into somebody's house? All it will have to do is to write and say - goodness knows whom it will get to go into people's houses; probably it will get Mr. Gooding-Edghill, the favourite bailiff of the Housing Authority, or somebody else, to go and look for television sets. Think of the bailiffs, Mr. Speaker - (ASIDES) We who practice in the courts know, because they are the sort of people who are likely to be appointed. Is this going to be an open charter to every hand-about in the Court houses to go into Barbadians' houses?

Mr. Speaker, they are making a joke of liberty, Members on the other side know perfectly well that the very fact that this Bill has been postponed over and over again reveals the doubts that are in the minds of some hon. members on the other side. What use is it to say that powers will be exercised sparingly? What use is it to say that the Electrical Inspector has never exercised his powers under Section 11? If he has never exercised his powers under Section 11, then that means he does not need them. If nobody's house has ever been entered under the provisions of Section 11, that can only mean that Section 11 is redundant and should be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side cannot vote for this Bill. We are not taking the risk of giving a two-thirds majority - (ASIDES) Mr. Speaker, I very much hope that the hon. Leader of the House will not mind if I quote him on platforms as saying: "It is not a strong point that people can go into a house at any hour of the day or night, allegedly, to look for wireless." I am saying it on the floor of the House; so there will be no accusation of misquotation.

When he is in the Opposition again, Mr. Speaker, let him think how he would feel if, perhaps, a Government not consisting of us, but some more violent Government came into power, and somebody came to his home at "Lemon Grove" at two o'clock in the morning to look to see whether he had a television set. There is nobody in politics in Barbados whom I can trust, Mr. Speaker, not to send somebody to my house under this Section. (ASIDES) I would trust the Minister of Communications, because he would not understand that Section 11 would give him the power to do such wickedness. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to vote for this Bill, and we are not going to give the Government any two-thirds majority to override the Constitution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel that with your responsibility to this House, the last speech we have just heard, and taking into account Section 17 of the Constitution, it is not really now a matter for the Leader of the House, or the Government. I think you should very well rule on this matter. This is a matter which, normally, I would vote for, but anything that infringes the Constitution I would not vote for. I feel that I could not give the Government a two-thirds majority in this Bill to amend the Constitution in this manner. That Section reads very clearly, and I am sure you are acquainted with it, Sir.

This is a matter of grave importance, and I would have liked to hear the legally trained men on the other side. In the absence of that, Sir, you with your great experience - this is a matter in which as Speaker, you owe a tremendous duty not only to the House, but to the inhabitants of this island. This is something which I have been watching for some time, and I think it should be postponed. I am wondering whether the legal luminaries of this House should come together and discuss with you, Sir, this infringement.

I am not going to vote for it. I want to make this clear: in time of war, emergencies, or disorder,

the Government must have power to trample anybody's rights. There are about 1,500 television sets in St. Lucia, I am told, receiving broadcasts from our station, but we do not collect anything from them. I think the people ought to pay. I have listened to the sentiments of the hon. Member for St. Thomas, and I have not heard anything to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, I have just re-read Section 17 of the Constitution, and this is a most important and tremendous matter. This is a matter on which I am not saying that you should rule offhand. If I am in order, I will move that it be postponed to give you an opportunity and more time to look into the matter. In fairness to all concerned, the Government should not rush the Bill through, having heard that a matter regarding the Constitution has been raised. It should be postponed to allow you to discuss it with the Government and the Opposition before you give your Ruling. This is a very serious matter.

It is now a quarter past two. Mr. Leader of the House, I think that this matter should be postponed to give the Speaker an opportunity to discuss it with the Government.
2.15 p.m.

What is amazing to me, Sir, is why a matter of this sort leaves doubt in the legal minds with regard to the interpretation of the Constitution. Why should the Government prefer to force this today rather than wait until next Tuesday and have a discussion with the legal people? Am I in order to postpone this, Mr. Speaker?

I beg to move that this Bill be now postponed. What has happened, Bree?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member no longer addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can see from your face that you are thinking very seriously on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: No more seriously than in respect of any other matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am surprised at you occupying that Chair and saying this. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the postponement of this matter will be divided, and as a member of this House, I am calling on you to rule on this. This is nothing that you nor I nor any responsible member of this Chamber can shirk. You know, Mr. Speaker, that I would never be rude to the Chair; therefore as the person presiding over this Chamber, I now call upon you to rule whether in your opinion this will be an infringement of Section 17 of the Constitution. If it is a breach, you will rule, and I know that even with your vast experience it must take time. I make this request because a two-thirds majority is required if it is a constitutional matter, or a simple majority if it is not.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has more or less given the impression.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter caught my eye first.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I feel it would require some time before you give your Ruling on a matter of this sort. I feel that the other side, no doubt, is also relying on section 17 of the Constitution to protect them, but there are two very vulnerable words mentioned in Section 17 which I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention.

Section 17 (1) says that "except with his consent no person shall be subjected to the search of his person or his property or the entry by others on his premises."

Section 17 (2) says: "Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law shall be held to be inconsistent with or in contravention of this Section to the extent that the law in question makes provision that is reasonably required."

Those are the two words to which I would like to draw Your Honour's attention. The Constitution specifically states that the law that is to be made, that is to say, the law that we are expected to make today, must be reasonably required. Now hon. members on the other side have heard what this side of the House has had to say on this matter. We are here as representatives of the people just as hon. members on the other side happen to be. Well then, Sir, from what has gone forth today, and from what we have heard expounded by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas in no uncertain terms, are we to understand that the other side still feels within itself that there is any possibility of establishing that this law as it stands is reasonably required? To do what? Could the other side establish that what this House is being asked to do here today is reasonably required under Section 5 of the amending Wireless Telegraphy Act? We have seen and heard enough to make us understand. How do we know what they have up their sleeves in giving authority to people, as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said, at C.B.C. to search people's houses at all hours of the night? There is no point my stressing this any further.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr HINDS and Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, no respect is being paid to hon. members of this House. Out of sheer decency you should say that you will give a Ruling afterwards; but you are putting the question! There can be no two ways about this. You cannot disregard a member who raised a question with you as Speaker. I voted for you as Speaker. You have to say something.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not have to say anything however loud the hon. senior member for Bridgetown may shout.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you have to. It is not fair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of grave disorder, this sitting now stands suspended for three quarters of an hour.

2.35 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read a third time. *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, before you were putting the question, you were intimating to the hon. senior member for the City that the hon. junior member for St. Peter had caught your eye.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter had already spoken. I did not understand that the hon. member had not completed his speech. I will ask the Clerk.

Mr. HINDS: I would very much appreciate, at least for the purpose of putting the record straight *(Asides)* All right, I am satisfied.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I remember rightly, when the hon. senior member for the City made a noise, the question had been put. All the members who are coming in now..... *(Asides)*

Mr. HINDS: I was awaiting Your Honour's ruling on a particular point. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me say this. There was a matter on which I was asked in very unparliamentary terms by an hon. member who is not now present, to give a Ruling. In respect of that matter, I will say that it is not a matter which I regard as being proper for the Chair to give a ruling on, but it is a matter, after a vote is taken here and a decision is arrived at here, which may be questioned by the Courts and decided by Her Majesty's Judges. I have no intention of giving any ruling as to the Constitutionality or otherwise of this matter.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, all of us will cheerfully, as we have to do, accept Your Honour's Ruling, but is it to be taken as an indication of the fact that Your Honour is saying that if an obviously unconstitutional Bill is before the House, I have not got the right to say that I will not entertain it? The Speaker can say: "I refuse to put that to the House." Your Honour has ruled and every Speaker will rule from time to time. This is out of order. If we pass something which is absolutely and blatantly against the Constitution, the Speaker in duty bound must say: "I shall not put that to the House." We are obeying what Your Honour has just said; but Your Honour is a lawyer - at least you were called to the Bar - (A MEMBER: Oh, oh!) You were called to the Bar many years ago, but not all men who were called to the Bar are good, bad or indifferent lawyers. They vary. They may be excellent lawyers in conveyancing, they may be excellent lawyers in the Police Magistrate's Court and they may be excellent lawyers in the Supreme Court; but no lawyer can

claim to be absolutely Al in every branch of the law. That is all I meant. If Your Honour will reflect on what was just being said, you will see that there must be an occasion when you will refuse to put to the House a motion which is made, because it is blatantly against the Constitution. I am not questioning what Your Honour has just done; Your Honour may feel, as to the interpretation of that exception in Section 17 of the Constitution, that these particular words can be capable of two interpretations and therefore Your Honour will not give one interpretation rather than the other. That is all good; but I should not like it to be said, and that is the only reason why I am speaking, that the Speaker has not got the right to refuse to put a motion on the ground that it is blatantly against the Constitution for one thing. You are putting the Government to the expense of paying costs if some individual brings an injunction in the Supreme Court which may reach the Privy Council eventually. All these costs have to be paid for by the taxpayers. I say what I said earlier today even if it means doing what I have not been doing for the past four, five, six or seven years, if it means going back to the Bar, I am prepared to fight this, to bring an injunction against this on the ground that it is unconstitutional, and there may be an appeal to the West Indian Court of Appeal or its equivalent. There may be an appeal then to the Privy Council and all these costs will have to be paid for by this Government, coming down with a supplementary Bill for legal expenses.

I have been called to the Bar 40 odd years ago. These two hon. members on my left - the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas - are lawyers, and do you think that we would stake our reputation just to make a little noise in a debate by saying that this is unconstitutional? Mr. Speaker, anyway, I rose only to say that we faithfully accept Your Honour's Ruling, but we do not want this Ruling to stretch to the extent of saying that the Speaker has no right to say "No" to a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not intend to intimate, nor have I intimated, that I extended beyond what I have stated.

Mr. HINDS: I am merely asking Your Honour if it is not for you, at some time or other, to decide whether what is being done by this Honourable House at any particular moment is something which is reasonably required.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already concluded his speech. As I understood the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, he rose on a point of order and made his point. As to the hypothetical question, I am afraid that I would not answer it even in the Speaker's Chambers. It is too hypothetical.

Mr. HINDS: Am I to understand then Sir, that the Constitution is written in hypothetical language?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I can give no opinion on that from the Chair.

The question that this Bill be now read a third time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs LOWE, CORBIN, SPRINGER, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 10.

On being called upon to vote,

Mr. HINDS: *(sitting)* Mr. Speaker, the matter which is before this Honourable House is one which can have very far-reaching consequences. It is a matter bordering on the liberty of every subject of this Island; and what this Bill which is now before this House seeks to do is to draw to our attention that the necessity has arisen for an amendment to the principal Act of 1940. It has been drawn to Your Honour's attention that this Bill should only be entertained, and I want to lay emphasis on this, if this Honourable House, or rather, if Your Honour is satisfied that the act which this House purports to do is an act which is reasonably required by this Hon. House. I am to say, Sir, that there are no circumstances presently existing in this Island, even with the presence of the Black Power movement - there are no circumstances prevailing which would warrant this Hon. House to act in a manner so that any citizen of this nation would be deprived of his rights by having members of the C.B.C. or any other Body walking into their homes at these, what we may call in Barbados, ungodly hours of the morning - 2 o'clock, 3 o'clock or at whatever time they feel like doing it - to search for things of this sort. It has been drawn to Your Honour's attention that there are other Criminal offences in which it may be permitted, like people keeping firearms on their premises.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting to the division or what?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage when the hon. member's name is called by the Clerk in a division, the hon. member should answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or by voting for the "Noes".

Mr. HINDS: But, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that I have the right to make it abundantly clear and to be sure that I do not cast my vote in a way that is in conflict with a previous vote which was cast. That is what I have got to be abundantly clear on, and that is the point on which I am addressing Your Honour. I have to be abundantly clear before I cast my vote individually.

3.25 p.m.

What I am concerned with is protecting the rights and liberties of every subject under the sun. I am imploring Your Honour to do all you possibly can to block the passage of this piece of legislation. It is not in the interest of the public; it does not serve

the good of the public and I am saying that no case has been made out to prove that it is something that is required.

Mr. Speaker, instead of the Members on the other side seeking to bring the principal Act up to date, or in line, with the 1968 requirements, we find that they are trying to fool themselves that they are just extending existing legislation. On this side of the House we maintain that this is not a case of extending existing legislation, because we have learnt from the mouths of members on the other side, Sir, that at no time Section 11 of the principal Act has ever been acted upon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot allow the hon. Member to proceed indefinitely. The hon. Member has made his points, and he may not either make a Second Reading speech, or a speech in Committee, at this stage, when the vote has been called for. The hon. member made his speech on the Third Reading. I cannot allow the hon. member, when the vote is called, to continue and to resume another speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is not a case where the vote has been called. A division has been called.

Mr. SPEAKER: The vote has been taken, a division has been called, and a member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or the "Noes".

Mr. HINDS: That is what every hon. member on this side of the House, intends to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member vote either for the "Ayes" or the "Noes"? I am afraid I cannot go on like this. Mr. Clerk, please take the vote of the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: It is not my fault this time, because I cannot be heard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to desist from his speech and cast his vote.

Mr. HINDS: This loudspeaker is not working; let an hon. member be treated with respect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can hear the hon. member quite well. The hon. member must cast his vote, and he must do so now. I call on him to desist from making a speech.

Mr. CLERK: Mr. Hinds,

Mr. HINDS : For what?

Mr. CLERK: For the Third Reading of the Bill.

Mr. HINDS: What Bill?

Mr. CLERK: A Bill intituled The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Act, 1968.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is an hon. member entitled to be apprised of what is before this Honourable House? (ASIDES)

The division continued as follows:-

NOES: Mr. HINDS and Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I heard a member voting twice. Is it in order in this House for an hon. member to vote twice?

Mr. SPEAKER: Only one vote will be recorded for that hon. member.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Did Your Honour observe how I voted?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, you voted "No".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will Your Honour ask the Clerk to ask me again?

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, please call the hon. member's name again.

The division continued as follows:-

NOES: Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. St. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk has reported to me that 10 hon. members have voted "Aye", and 5 hon. members have voted "No". I declare the Third Reading duly to be passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We know that the Clerk makes a lot of mistakes in his job, but how did he get us to be only five?

Mr. HINDS: Has my vote been counted, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask Mr. Clerk. (PAUSE) I understand that the vote of the hon. junior member for St. Peter was counted and is included, and that a mistake was made because the hon. and learned member for Christ Church - his voice either was not heard, or he was not seen.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. and learned member for Christ Church walked in with me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let there be no dispute about that. I will ask the Clerk to report to me.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, how must members be seen, or be considered as having been seen? Will Your Honour explain this point, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now told that the voting is: 10 hon. members in favour, and 6 hon. members against. I am also told that the hon. junior member for St. James was not in his seat when the question was put.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you have just announced that 10 hon. members voted "Aye", and 5 hon. members voted "No". No count has been taken since then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare that the "Ayes" have it, 10 hon. members voting for, and 6 hon. members voting against.
3.35 p.m.

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

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 10.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. St. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 8.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, I should have intimated to the House that I would like to give supplementary notice of a Resolution, and also the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would like to do one. I think that some hon. member on the other side may wish also to use this opportunity to give a notice since he was not present.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member and other hon. members have permission to give such notices now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve advances of salaries or wages to persons in the employ of the Government.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the usual Christmas loan to employees in the Public Service which we bring at this time of the year every year. I have copies here which will be circulated to hon. members, and I would like to do this in Committee at a continuation of this sitting tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are certain hon. members who were not here when notices were given, and that includes the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$58,887 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 42 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: That concludes Government Notices. Now Private Members' Notices. I am giving permission now to the hon. junior member for St. John who was not present during Question Time, and the hon. senior member for St. James who was not present when Notices were being given, to give notices now.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to anything else, if I am in order, I would like to say that I did tell the Leader of the House that I would have no objection, speaking for myself, to coming back tomorrow to deal with this matter of Christmas gratuities, but that I could not answer for the others. I personally now after speaking to them would prefer to finish it this evening than to come back tomorrow, but I will do either. I have more time at my disposal, I suppose, than anybody else on my left; so I will fall in with any majority feeling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. John give notice of his Question now?

QUESTION

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister -

Will Government in view of the increased facilities provided at Bath in the parish of St. John, declare Bath to be a Development Area?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the cost of living in this Island is spiralling beyond proportion;

AND WHEREAS the amount payable to Old Age Pensioners is hopelessly inadequate to meet the increased cost of living;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to increase the amount payable to Old Age Pensioners by at least two dollars a week.

Mr. SPEAKER: That, so far as I am aware, concludes Notices.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken for half an hour.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 145 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas

QUESTION re CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. What measure of day-to-day control is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting over the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation?

2. Is it a fact that the Minister directed that an end-of-year function planned by the Corporation to entertain representatives of advertisers should not take place although the function had been requested by the General Manager and approved by the Board?

3. Will the Minister make a statement as to what, if any, reasons were given by the General Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for his request for re-assignment of duty?

3.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

"1. No day-to-day control over the operation of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting.

2. Yes, Sir. The Minister considered the expense undesirable at the time in view of the financial problems of the Corporation which had been referred to him by the Board, with the urgent request that he should find a solution.

3. The Minister is not aware that any reasons were given by the General Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for his re-assignment of duty."

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister tell us now who is responsible for broadcasting?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think it has been announced, as the hon. member already knows, the Prime Minister is responsible.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister in a position to say what Section of the Caribbean Broadcasting Act permits the Minister to veto a function approved by the Board?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Obviously, I cannot say that without looking at the Act, but I would imagine that the Minister can give the general directions of policy, including the spending of money for the Board.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Minister says that he has not looked at the Act. Will the Minister agree that there is nothing in the Act which says a word about the general direction as to policy including expenditure?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot agree until I have seen the Act. but if the hon. member says it is so, I have no reason to doubt him.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Hon. Leader of the House know whether the Minister responsible, whether the Prime Minister knows of any other broadcasting station in which members of the Opposition to a Government are precluded from having the same opportunity as members of the Government? Can he think of any country in this world outside of Russia in which that takes place?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I can.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Well, tell us. If the hon. member says so with such assurance, surely, it is only fair that the House should know which country he is referring to.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister arrange for a course in Ministerial behaviour towards broadcasting to be taken by the Minister responsible for broadcasting?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Minister arrange for a course of training to be taken by Ministers of the Government who fail to answer Questions put by the Opposition?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I do not regard that as a supplementary.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us if broadcasting in Barbados is being used as a means of educating the people?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I believe that this is so, just like any other facility which has to be developed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In the course of development, does the Hon. Leader of the House consider that broadcasting for purposes of getting members of the public to join the D.L.P. comes first?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Does the Minister really think that it is a proper exercise of Ministerial responsibility for a Statutory Corporation to be telling that Corporation not to hold a Cock-tail party? Does the Government consider that that is a proper exercise of Ministerial responsibility?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would not think that the question of propriety would be very important here. It would certainly be a question of timeliness. The hon. member must remember that this was at a time when the Corporation was going through a period of financial stress, and the Corporation had engaged the attention of the Minister and put upon him the responsibility of finding a solution to its financial problems. It seems to me therefore, that it was very timely for the Minister to say to the Corporation, and in these circumstances it would have been proper to ask: "If you are asking me to find \$2 million for you, is this function which

you propose the sort of function which you could usefully or sensibly spend money on?" I think that this was the attitude which the Minister held, and I really do not find it possible to condemn him for this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Minister see any difference between having super functions, feeds for Ministers going abroad and coming here for supplementary Estimates before you have overspent the vote, and the C.B.C. just asking for a sum of money to entertain people? Is there any difference?

Mr. HINDS: Since the Minister has agreed that broadcasting is an educational medium, can the Minister tell us whose responsibility it is for schools' broadcasts? Is it the function of the Minister of Education or that of the Minister responsible for broadcasting?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If schools broadcast were the function of any Minister, it would be the function of the Minister of Education. The hon. member must know this because impliedly, his Question is placing the responsibility for schools' broadcasts on the Minister. At the moment such broadcasting as is done is done by private arrangement and on the private initiative of Barbados Rediffusion Ltd. I am not aware that the C.B.C. does any schools' broadcasting now; but what is done is done by Rediffusion and it is on their private initiative, of course, with the knowledge naturally of the Ministry of Education. No directive, no organization and no administration has been set up by the Ministry of Education to organize schools' broadcasting.

Mr. HINDS: Is it that such schools' broadcasts as are at presently done are a private arrangement between Rediffusion and the Minister of Education?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not say that it was a private arrangement between Rediffusion and the Ministry of Education. The Minister of Education has no responsibility whatever for broadcasting. I said that this is done on the initiative of Barbados Rediffusion; but if it did have to come under the scope or responsibility of any Minister, it would naturally be the Minister of Education.

Mr. HINDS: Can Rediffusion broadcast whatever they like to schools? Can they direct whatever programme they like to schools at any time they like to do it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would like to assist the hon. member, but I am in some difficulty in connecting this question with the original Parliamentary Question with which the hon. member's supplementary is meant to be connected.

Mr. HINDS: My supplementary is based on Question No. 1 and the Reply thereto. What measure of day-to-day control is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting over the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If that is the question, it is answered as it has been answered in respect of C.B.C., that no day-to-day control over the operation of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is exercised by the Minister responsible for Broadcasting and the hon. member would have been answered.

Mr. HINDS: Is it not my proper function to elicit from the Hon. Leader of the House such information as may contradict his Oral Replies?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House this question: Is it not the settled policy of the Government that, up to the present moment, Radio Barbados puts over a discriminatory series of programmes in which the Government Party is boosted and the Opposition Party and other Parties are left out as much as possible, and therefore it does not matter whether Rediffusion puts out a school educational programme? In short, let them teach the schools the ABC, addition and subtraction and anything else they like, but leave it to us to teach the people of Barbados politically. Is that not the position?

3.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir.

POLICY re DIGGING UP OF THE HIGHWAY FOR INSTALLATION OF PIPES, ETC

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 139 asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, which is on page 6, left hand column, at the bottom.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I asked this question so long ago that I had forgotten it. Following the custom, though I do not see any authority for it, I will read it out:

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. What policy, if any, has the Government or the Minister in respect of the digging up of sections of the highway to enable Public Utility Companies and the Waterworks Department to lay pipes, cables and the like?

2. Will the Minister recommend to the Government the establishment of a policy, to be adhered to in all cases, of all works of this nature being conducted at the same time?

3. As a means of securing this end will the Government obtain from its own Public Works Department and from Utility Companies an estimate of foreseeable and projected repair and extension works for a five year period, before allowing any further promiscuous digging up of the highways?

4. Does the Minister agree that this policy will save much inconvenience and passed-on expense to the taxpayer?

QUESTION *re* CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING
CORPORATION

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. What measure of day-to-day control is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting over the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation?

2. Is it a fact that the Minister directed that an end-of-year function planned by the Corporation to entertain representatives of advertisers should not take place although the function had been requested by the General Manager and approved by the Board?

3. Will the Minister make a statement as to what, if any, reasons were given by the General Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for his request for re-assignment of duty?

3.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

"1. No day-to-day control over the operation of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting.

2. Yes, Sir. The Minister considered the expense undesirable at the time in view of the financial problems of the Corporation which had been referred to him by the Board, with the urgent request that he should find a solution.

3. The Minister is not aware that any reasons were given by the General Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for his re-assignment of duty."

Mr. HINDS: Would the Minister tell us now who is responsible for broadcasting?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think it has been announced, as the hon. member already knows, the Prime Minister is responsible.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister in a position to say what Section of the Caribbean Broadcasting Act permits the Minister to veto a function approved by the Board?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Obviously, I cannot say that without looking at the Act, but I would imagine that the Minister can give the general directions of policy, including the spending of money for the Board.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Minister says that he has not looked at the Act. Will the Minister agree that there is nothing in the Act which says a word about the general direction as to policy including expenditure?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot agree until I have seen the Act. but if the hon. member says it is so, I have no reason to doubt him.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Hon. Leader of the House know whether the Minister responsible, whether the Prime Minister knows of any other broadcasting station in which members of the Opposition to a Government are precluded from having the same opportunity as members of the Government? Can he think of any country in this world outside of Russia in which that takes place?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I can.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Well, tell us. If the hon. member says so with such assurance, surely, it is only fair that the House should know which country he is referring to.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister arrange for a course in Ministerial behaviour towards broadcasting to be taken by the Minister responsible for broadcasting?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will the Minister arrange for a course of training to be taken by Ministers of the Government who fail to answer Questions put by the Opposition?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I do not regard that as a supplementary.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us if broadcasting in Barbados is being used as a means of educating the people?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I believe that this is so, just like any other facility which has to be developed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In the course of development, does the Hon. Leader of the House consider that broadcasting for purposes of getting members of the public to join the D.L.P. comes first?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Does the Minister really think that it is a proper exercise of Ministerial responsibility for a Statutory Corporation to be telling that Corporation not to hold a Cock-tail party? Does the Government consider that that is a proper exercise of Ministerial responsibility?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would not think that the question of propriety would be very important here. It would certainly be a question of timeliness. The hon. member must remember that this was at a time when the Corporation was going through a period of financial stress, and the Corporation had engaged the attention of the Minister and put upon him the responsibility of finding a solution to its financial problems. It seems to me therefore, that it was very timely for the Minister to say to the Corporation, and in these circumstances it would have been proper to ask: "If you are asking me to find \$2 million for you, is this function which

you propose the sort of function which you could usefully or sensibly spend money on?" I think that this was the attitude which the Minister held, and I really do not find it possible to condemn him for this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Minister see any difference between having super functions, feeds for Ministers going abroad and coming here for supplementary Estimates before you have overspent the vote, and the C.B.C. just asking for a sum of money to entertain people? Is there any difference?

Mr. HINDS: Since the Minister has agreed that broadcasting is an educational medium, can the Minister tell us whose responsibility it is for schools' broadcasts? Is it the function of the Minister of Education or that of the Minister responsible for broadcasting?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If schools broadcast were the function of any Minister, it would be the function of the Minister of Education. The hon. member must know this because impliedly, his Question is placing the responsibility for schools' broadcasts on the Minister. At the moment such broadcasting as is done is done by private arrangement and on the private initiative of Barbados Rediffusion Ltd. I am not aware that the C.B.C. does any schools' broadcasting now; but what is done is done by Rediffusion and it is on their private initiative, of course, with the knowledge naturally of the Ministry of Education. No directive, no organization and no administration has been set up by the Ministry of Education to organize schools' broadcasting.

Mr. HINDS: Is it that such schools' broadcasts as are at presently done are a private arrangement between Rediffusion and the Minister of Education?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not say that it was a private arrangement between Rediffusion and the Ministry of Education. The Minister of Education has no responsibility whatever for broadcasting. I said that this is done on the initiative of Barbados Rediffusion; but if it did have to come under the scope or responsibility of any Minister, it would naturally be the Minister of Education.

Mr. HINDS: Can Rediffusion broadcast whatever they like to schools? Can they direct whatever programme they like to schools at any time they like to do it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would like to assist the hon. member, but I am in some difficulty in connecting this question with the original Parliamentary Question with which the hon. member's supplementary is meant to be connected.

Mr. HINDS: My supplementary is based on Question No. 1 and the Reply thereto. What measure of day-to-day control is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting over the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If that is the question, it is answered as it has been answered in respect of C.B.C., that no day-to-day control over the operation of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is exercised by the Minister responsible for Broadcasting and the hon. member would have been answered.

Mr. HINDS: Is it not my proper function to elicit from the Hon. Leader of the House such information as may contradict his Oral Replies?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House this question: Is it not the settled policy of the Government that, up to the present moment, Radio Barbados puts over a discriminatory series of programmes in which the Government Party is boosted and the Opposition Party and other Parties are left out as much as possible, and therefore it does not matter whether Rediffusion puts out a school educational programme? In short, let them teach the schools the ABC, addition and subtraction and anything else they like, but leave it to us to teach the people of Barbados politically. Is that not the position?

3.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir.

POLICY re DIGGING UP OF THE HIGHWAY FOR INSTALLATION OF PIPES, ETC

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 139 asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, which is on page 6, left hand column, at the bottom.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I asked this question so long ago that I had forgotten it. Following the custom, though I do not see any authority for it, I will read it out:

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. What policy, if any, has the Government or the Minister in respect of the digging up of sections of the highway to enable Public Utility Companies and the Waterworks Department to lay pipes, cables and the like?

2. Will the Minister recommend to the Government the establishment of a policy, to be adhered to in all cases, of all works of this nature being conducted at the same time?

3. As a means of securing this end will the Government obtain from its own Public Works Department and from Utility Companies an estimate of foreseeable and projected repair and extension works for a five year period, before allowing any further promiscuous digging up of the highways?

4. Does the Minister agree that this policy will save much inconvenience and passed-on expense to the taxpayer?

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say this *apropos* a remark made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I agree that it is unnecessary to read the question, but it sometimes helps to refresh the memory of hon. Members of the Questions which they put sometime ago.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. Public Utility companies are required to submit their pipe and cable laying programmes to the Ministry one year in advance to permit the Ministry to plan its road works projects and to ensure proper programming and co-ordination of all road works projects in any given area. The Ministry already pursues a policy of simultaneous road openings wherever practicable in order to minimise any inconvenience to the public and to reduce reinstatement costs. However, there are occasions when it is impossible for the utility companies to notify in advance proposals for road openings as emergency excavations are often required.

2. Does not arise.

3. It is considered that a five year programme is unlikely to be more meaningful than the existing policy of a planned programme annually in advance which is considered more practicable.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member seriously think that if you know beforehand for five years what your policy is going to be that that will not be less expensive than if you have a yearly programme? I am asking the Minister whether the Government seriously says that, from an economic point of view, it is better to have an annual programme?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, not only does the Government think so, but I, as Minister, know so, for the simple reason that no person can tell when machinery or mechanism will breakdown. Experts have been working on the Apollo Rockets, and they cannot tell when the machinery will breakdown. How can anybody plan for a burst pipe underground? How can anybody plan for five years when he does not know what is going to happen? It is impossible and impractical.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member saying that as a serious grown up man? (An Hon. Member. (Opposition): He has not yet grown up.) You can plan for five years. Emergencies may take place, but what has an emergency to do with my Question? I asked him a simple question: Has the Government considered that planning for one year was more economical than planning for five years? All the hon. Member can tell me is that something may break down. What is that to do with planning? When you have a burst pipe.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member is making a speech; he is not asking a question. This is not speech time; this is Question time. He does not know what he is asking for. His Question states:

"1. What policy, if any, has the Government or the Minister in respect of the digging up of sections of the highway to enable Public Utility Companies and the Waterworks Department to lay pipes, cables and the like?"

When you lay a pipe, a cable, or the like, you have no control over that. You can lay a pipe today, and it may be broken tomorrow. Must you allow an area to be short-circuited because a Member may come here and ask a silly question?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have tried, as mildly as I can, to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister who answered the Question — not No. 1, but Question No. 3 which states:

As a means of securing this end will the Government obtain from its own Public Works Department and from Utility Companies an estimate of foreseeable and projected repair and extension works for a five year period? That is a simple Question. Cannot you ask the Utility Companies — (*Asides*) I wish the hon. member would not interrupt me.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, he is making a speech.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, fancy the hon. member, who ought to get down on his knees and thank God that he is on the floor of this House, trying to correct me!

Mr. SPEAKER: No supplementary questions may be addressed to the deity.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is the hon. member trying to correct Your Honour, or to correct me? I asked a simple question, and he could have given me a simple answer. I will now draw his attention to it: Is foreseeable expenditure — not a possible breakdown — a burst pipe! Is it not better to ask the Companies, or to ask the Waterworks Department, because I suppose the hon. member will ask the Waterworks Department rather than give an answer himself, to extend pipes in Poreys Spring? Why cannot you say that in the next five years you will extend pipes to Poreys Spring, Welchman Hall, and so on? Why cannot you project a five-year-plan and ask Public Utility Companies to do the same thing. That is all I ask. Have a policy instead of promiscuous digging up of the road.

Mr. SPEAKER: Supplementary question duly put.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I ask him to answer that. I do not expect him to answer it — bad manners all the time.
4.05 p.m.

I do not expect an answer. I say again, that the hon. member ought to thank God that he is sitting in the same room as some of us on this side instead of being rude.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a question

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Now I am asking this supplementary question. Has it been drawn to the attention — and you have to mix with all types and you have to put up with all types of people, whatever their manners — has it been drawn to the attention of the Ministry that when these diggings up are ended the road is not put back flat? There is no road I have been over which has been properly put back. Has he done anything as regards that? You passed a three-lane traffic regulation, and you have your heart in your mouth that your car would not shift over and hit one side or the other because the road is not put back flat. Has that been drawn to the Government's attention? Has the Government insisted on approving of the final repair? What I am saying, every man who drives a motor car in this Island knows is true. It happens all day long.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell me if his attention has been drawn to the serious inconvenience suffered by the travelling public resulting from the excavation works now being carried out at various points in this Island by the Mitchell Construction Company?

The Minister seems not inclined to answer. I wonder if the Minister knows that highways are being dug up at various points at the present moment and have been so dug up for some months and that the public is seriously inconvenienced.

Well, Sir, as you know, I can make the Minister reply. I can make him get to his feet right now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that does not sound supplementary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 105 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

QUESTION re VACATION PAY TO H & T WORKERS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is it a fact that workers from the various parishes of Barbados employed in the Department of Highways and Transport, have to travel to the Head Office of H & T at the Pine, St. Michael during their vacation period for their wages?

If the answer is Yes, will the Minister state the reason why?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:-

(1) Yes, Sir. It should be pointed out, however, that some workers receive wages in respect of their vacation periods at their work sites at their request.

(2) Paysheets of wages payable in respect of workers on vacation leave contain the names of workers attached to worksites scattered throughout the Island. Consequently it was found more convenient to have workers come to a central point - the Ministry's Headquarters in the Pine - to receive their wages than to detail a special Pay Officer to travel around the Island on the day on which wages are paid. Also quite a number of workers do not live near the work site and for these it was thought that coming to the Ministry's Headquarters would be more convenient than going to their work sites. To obviate any hardship to the workers concerned it is proposed to pay them their vacation pay immediately prior to going on leave. This payment will be made in the field.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to the Hon. Minister for his reply, but as a supplementary, I am glad that the Minister has seen the light, that they were doing wrong before and through my asking this Question they have fixed it right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not detect the supplementary. Question No. 180 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

QUESTION re BAYLEY'S ALLEY, ST. GEORGE

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:

Is Government aware that the road leading through Bayley's Alley, St. George, is now well-nigh impassable?

2. Will the Government take steps to have the present road repaired, or a new road constructed, as the case may be, in the said district?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The road will be included for consideration when the 1969-70 Road Works Programme is being prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 247 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

QUESTION re SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE TO CHAIRMAN OF TOURIST BOARD

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister state the total sum paid by Government as subsistence allowance to the present Chairman of the Tourist Board in respect of trips

made by him outside the Island during his term of office?

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

"During his five and a half year term of office from January, 1963 to the end of August, 1968, the Tourist Board paid a total of \$13, 150 in respect of expenses of the Chairman on fifteen promotional and business trips undertaken on behalf of the Board."

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be able to say if this includes his hotel bills or is just subsistence allowance?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is in respect of board and lodging and subsistence.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Will the Minister state what was the rate of subsistence exclusive of board and lodging?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot, and if hon. members wish to know the itemized break-down, it is available here. It starts from 6th. April, 1963, and ends June, 1968.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Could the Minister give us a sample of six months this year?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: One this year. In June 1968 this year, a C. T. A. meeting in Canada \$225.

Mr. CRAIG: Would the Minister say whether this is Canadian or E. C. currency?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It would have to be E. C. Were it not so, I would have told the House.

Mr. HINDS: Now that the Minister has informed us that his reply is really in connection with board and lodging and subsistence, would the Minister now proceed to answer the Question as asked by the hon. member at No. 247? The Question asked for subsistence allowance; it does not ask about board and lodging.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not think that is a very strong point, Mr. Speaker. The question may have been imperfectly or narrowly framed, but the answer is wider than the terms of the Question. That is what I understand the hon. member to be saying. In other words, the Question asked about subsistence, but the answer deals with board and lodging and subsistence. 4.15 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: The Minister said that it was \$225 for the month of June. Would the Minister be in a position to say how many days in the month of June did the Chairman of the Tourist Board spend abroad?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would not be able to say that. I offered to give hon. members a full breakdown for all journeys recorded here from 1963 to 1968 and I

mentioned June, 1968, because the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church asked for a sample month or a sample portion of a year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that Question Time has now expired.

Mr. HINDS: How much of the \$225 was for subsistence in June? That will satisfy us.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It would have to be some portion of it. *(Laughter)*

Mr. CRAIG: Would the hon. Leader of the House be able to say what portion of it?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Did the hon. Leader of the House ever consider getting a job as teacher of village idiots?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that as a supplementary question, the more so because it is out of time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is "Yes", but you cannot run a school with one pupil. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time has expired.

EXTENSION OF QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be extended for another half an hour.

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

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

QUESTION *re* SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE TO CHAIRMAN OF TOURIST BOARD

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister indicated that he would have told us what portion of the \$225 was for subsistence allowance in June.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I did not indicate that I would state what portion. I said that I imagined that of any sum mentioned here, some portion of it would cover subsistence. The information supplied on this file is information which answers the Question direct. The Question was what was the total sum paid to the Chairman of the Tourist Board in respect of trips? I have supplied figures against each trip, and presumably, the date on which the Chairman of the Tourist Board left the Island. The duration of the trips is not mentioned in every case. For instance, on the 6th April, 1963, there was the opening of the London Office and the cost of that was \$345. The second one is the 30th April to the 8th May, promotional tour to Venezuela and the cost of that was \$1,037, but as to the promotional tour to Canada from the 12th May to 18th May of the same year, the cost against that

is \$357. After that, from the 8th March to the 21st March, 1964, there was another promotional tour to the United States of America and the cost of that was \$1,245. Then on the 21st August, there was a visit to Canada in connection with the setting up of a new office and the cost of that was \$440.48.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would just give way, I do not want him to quote the whole thing. Can the Minister tell us the days of these trips which the Tourist Board Chairman has made? Can he tell us the number of days and how much was spent?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can certainly tell the hon. member the days because, as I said, in respect of some of the visits, the duration is mentioned. For instance, the promotional tour to Canada from the 12th May to the 18th May, 1963, the figure against that is \$357. The promotional tour from the 30th April to 8th May, 1963, to Venezuela; the figure against that is \$1,037. From the 11th March to 25th March, 1965, the promotional tour to Canada cost \$1,917, but in September of the same year, the figure was \$174.42.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the cost of the Chairman's travels backwards and forwards included in these amounts?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I particularly said, and I quoted from the file that the total figure of \$13,150 represented board and lodging and subsistence.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister intend to reply to the Question asked by the hon. member as laid?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Unless we are talking at cross purposes, I understand the Question put to be this: "Will the Minister state the total sum paid to the present Chairman of the Tourist Board in respect of trips made by him outside the Island?"

Mr. HINDS: This is coming from a former Oxford Debating Society....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot make a speech now.

Mr. HINDS: The Question reads as follows: "Will the Minister state the total sum paid by Government as subsistence allowance." The Minister has not seen those words "subsistence allowance".

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a time for comment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have here on this file at Minute No. 27: "House of Assembly, 3rd September, 1968, addressed to the Cabinet Secretary: The following question was enquired of the appropriate Minister by Mr. L. S. Craig; 'Will the Minister state the total sum paid to the present Chairman of the Tourist Board in respect of trips made by him outside the Island during his term of office?'"

That is the text of the Question as it has reached the Cabinet, and it is to this that we have replied.

Nobody in the Cabinet, unless, as I have just done now for the first time, unless he had looked at the printed text of the Question on today's Order Paper, would have suspected that there was any difference between what came to us and what is here printed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like firstly to be fair to the Clerk. I would like the Clerk to have an opportunity to see the file as just read by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is Question Time.

Mr. HINDS: Since this is the case, it would be best if we allow the Question to remain on the Order Paper and give the Minister time to reply to it, because he has not replied to the question as laid by the hon. member.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I see it, a check will have to be made. The Question, as handed on the 27th August, 1968, by the hon. senior member for St. James - I will read it:

"House of Assembly,
3rd September, 1968.

The Cabinet Secretary,

The following question was inquired of the appropriate Minister by Mr. L. S. Craig on the 27th August, 1968.

H. O. St.C. Cumberbatch,
Clerk, House of Assembly.

Parliamentary Question No. 247

Will the Minister state the total sum paid to the present Chairman of the Tourist Board in respect of trips made by him outside the Island during his term of office?"

The signature "H. O. St.C. Cumberbatch", to me, is the signature of the Clerk of the House, which I have seen on many occasions.

Mr. HINDS: From the same file, do you see the words "paid by Government"?

Mr. SPEAKER: I see nothing other than that which I have read. I have read everything that is there.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if you will refer to the notes made by the Reporter, you will find that the Leader of the House read out the words "paid by Government". You have just read from the same file, and you do not see the words "paid by Government".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask the Leader of the House, how does he square what he has now said as if for the first time he has noted that a line was omitted from the Clerk's letter? How does he square that with the fact that for

ten to fifteen minutes the discussion was subsistence? Separate boarding from subsistence. How does he square that with what happened before we agreed to resume Question Time?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that is quite easily explained. I have not seen the printed Question; so I assumed, quite rightly from my point of view, that hon. members were trying to push me in an awkward situation by trying to force from me information about subsistence which I did not have. Obviously I did not have it, because, as I have shown you, from reading the Question as it came to the Cabinet, a specific accounting of subsistence was not asked for and, therefore, I could not give it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the House did not have the words "subsistence allowance", but trips were mentioned, why, in his reply, did he include subsistence allowance and did not include the cost of the Chairman's travels?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this is even simpler. The reason is this: I see on a note in the file which tells me that the sum referred to here covers boarding and lodging and subsistence, and I said this. That is why I mentioned it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, while I do not differ from what the hon. Member has just said, because I remember quite clearly that he read that part, how does the hon. Member square what he says is his inability to say the rates, when he gave us the number of days and the sum? Cannot any village idiot divide it? I am sorry I used that phrase, because when I said that just now, the hon. Member made some remark that caused laughter. The hon. Member must have noticed that recently I have been trying my best to co-operate with him and to be mild in everything, but if he attempts to make fun at me, he will get all that we ought to give him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that we are now expending time which might be more profitably employed in respect of another Question, because it is clear to me that a certain Question was put by the hon. member, but that that Question is not being answered by the Minister. I am going to direct that the Clerk—even if I have to supervise that as well—has properly typed a copy of the hon. Member's Question from the hon. Member's manuscript. This Question may remain on the Order Paper. I will supervise it myself; if I have to do all the work, I will.

REQUEST FOR DISTRICT HOSPITAL AT HOLETOWN

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the same hon. senior Member for St. James, I understand that there is an answer to No. 248, which is on page 14, right hand column.

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

Is the Minister aware that there is urgent need for a District Hospital at Holetown, St. James?

2. Will the Minister treat the provision of such a Hospital at Holetown as an urgent priority?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

1. No, Sir.

2. No, Sir. Birth statistics for the parish of St. James for the year 1967 indicate that a District Hospital in the area would be an uneconomical service.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, all Hospitals are uneconomical. I wonder whether the hon. Minister is aware that there has been a build-up in the Holetown area within the past three years and, in the absence of the St. James Infirmary, if his Ministry does not see the necessity to have a District Hospital there?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be a very active member and is fully aware of what goes on in his and in the neighbouring constituencies. There is a Hospital in St. Peter at present; there is the Roman Catholic Hospital at St. Joseph which serves the needs of the Northern Parishes. There is a District Hospital at Oistins, Christ Church, and there is another one in St. Andrew which is more or less complete, and when finally renovated will be a Maternity Hospital as such. It will provide maternity services, incorporating facilities for outpatients clinics in the same way as the one at Oistins.

The statistics of births registered in the various Parishes for the year 1967 were as follows:

St. Michael	...	2,188
Christ Church	...	713
St. George	...	405
St. Philip	...	379
St. James	...	327
St. Thomas	...	272
St. John	...	264
St. Peter	...	264
St. Lucy	...	255
St. Joseph	...	202
St. Andrew	...	186

In the Government Development Plan 1965-68, provision is made for a District Maternity Hospital in St. Andrew, St. George and St. Peter.
4.35 p.m.

The St. Andrew's Hospital has been completed and is now functioning in so far as the outpatients' section is concerned, but the main building is undergoing certain final repairs owing to leaks which have been discovered. The other two Hospitals are included in the Ministry's Draft Development Plan for 1968-72. In so far as the St. George's Hospital is concerned, further review of the matter has brought to light that a hospital of the planned size - twenty beds - should serve 900 cases a year to justify its existence, but statistics show that in the St.

George's Infirmary the Maternity block with six beds only had 63 cases in 1967. In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is felt that further revision has to be looked into as far as the St. Joseph Hospital is concerned, and by providing some hospital on some outlying district of St. Michael and St. George which will serve a dual purpose - it would indeed serve the outside parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. Thomas and St. James; so St. James would be taken care of in the further review in so far as the siting of this particular hospital is concerned.

Further, Mr. Speaker, there is a hospital in St. Peter, as I said from the outset, and it is felt that every assistance be given to this St. Joseph Hospital which is already in existence and which has allocated 20% of the 140 beds for maternity cases in the area. There is no point having the St. Joseph Hospital functioning and trying to kill it. We try to co-operate, and if they have allocated 20% of their beds for maternity cases, we feel that the Government should co-operate with the St. Joseph Hospital authorities and try and make it work, make a success of it and provide a better service for that area.

Mr. SPEAKER: That concludes the Question in respect of which answers have been made.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Communications has some Replies.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I have Replies to Questions Nos. 225, 205 and 168.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 168 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that this Question be printed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let it be printed.

Question No. 205 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

QUESTION re POSTAL STAFF AT HOLETOWN POST OFFICE

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is the Minister aware of the need of more postmen to be attached to the Hometown Post Office?

2. Is the Minister aware that a requisition in respect of increased postal staff has been applied for in respect of the Hometown Post Office?

3. Will the Minister use his good offices to see that such increased staff be made available as soon as possible?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir!

2. The Postmen attached to the St. James Post Office made representations for increased staff.

3. The establishment of the St. James Post Office has been increased by one post of Senior Postman and three temporary posts of Postmen. An assessment of the need for Postmen is being made on an island-wide basis and the establishment of the St. James Post Office will be further increased, if this proves to be necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 225 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for Christ Church.

QUESTION re PARKING FACILITIES AT OISTIN

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there are no proper parking facilities in the Oistin area in the parish of Christ Church?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, is Government prepared to create parking facilities in the said area?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Provision of parking facilities in the Oistins Area is under active consideration.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be able to tell us if this is the first time they have ever taken the Oistin Town park facilities under active consideration?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this matter is under very active consideration, and there are new plans for re-developing the entire area.

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the Minister give us the assurance that these plans will be published so that the public can have the opportunity of contributing towards the making of these plans?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of Oistins area would be notified first. (Asides) You don't live there! you only pass through. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Order!) Know your place!

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not ordinarily object to offensive remarks especially coming from the hon. member who has just made that, because he cannot help it; but for the sake of the dignity of the House, is that sort of thing to be allowed to go unnoticed?

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have a genuine supplementary. *(Laughter)* Will the Minister see to it that something is done partially now to relieve the situation before the fishing season which is due to come into force in January? Will the Minister for instance consider levelling out the area of land between the Salvation Army Hall and the Infirmary as a temporary solution so that during this year's fishing season we do not get the congestion which we get every year?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not really know if I can answer that; but in fairness to the hon. member, I would say that we do have something big planned for Oistin, and I do not like this piece-meal business, because when you do that you eventually spend a lot of money and do not get the necessary effect which you set out to get. I am sure that both hon. members would be extremely pleased with what we have planned to do at Oistin.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the hyena-like laughter that accompanied the beginning of the last hon. member's speech, I rose on a point of order because of the rude, offensive remarks from the other side. I was not putting any supplementary question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 168 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

QUESTION re TRAFFIC LIGHTS

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

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is it a fact that most, if not all, of the traffic signal detector pads at road junctions controlled by traffic lights have been covered by the Ministry and that these detectors are no longer serviceable, with the consequence that the lights are now operating on a fixed time basis and cannot automatically adjust themselves to the volume of traffic approaching road junctions?

2. What liaison, if any, exists between the departments of Government responsible for maintenance of traffic lights and the departments responsible for controlling road traffic?

3. If the answer to paragraph 1 is "yes" will the Minister state on whose advice was the decision to cover the detector pads taken?

4. Will the Minister consider returning control of the entire traffic lights system to the Commissioner of Police who is still responsible for general traffic control?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I have asked that this Question be printed since the hon. member was not in his place when it was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has come in and I have allowed the Question to be asked.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I will answer it, but we cannot have a two-way system. If we come to an agreement on something, I expect that agreement to remain. Before I reply to the Question, I will say that I heard some rude remark about hyena-like laughter. I prefer to make hyena-like laughter than to have a boar-hog roar.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not an answer to any Question. In any event, Question Time has expired. This Question will remain on the Order Paper for next meeting.
4.45 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

ADVANCES OF SALARY OR WAGES TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that the Resolution, copies of which have been circulated to hon. members earlier today, be taken as the next Order of the Day. It is a Resolution for a sum of money not exceeding \$400,000 to be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advances of salary or wages to persons in the employ of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take this Resolution as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. *(A Pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted.

The next Order of the Day therefore is to move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$400,000 be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advances of salary or wages to persons in the employ of the Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to deal with this Resolution in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed with this Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is much in this Resolution which would be unfamiliar to hon. members. The scheme for advancing salaries or parts of salaries at Christmas time was started in 1962. At the 30th September, 1968, the total amount remaining outstanding or unrepaid against advances made since the inception of the Scheme was \$8,558.68. In each of the five years, I suppose since 1962, where we have had advanced roughly \$400,000 nearly \$2 million, the only amount outstanding or not repaid is \$8,558.68, in respect of almost 11,000 people. That is a splendid record indeed. There are certain regulations which attend these advances. For instance, no employee shall be eligible for an advance in 1968 until the previous advance of 1967 has been repaid in full, and, of course, these advances should be repayable by deductions from the salaries or wages in monthly or weekly instalments as the case may be, between the next pay day following the date on which the advance is given, and the 31st March at the end of the financial year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Suppose an employee does not consent?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that the hon. member's question is if an employee does not consent to the conditions of the deductions. Well, he just does not get the advance. He signs the agreement, the release, or whatever it is; he signs as having agreed to these conditions and, having repaid all the previous loans, gets the advance.

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

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.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 37

EDUCATION - MOBILE CLASSROOM UNITS

A Resolution for the sum of \$112,000 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 38

STATISTICAL SERVICE - FURNITURE & EQUIPMENT

A Resolution for the sum of \$120 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 40

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS - ELECTRICITY

A Resolution for the sum of \$1,500 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 41

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS & WORKS PLANT, TOOLS, SPARES AND EQUIPMENT

A Resolution for the sum of \$13,689 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER the passing of four Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

4.55 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT AND PENDING BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I should like to intimate to the hon. Members that the hon. and learned Minister of Finance proposes to move the Second Reading of the Income Tax Bill next Tuesday. I am very grateful to hon. Members opposite for having assisted in clearing the Order Paper with the exception of the Income Tax Bill and the other Bill. We can spend as much time as we wish next Tuesday on the Income Tax Bill which is, of course, of great importance, and a debate in which hon. Members on both sides, I believe, will wish to take part.

Do hon. Members opposite have any feeling about coming early next Tuesday to start on the Income Tax Bill? Let us say ten o'clock or twelve o'clock. (ASIDES) Mr. Deputy Speaker, there seems to be a consensus about starting at twelve o'clock. I want to warn hon. members, however, that it might be a fairly long sitting, not because of controversy, but because, of course, the Bill is a long one and it will take some time going through Committee. But since we are not likely to be doing anything else, I do not think there will be any great inconvenience.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, November 26, 1968, at twelve noon.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second that in order to be able to say that I am glad the hon. Leader of the House said something about members on both sides of the House being interested. Even non-lawyers should study the Income Tax Bill carefully, because it affects all of us. Even some lawyers are finding difficulty about it. It seems to me that questions being asked by laymen as to the interpretation of a particular section would be extremely useful to those other members of the House who may happen to be lawyers, but who may like to know what the average man feels about a particular portion of the Act. It is tough work going through this Act, but I do hope that hon. members, even though they are laymen, will study the Act and come forward with any points they have.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was late, but I am asking leave that the Resolution I have tabled earlier today be made Item No. 1 under Private Members' Business at the next sitting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is all right.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 26th November, 1968, at twelve noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.00 p.m.