

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd September, 1968.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committees) and Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN.

Prayers were read.

Mr. HINDS and Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will recall that there were five sets of Minutes, the confirmation of which was left over until this Meeting inasmuch as hon. members may not have had sufficient time to pursue those sets of Minutes. Those Minutes I am prepared now to submit for confirmation unless any hon. member objects. (After a pause). If no hon. member objects, I declare each of those Minutes for those five meetings duly confirmed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Mr. SPRINGER entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

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

Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Auditor General for the year ended 31st March, 1966 and 1967 respectively.

Investment Guaranty Agreement.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1968. I should also like to ask permission of the House to deal with this Bill in all its stages today along with another Amendment which was on the Order Paper some weeks ago.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 229, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, and the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 212, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention that two sittings ago I gave notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 214 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, and the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 191, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, were ready.

QUESTIONS

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

Can the Minister say whether the gas found in the wells at the Mount, St. George, will be used to extend the natural gas service to the community?

Will the wells at the Mount make any substantial difference to the belief that the exploration for oil in Barbados has not yet proved commercial?

Mr. SARGEANT and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the House and took their seats.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Lions Club of Barbados met yesterday and recommended the acceptance of the Bill by this Honourable House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for that information.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1968, be now read a first time.

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

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

SELECT COMMITTEE DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to discharge with my thanks the Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Amendments of the Senate to the Bill intituled "The Dairy Industry (Regulation and Control) Act, 1968". The labours of that Committee have been completed and I beg to thank hon. members who were associated with me for their co-operation.

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. Question Time and Private Members' Business will be taken in their due course.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

12.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

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

ESTIMATES OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT FOR THE YEAR 1968-69

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Minister of

Communications and Works, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the expenditure required to supplement the Annexed Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1968-69 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, first, I must thank hon. members on the other side; secondly, I must make an apology for the briefness of the Addendum. The Port Department included a Capital Estimates section in the presentation of their 1968-69 Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure making provision to purchase as replacements 2 launches, 1 pump and 1 truck.

Section 4 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960-29 provides:

"The Governor in Executive Committee is hereby empowered to provide in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or any subsidiary legislation made thereunder, a co-ordinated and integrated system of harbour facilities, lighthouses and Port Services within the Island by means of a Department to be known as the Port Department."

I guess that everybody on the opposite side knows of this.

The important thing in this matter, Mr. Speaker, which hon. members would want to know, is that the sum of \$110,600 is required for Marine Equipment \$105,000, and Mechanical Equipment \$5,600. Mr. Speaker, this money is needed to supply 2 launches 1 pump and 1 truck. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has apologised for the short Addendum, because he knows that when you ask for \$110,600 and you say 2 launches, 1 pump and 1 truck, any awake opposition would want to know how much for the launches, how much for the pump, and how much for the truck. The Addendum states that the Capital expenditure was inadvertently omitted. We all know that the Port is doing an excellent job, and we would hate even to hold up for a minute this Resolution which the hon. member so ably put forward. I am sure he will have in his file the breakdown of this sum, and he can tell us how much the launches will cost. If he cannot tell us that, then I am sure the Hon. Minister of Trade will know all about these launches, and he will even give him the names of the launches. I would also like to know the cost of the pump and the cost of the truck. I do not think I am asking him too much.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the Minister will be willing to tell us what is the age of this truck that is going to be replaced. We ought to bear in mind the fact that the Port Department has not been in existence for so long as to cause a lorry to suffer from considerable wear and tear, thereby making it necessary to have a replacement.

I am sure the Minister will gladly tell us something about the age of these launches, and what services they have rendered so far, so that we may better be able to determine if the Port Department is getting sufficient service from the launches and the truck. I am sure the Minister will give us the information, and let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who wishes to speak, let the Minister proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: In reply to the question asked by the junior member for St. Peter, the truck would be in the vicinity of 7 years. So far as the launches are concerned, all of us who had anything to do with the waterfront will remember that when the Harbour was first opened we were using some skiffs, because it was not necessary to use proper launches for mooring ships and so on. Apparently, when the Harbour was opened, no provision was made for certain things. This money is to replace a launch that was given to us by the Canadian Government. You will notice that I have looked around, before I say what I have to say, to see whether any Canadians are here. The launch was not the type of launch to do the work required to be done in the Harbour. It was not designed for this type of work. Anybody who worked on a launch would know that the moment a boat starts to make speed the bow would go up, but this launch did the opposite; it was like a submarine, and the moment it started to make speed the bow would go down. That is the reason why it is proposed to replace it.

In reply to the senior member for the City regarding the price of the launches, the three pieces of Marine Equipment (2 launches and 1 pump) will cost \$105,000, and the truck will cost \$5,600. I believe that whenever the Government puts out tenders for these vehicles, there is a notice to the effect that it is likely that the vehicle to be replaced will be traded in.

12.35 p.m.

I do not know if there is any other point which I did not answer, but I think that is all.

The question that the 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. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

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

THE DEMONETISATION (BRITISH CARIBBEAN CURRENCY BOARD COIN) ACT, 1968

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which we now have before us is a comparatively simple one. As a matter of fact, I wonder if apart from its being a formality it is really necessary, because I cannot remember for years having seen these half-

cent coin in circulation. The Bill seeks to demonetise the half-cent coin which was issued by the British Caribbean Currency Board. The authority for issuing of notes and coins now is the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority which is a different institution from the British Caribbean Currency Board. The Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority has issued no half-cent coins, but when the British Caribbean Currency Board in which both Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago participated was dissolved, the coin issue of the British Caribbean Currency Board was taken over by the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, but the old coins which were used by the British Caribbean Currency Board in which Great Britain, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago were the additional partners or signatories are still in circulation, and except for the half cent coin which has not been circulated for a very long time, there is also a large amount of surplus copper which the Currency Authority has authorised to be sold, because it is surplus to the requirements of the much smaller area which the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority now covers.

Copper is now fetching a reasonable price on the London Markets, and I think that is one of the reasons why the Currency Authority has at this stage examined their vaults, as it were, in order to rid itself of any unprofitable assets which they may be holding. I do not think anyone will shed a tear. The cost of living and the standard of living have improved throughout all these Islands, and nobody can get a half cent in salt or a half cent in fish cakes any more nowadays. As a matter of fact, those days disappeared way back in the thirties. There may have been territories in the region that utilised the half cent coin, but I do not think this coin was ever in use or circulation in Barbados. Clause 3 is the effective Clause of the Bill which demonetises the half cent coin, and I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am not pressing this, but I just suggest that it would help us if you circulated half cents, because when a seller is pricing, if a thing comes to half cent, he is going to make it a cent, and therefore the customer loses every time. I only wanted to say that without pressing it. If a thing comes even to ninepence, they make it a shilling.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would say that half cent would have been only useful in paying some members of this Assembly at the end of the month for what they are worth, but they have no other use in Barbados really.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

12.45 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 28

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (5) SCHOOLS ARREARS OF SALARY

A Resolution for the sum of \$5,910 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to supplement the salaries vote of certain schools. In the case of the Primary and Comprehensive schools, a sum of \$600 is required, and in the case of Grammar Schools, \$5,310. In the Primary and Comprehensive Schools, there are three acting Teachers who have not received arrears of salaries and 28 teachers who have received arrears on their basic salaries, but who were acting in higher posts, and therefore they are also eligible for the arrears of acting allowances. In the case of the Grammar Schools, all the arrears of salary increases arising out of salary recommendations have been paid with the exception of the Boy's and Girls' Foundation Schools. In the case of the others, they all have savings to meet the various amounts, but it is necessary to supplement the vote in order that these two Founda-

tion Schools should be able to finalise their arrears. I do not think that there is much more that I can add to that; if there are any questions asked, I will try to answer them. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to enquire of the hon. Leader of the House if this provision will meet all the demands. We have been seeing a spate of letters in the Press relative to this backpay, or whatever you like to call it, and I should like to know if this provision will meet all the demands for the last revision of salaries as regards Teachers. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, that is correct). This will meet all of it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think that this Resolution is about enough to convince this Honourable House that the time has come when education, and all matters related thereto, ought to be reviewed and examined with a view to seeing that a system which was inherited by this Government — and I want to say that education today should be looked up on as a human body which was once heavy and suffering from the lack of nourishment through some extraneous cause of causes. It is now trying out for a diagnosis of the ailment and we are to urge that such a diagnosis is very, very necessary at this time. We are to say that we need a definite enquiry into the administration of education in this Island. Not one dime more should be spent on education in this Island until we are satisfied that this Government is prepared to have from its own Minister or Ministers of Education down to the last Relief Teacher examined by people who are capable of doing so. I am to say that all the Headmasters and Headmistresses of our Secondary Schools in this Island — Harrison College, Queen's College, Lodge School, St. Michael's Girls', Foundation Boys' and Girls', Coleridge-Parry, Alexandra, Alleyne — all the Headteachers in this Island should be subjected to an examination or inspection — which would be more appropriate in the case of Headteachers. Every Institution in this Island which is providing education in any respect at the Government's expense ought to be inspected, and we are to urge in this particular instance — not that we do not have people in Barbados with the expertise necessary for such an exercise. We have them, and they are willing to undertake such a task; but what we fear is that just as happened some time in 1960-61 a survey of Independent Schools in this Island was carried out by local personnel, and what we found was that the Report was pigeon-holed and nothing has ever been heard or seen of it. We are urging this time that if it is necessary, a team of Her Majesty's Inspectors be brought here to examine education in our Secondary, Primary and Independent Schools which are receiving benefit from the Treasury of this Island. It is not good enough to continue in our present stride.

Now, Sir, as to education in this Island — and this Resolution proves that in Government circles we are suffering from administrative inertia. We

are suffering from a lack of direction, we are suffering from a healthy inter-personal relationship and, as we know, the Minister of Education has said that we need more school buildings. We are over-crowded and therefore he cannot, until these things are attended to, until they are given the attention they deserve, there can be little hope for any rapid success, bearing in mind the sum of money, what portion of our revenue education is now costing us in this Island.

12.55 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education has been telling the world that we are suffering from the lack of trained and experienced Teachers. What has the Minister done? What has he shown to make us believe that he intends to use what material there is at his disposal to perfect the system?

I can say that we have in this Island quite a number of retired School Teachers. I am saying this because the Minister, out of his own mouth, makes us to understand that he cannot get trained and experienced personnel recruited to his staff from amongst the young people who are now leaving schools. Here is it we have these trained retired Teachers, some of whom, I am sure, are quite willing to serve again.

Mr. Chairman, we hear so much about In-service Training, Team Teaching and the like. Who is better able to teach or train the young whilst in service than some of our experienced Teachers who have come all through the ranks, and some of them have put in about 30 or 40 years in the Teaching Service of this Island? You will find today that some of these people are Headmasters and some are assistant Masters and Assistant Mistresses. Nothing is wrong with these people; they could easily come out and give assistance. If they cannot work a whole day, then they could be contracted on some sort of basis. They could give three or four hours per day; but the Government has no intention of making use of such people, except in the case where they are about five retired Teachers who are presently employed. I think there are two or three at St. Leonards' and somewhere else. If you were to hear the story behind how these few Teachers were brought back into the Service, believe me, Sir, you would be shocked. But let us leave that aside in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, what we are saying is that we need some Specialists preferably, in this instance, from abroad. They would have, let us say, a detached and not a vested interest in the system, and what is going on here. The point about it is that, if such a Report is ever written, we must insist that it be made public and that it be implemented wherever possible. We must try and impress upon the Government that it should set up a Commission to have this necessary enquiry carried out into our educational system. We are not satisfied that things are working as well as they ought to at any stage in our First or Second Grade Grammar Schools, and at the Primary Level it is far from satisfactory.

I think that the Government has at its disposal at the present moment the Petter Report which, I understand has never yet seen the light of day, but there are recommendations in the Petter Report which could be implemented with satisfaction. It would assist considerably in the present system, because I understand that the Petter Report made provision that all children with the ability to benefit from Advanced Level training should be concentrated as to those in the eastern parishes (St. Philip, St. John and the like) at Lodge School, and those for the areas adjoining St. Michael could be served by Harrison College and Queen's College, and that a similar institution should be provided in the North for serving those children who could benefit from Advanced level training there.

In that Report, I also understand that it made provision for what is called Academic or Classical Training in respect of one set of Grammar Schools, and another set for bilateral: that is a system which has both Academic or Classical and Technical streams in the context. But you will see, Mr. Chairman, that education in Barbados has gone through numerous experiments during the past years. What we are doing now is spending large sums of money on it to find that there is very little benefit, in its truest sense, to be derived; but of this lack of inter-personal relationship we cannot get what parents are demanding. I have to lay a considerable amount of blame for what is going on in the face of parents of children in this Island, because there can be no doubt that many of the parents of children are not paying sufficient attention to what their children are receiving. All of this is in contrast with situations which obtained earlier. That is, in years past we did not have what is called the triple control of education which we have today.

Now, Sir, education is under a Minister; then there is a Permanent Secretary, and there is a Chief Technical Officer; but what we happen to know is that you will find the Minister paying little or no attention to what his Chief Technical Officer advises and as for the Permanent Secretary, he is operating in a Kingdom of his own.

1.05 p.m.

Now what is absolutely necessary, Mr. Chairman, is that we ought to set about raising the age limit in our Senior Department Schools, for children up to eighteen years, and we ought to review our system to such an extent that while our education remains free, we would leave the wealthy people of this Island whom we know are glad to pay for their education to send their children to the private schools of their choice and pay whatever the private schools charge, making the space which they now occupy in the Government Secondary Schools available to our children.

I understand, Sir, that in the case of Lodge School there is presently an attempt being made to have a boy of twelve years or thereabouts who was born in one of the other Islands drafted into Lodge School. I have no objection to such a boy or girl from

any of the Islands being taken into any of our schools here to benefit from our educational system, free or otherwise, and the only reason why I understand this boy has not been accepted up to the present is because the Headmaster is insisting that he be boarded at Lodge School if he is to take him in, whilst the parents who are abroad want the boy to be taken in at Lodge School, but that he will not be boarding there. What we are concerned with is not the boarding part of it at all. What we are saying is that by all means you can take in this boy after you are satisfied that there is no Barbadian child who is qualified for getting that place at Lodge School.

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for \$5,910 calls to mind one or two things about the Accounting Section of the Ministry of Education. I am in a position to say that unfortunately there are many Clerical Officers in the Ministry who do not have the ability of some of the Teachers with whom they have to deal from day to day, and there is a sense of frustration and disgust running through many of these Teachers, many of them very experienced. When they have to go to the Ministry, they are tossed and turned about, especially when it comes to the question of asking about payment of salaries. Mr. Chairman, on pay day last week there had to be posted up at Barclays Bank at Broad Street a notice to the effect that salaries have not yet been received from Government, so that on pay day those Teachers whose salaries according to their instructions were to be deposited at Barclays Bank, Broad Street, or various other Banks in the City turned up to be presented with a notice at the Counter saying that salaries had not yet been received from Government. That is not good enough, and something is definitely wrong with the Accounting Department at the Ministry of Education. Were it a case where for one month or for that matter two months a situation had arisen where the salaries were late in coming, Barclays Bank would not have been driven to the extent of preparing a notice ready to be sent out next morning, but it is a case where Teachers have been leaving St. Philip, St. Peter and St. Lucy and going to the banks on pay day to hear that there is no money. We are asking that matters of this sort be given better attention in the future. A School Teacher has got his expenses to meet like anybody else. They may owe house rent or other debts, and the people to whom they owe money know when it is pay day much better than the officer who is in the service; so when an officer is expecting to receive money on 25th, 26th or 27th or whatever date of the month, and has to return home to tell his landlord that there is no money that day, he just would not believe him. He would tell him that he is working with Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that there are some Teachers who had been trained at the Rawle Institute who had been serving, but that they were not paid a sum commensurate with their qualifications. I made some enquiries only this morning because there was a case of a Teacher from St. Philip who has gone abroad, and his mother has been to my office about six or seven times, and on each occasion

I had to make contact with the Ministry of Education. I could not ask her why she had not paid a visit to one of her own representatives because she does not seem to know them. However, I certainly did pay some attention to her problem, and I was informed by the Ministry that a portion of this money that is to be voted today is to make right with that lady's son. She has been a very pleasant person to deal with; she has borne her burdens, so to speak, because her son left her to satisfy certain obligations of his here, and by being able to get in touch with one of the persons who had been looking forward to a settlement, she was able to rally through until this day, and I sincerely hope that when this Resolution is passed today, everything will be done to satisfy all these Teachers and others who have been working and receiving less than that to which they were entitled. One thing we have got to bear in mind in this is that this Resolution is to make adjustments for matters from as far back as 1966.

1.15 p.m.

That is what we have got to concern ourselves with. We cannot deny that there are Clerical Officers who are responsible for preparing these accounts, investigating salary claims and making the necessary adjustments. Such officers would, of necessity, refer matters which appear to be doubtful or which were in any way found to be controversial, to their Education Officers of the Department or their District Education Officer. You will also find that they have a Chief Personnel Officer to whom any such claims, whatever they might be ought to have been referred and then we come down to the Permanent Secretary. You will see that there has been a team of officers who have not paid enough attention to these matters or they are now guilty of neglect, whatever it might be; but it has brought the situation to the point where we are at this particular moment. There are some married women, I understand, who have returned to serve and they, too, found that they were being paid in a salary scale which was not the correct one, and all of these matters now stand likely to be adjusted.

Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the Governor to get up a Commission to enquire into the administration of Education in this Island, and the sooner that such a Commission is appointed and its recommendations examined and made public — and I want to urge on the Minister that, in the event of an enquiry being conducted into the administration of education in this Island, the Commission should conduct public hearings whereby members of the public who, instead of being now encouraged to go up to the Ministry on the last Wednesday in each month and malign and blackmail School Teachers, these same parties be encouraged to come forward and state publicly all that they experience and what they have to complain against in our educational system. I would like to urge upon the parents of children and their guardians to begin to show how restless they are with the conduct of the administration of education in this island, and show themselves in readiness to demonstrate publicly if things are not put into better shape in the very near future.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the things which can be said for the educational system is that you can have as many people to support it as there would be the same number to criticise it and you would have

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Is the hon. member referring to education in Barbados?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Here and otherwise, and you would have just as many ideas on both sides of the argument as there are people to argue, and nobody would be rash enough to say that this or that argument is wrong, or that this or that suggestion is wrong. Some suggestions may be taken up to be unworkable, and others may merit further examination; but when you are talking about education, I think that one ought to be very tolerant where one is criticising the system or supporting it because it is a living thing. It is the kind of thing which can only thrive on continual experimentation, trying out one method and discarding it when it does not work, trying other methods and testing them in the light of given conditions, and so on. I also think — and this is a personal opinion, but it comes from my own experience, however limited this might have been — that whenever, in any country there are social pressure on an educational system, there is likely to be more discontent about it. In the days when fewer people had the advantage and the opportunity of a good education, there was little criticism about the educational system. The case is altered now; a wider cross-section of the population is being brought into the system, and because more and more people are exposed to more and more benefits and opportunities, some of the defects of the system become more and more apparent. If you could suppose a country in which 98% of the population could not read or write, you would be seeing a country in which there was little or no quarrel with the educational system; it would be only when the population became more and more exposed to greater and greater opportunities that the defects of the system would become more noticeable.

The point I am trying to make is this; the hon. member in his remarks on education, if I interpret him rightly, tends to hold the argument that before this Government came into power all was well with our educational system, or most was well with it. Mr. Chairman, you would be a very brave man indeed to be able to hold that view in the teeth of all the arguments. The hon. member himself knows how, in the old days when his views were somewhat altered, he could find the defects in the system 6, 7, or 8 years ago, as I could find them, and I am wondering how he manages to square his opinions then with his opinions now. Of course, he is quite entitled to his opinions and to change them, but I do not think you could truthfully say — and when I say "truthfully", I mean from the point of view of finding arguments and finding examples to substantiate the arguments — I do not think you could say that there has been no improvement in the educational system in the last six or seven years.

1.25 p.m.

For instance, in the days when to get into a Government Secondary School was not only on merit but on merit plus an interview, look how many children were turned back from enjoying their rightful opportunities because they used to bring water from a standpipe, or because they used to sit in the half-door with a bowl between their feet to eat their meals! This is the kind of question that used to be asked of children in the old days. Nobody asks that kind of question nowadays; they cannot, and more and more of that type of child is getting the benefit of improved education in places in the Government Grammar Schools.

One more point I want to make on that part of my reply. I know as everybody knows, that there is general dissatisfaction with the Grammar School system, and certainly general dissatisfaction from the point of view of the numbers of children who cannot get places in the Grammar Schools. Here, again, the reason for this dissatisfaction may lie partly in the system of itself, but partly in the social pressures surrounding this system. In the days when the son of a carpenter, or of an agricultural labourer, though, perhaps, bright enough, had an ambition to enter Harrison College, the whole structure of society was such that it was only in the most extraordinary circumstances that that ambition could be gratified. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not so.)

Now the senior member for the City says it is not so. It is a pity sometimes that people would not listen. I have never said that sons of carpenters or agricultural workers could not get into Harrison College. I am saying that it was more difficult years ago for that ambition to be gratified than it is now. That is a fact. And how has it been made possible? Not only because more of them can do it now, but because the hon. member who is cross-talking me has himself contributed to this by his own direct experience. It was the hon. member who drew it to my attention way back in 1963 that one of the consequences of the changed system of Secondary Education was that more children from disadvantaged homes were gaining places, and, although they satisfied all the requirements intellectually, they did not have the clothes, or the books, or the lunch, to make good those opportunities. So I had experience at first-hand of what this thing is about.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, if you are opposed to a Government, you are in duty bound to find any argument to defeat it if you can. No matter what arguments you use, there are still certain facts that you have to reckon with. Questions were asked of us some months ago from the other side. I do not remember the nature of the questions, but I remember the whole point of the questions. The point of the questions was to elucidate statistically what percentage of children who gained places to the Grammar Schools came from Primary Schools. When the figures were disclosed, they showed that over 80%, in each year since 1962 or whatever year it was, of the entrants into Government Schools came from the Primary Schools.

At this point, I want to take the hon. junior member for St. Peter up on an argument which he used and with which I profoundly disagree. I would yield to nobody on that side in my interest in seeing that everybody, or every child in this country, has the best type of education. But at the risk of losing the seat which I now hold, I would be bound to oppose any suggestion which seems to insist that because a man is rich, or is in a good position, his child should not have the same opportunity to enter a Grammar School, if he qualifies for entrance, as the child of a person who is disadvantaged. This is an argument that I would rebut most strenuously. If people pay taxes and are citizens of this country, their children have as much right to all the facilities which this country provides as the children of anybody else. I must disagree with him in this suggestion to let the rich pay for their children in Private Schools. I presume he meant even if they qualify for places, and we should keep the places for the others.

The solution would be, of course, to have more schools of a certain type. But to have more schools of a certain type, everybody in this Island would have to provide the money for these schools. Mr. Speaker, I say this by way of parenthesis. The suggestions which come from this side of the House, or which used to come from this side when we were in Opposition, do not vary very much from one another. Everybody wants to see improvements in education; but neither when I was in the Opposition, nor is it now the case with this Opposition, were there any suggestions given, either to the Government of the day, or to this Government, for raising revenue. All the suggestions, good and valid as they are, are suggestions for spending money, but very few suggestions come to any Government anywhere in the world for raising revenue.

I have said this when I was the Minister and I say it now, because it is something which I basically believe, that the people of any country can have the best kind of educational system that there is anywhere to be had, provided they are prepared to pay for it. If the people in this country want more Grammar Schools, they can have them, but they will have to make the appropriate and commensurate sacrifices to have them. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Repeat that.) I said that if the people of this country, and I now add in parenthesis, or any country but particularly of this one, want more Grammar Schools they can have them, but they must be prepared to pay for them. (Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a question of priority.) Why anything and not something else? I have said it, and I repeat it again. Hon. members have an idea that in the whole spectrum of education this or that aspect is a priority. I say that is not so.

1.35 p.m.

I contend that this is not so; it is the whole educational system which is a priority. It is education itself which is a priority. So you can argue not to do this, but to do that. I can argue not to do this but to do something else, and you can have a million arguments, you can have as many arguments and promptings as there are people speaking on the subject telling

you to choose each of a million things and do it first, but I do not take that view of it. It is all of the things which form the priority in education. To tell me that you should pay attention to Primary Schools and leave out Secondary Education, to tell me that you should pay attention to Secondary Education and leave out the Primary Schools, to tell me that you should make provision for further Education and do nothing about either, to tell me that you should improve Teacher Training and do nothing about the School Welfare Service, to tell me that you should attend to the School Welfare Service and do nothing about Teacher Training, none of this I accept. What I accept is that at one and the same time — which would be ideal — but as quickly as possible, one after another, if all cannot be done at the same time, must be done. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, do the most essential). Who is to argue what is more essential? (Mr. MOTTLEY: If you have 10,000 children and they cannot get into schools, that is essential.) All this proves what I was saying. You can have as many opinions about an educational system as you can have people, and I have not yet said that hon. members opposite are wrong except in respect of one of the points I touched on on this question about the facilities offered the rich and poor.

Mr. Chairman, the ideas which are held on the other side are perfectly arguable. When I was in Opposition I used to say to the then Government, why don't you do this particularly in respect, say, of the School Meals Service, but they said they could not do it. But I never put the whole thing out of focus and balance by arguing that you must have a School Meals Service as a priority. It is as important as any other aspect in the educational system, and anybody who argues that education works differently is arguing against the facts. Of course you could say that for the next year we are going to do nothing but build Primary Schools or build Secondary Schools or whatever it is; but even so, when you are doing that, you still have to be thinking of issues which will emerge as soon as your schools are built. Suppose it turned out you could get 100 new schools built over-night and have them opened tomorrow morning, your Teacher Training would be the same sort of priority as the opening of the schools, because if you open the schools and do not have the Teachers to teach the children, you will have the children and the buildings, but no Teachers.

Here it is, Mr. Chairman, that in a single aspect of education like the extension to Primary Schools, you have not one priority as you would think, but two — the teaching of the children and the building of the schools. Somebody would then say that you have the Teachers, you have made provision for Teacher Training, you have the schools, what about the ancillary services — the School Dental Service, the School Medical Service, the School Meals Service and all that, and before you know where you are in a single act of extending your Primary Schools, all the so-called priorities of education come in because you would find somebody to say that it is all very well to build new Primary Schools, to train new Teachers, to do this, that and the other, but don't you realise that

in three or four years' time you are going to need new Secondary Schools for X thousand extra young people? Somebody would then say that if you are going to need these new Secondary Schools for children who are now entering the Primary Schools you have just built, how are you going to train those Teachers for the Secondary Schools that you are going to need in three or four years' time? Then somebody else would say that if you are going to do that, the quality of your Secondary Education has to improve now because it is your Secondary people who will be the Teachers in the new Secondary Schools when you build them. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, the person who insisted that Primary Education was a sole and absolute priority would discover before he is finished that in the very act of attending to that apparently absolute priority, four or five other priorities were drawn into the vortex. The same holds good of any other aspect of education.

There are some people who look at an educational system not from the Primary School up. Some people have a view of an educational system from what they call Higher Education down, and would be prepared to spend all their interest and all our country's money on improving the quality of High Education. Well, they would not get very far with that, because they would soon discover that the quality of Higher Education is best improved when the stages below that are well looked after to feed the Higher Education system. It is probably good politics to argue for individual priorities. It is not the kind of argument that I can accept because I see all education as a priority; and a country therefore which works to keep abreast cannot take one or two aspects of a system and press them on the ground that these are the most urgent and the others do not matter.

Hon. members, of course, opposite do not take the extreme view that one or two things matter and others do not; but it is an argument that some people take and it is an argument which I just cannot accept. We spend something like 25%, certainly more than 20% of the total budgetary provision on education. I can agree not only from my observations before I was a Minister, but in some of my observations as a Minister and since that our spending could be better and we could get more value. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask hon. members to observe Standing Order No. 29(6). I am observing the strain through which the Reporter is going to write what one member is saying from the other; and members would remember how often it is said that Reporters do not write the things that members say. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that we spend a lot of money on education, and I was saying that from my own observations as a Minister and from my general experience since and before I was a Minister, I am convinced that we could get more value out of the \$12 million or \$13 million or whatever amount it is. There is a lot of wastage and misdirection inside this system. This has not only

just appeared; this is something that has always been there and seems to drag behind or alongside every educational system, because most communities do not like to stint money for Education; and because Communities are generous in their spending on education, educational authorities more often than not believe that there is always more money where it has come from, and they do not always look after expenditure carefully, and do not always try to get the most out of the dollar or the pound or the mark or the bolivar or whatever it is. This happens all over the world.

I want hon. members to recall this: if you ask for a Commission of Enquiry, you are not asking for anything which any reasonable person would be opposed to, because it is a sensible thing for any educational system to have a periodical re-evaluation of itself; but while you are examining the system, the system still has to go on. So you just cannot say that because you want a thorough, down-to-earth meaningful examination and evaluation of the whole system, you must stop where you are while this is going on. (A VOICE: Nobody said so.) I have never said that anybody has said that; I am only saying, which is true, that even while you are examining the system, the system has to work. It is nothing that can stop while you are examining it, because if it does stop while you are examining it, you would not get the truth about it because you have to see it as it works.

1.45 p.m.

If an examination of the educational system took three years, I do not know how long it will take, but suppose it took two or three years! (Mr. MOTTLEY: Why are you talking so long?) Is it not my privilege to talk now? (*ASIDES.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. senior member for the City addressing the Chair? Let the hon. junior member for St. Lucy proceed without interruptions.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that it is a working system which you would be examining, and all the time that the examination is proceeding, the system will have to be fed and nourished. I would not like to undertake at this juncture to say whether a Commission is a feasible or a necessary thing; but what I would say is that I would not object to it myself in principle because an educational system ought to be re-examined and re-valued periodically. I want to say this much, that the educational system in Barbados is not nearly as bad as the hon. member tries to make out. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Which hon. member?) The hon. member who is sitting on the hon. member's right, the hon. junior member for St. Peter. Obviously, and in the political game, Mr. Chairman, members of the Opposition, as a matter of fact, will be more directly brought into contact with grievances than members of the Government. The hon. member will recall in the old days how it was. As a matter of fact, I am grateful to the hon. member, and I say it now, for having drawn something to my attention years ago which, had it not been for him I would not have known and upon which

I was able to take some action. Some years ago, for a reason which I will not mention here, the entire Fifth Form of St. Michael's Girls' School was not entered for a public examination, and in circumstances for which there could have been no justification. I did not know about it, but I was supposed to be the Shadow Minister of Education at the time. The hon. member drew it to my attention. He has means of information which were certainly denied me in those days and obviously they are denied me now. I was able, thanks to the hon. member, to investigate the matter. I wrote a personal letter to the then Minister of Education, Mr. Thorne, and had the matter put right within three months. Therefore, I say that, obviously, a Teacher or Teachers, a parent or parents will go to hon. members opposite with grievances. I hope that they will come to us, but they do not always do; most of them do, but some do not and therefore if an hon. member comes in here, as he has a perfect right to do, to give expression to a grievance which is a genuine grievance and which affects a citizen of this country, we must avoid making it appear that the individual grievance or the group of individual grievances gives an accurate picture of the entire system. That is not always the case, and I am convinced that the educational system is not as bad as some people make out. What I am convinced also about is this, that in any level of society in any country or as soon as improvement begin, you will hear more criticism about the system. After all, the French Revolution came when conditions in France were not at the very lowest. They were improving, and it is the same thing with the Russian Revolution. This is true of all societies. As soon as something begins to improve, people who were not before aware of its value, because of the very improvement will become aware and start to make more noise about it. Unlike the hon. member who may be alarmed about the educational system, I am not alarmed about it, because the more criticism I hear about it, the more I am convinced that it is making a greater and greater impact upon the population; and as long as it is making that impact, they have a right to be discontented with it until they get it how they want it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, one of God's greatest gifts is the ability to speak or to talk; but another great gift is the ability not to be bamboozled or fooled. The hon. member made a speech.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the hon. member that I certainly did talk but I was not bamboozled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know if the hon. member thinks that that is funny, but it is not funny for me. Anyhow, I just want to make two points. The hon. member in replying to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, made a very long speech, which is unlike him, because he has always, when he has a good case, made his points and left it to his colleagues to vote. I suppose that, *sotto voce*, I made some remarks which caused him to go on with his speech. What I took objection to was the fact that — if I misquote him he will pardon me — the ambition

of carpenters' sons and the sons of people of the like were not always given the opportunity when they wanted to get to Harrison College and the like. I am one of those people who granted the hon. member — I supported the Government in power in their Food Programme. The hon. member knows that and therefore he cannot suggest anything about me in this matter. The hon. member knows that I made a contribution in respect of giving people in the lower walk of life opportunities such as getting Exhibitions, whereas 26 or 27 years ago, I found that 20 Exhibitions were given by the St. Michael's Vestry; and when the hon. member and his Government sought to take things away from me, I caused my colleagues to give Scholarships to the U.W.I. There were something like 200 Exhibitions at the time, and I do not think that the hon. member would disagree that none of those went to the sons of rich people as he was setting out here just now.

The point I want to make is this. I will always suggest, and deep down in the heart of the Hon. Leader of the House, he knows that it is true, if there are 10,000 children in this community post-war with the present system of education — you take the Common Entrance Examination for children to get into the Secondary Schools — if I am wrong the hon. member can stop me — the hon. member and his Government said: "We have over seven hundred places," and are you suggesting to me that only 700 of the 10,000 could pass that Entrance Examination? 1.55 p.m.

Why am I saying a priority? I have often heard the hon. member repeating this: "The greatest good for the greatest number." Now, if you establish a Community College for 400 people; you have 10,000 children taking the Common Entrance Examination; you say that you have places for 700 only; let us assume that 3,000 or 4,000 out of the 10,000 passed. It is not a priority to find places for the others? Is it not necessary to see to it that 90% of the parents in this country, who have an ambition to give their children a smattering of a Secondary Education, are given an opportunity to fulfil that ambition? Are you telling me that it is not a priority to have more Secondary Schools, but to have a Community College? Down in the Minister's heart, he knows that this is true. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know that.) Perhaps he does not want to say it.

If the Minister tells me that 10,000 children took the 'Common Entrance Examination, and the Ministry had only 700 places, is it not obvious that something is wrong? He did not say that only 700 passed; he said that he had places for 700 only. If you have places for 700 only, and 10,000 took the Common Entrance Examination, is it not obvious that you must look at the question of priority for Secondary Schools? If you are going to have 450 children only in the Community College, the feeder to the Community College will be from the Secondary Schools, I presume, as well as Government Aided Secondary Schools. It is clear that there should be a priority to have more Secondary Schools.

Sir, if the Minister were to take a plebiscite in this country tomorrow, with the strongest supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, they will tell him that every person in this country with a child 10 or 12 years old wants to give that child some sort of Secondary Education. You can notice that even in the Police Force. When boys get an opportunity to go into the Private Secondary Schools and they go into the Police Force, you can see the difference. Therefore you cannot say that this matter should not be a question of priority. All we contend on this side is that priority should be given to the provision of more Secondary Schools, because more than 90% of the parents in this country would certainly prefer to get an opportunity to send their children to Secondary Schools.

I would like to draw this matter to the Minister's attention. Does the Minister know it is a most difficult thing to get a child into a Primary School today? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know that.) The hon. member says he does not know that. Well, I can tell him that; maybe my children are all big, but I have grand children, and I know what I am talking about. If you want to get a child into a Comprehensive School, or a modern Secondary School, it is worse.

Some years ago I came in here and reminded the Hon. Minister that they were putting the children out the Modern Secondary Schools at 15 years of age. They were throwing them on the labour market, and they are still throwing them out at 15, but the Minister is doing nothing about it. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is not true) Do not tell me it is not true; some of them are even thrown out earlier. It is true to say that if a child appears to be bright, you can manoeuvre and possibly see a Minister or somebody connected with the Education Department and the child may be able to remain in this Secondary School. You talk about the greatest good for the greatest number, and you still say that this is not a question of priority? You are a Democratic Labour Party, and in this modern day you are going to establish a Community College to take care of 450 children; you have 10,000 children taking the Common Entrance Examination; you admit that you have room for 700 only, and the Minister of Education is walking around saying that all of these Primary Schools are in a shocking condition — (ASIDES). I am not talking about Teachers now, I am talking about places in Schools.

Sir, I know that the Minister has done a tremendous lot in revamping the system of education with which I have agreed. (ASIDES.) We feel strongly on this matter. We feel that priority should be given (a) to the provision of a greater number of Secondary Schools, or converting your Modern Secondary Schools into Grammar Schools; and (b) having more Primary Schools. That is how we feel about it. (ASIDES.) For the Minister to suggest that we feel he has done nothing is stupidity.

The question that a Resolution for \$5,910 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Time.)

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No.30

A Resolution for \$2,272 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Could we not come out of Committee with these two Resolutions? There are two more small money Resolutions. Why do not we do them? (Mr. MOTTLEY: "Time.") I am not pressuring the House unduly; I am just only drawing the Committee's attention to the fact that we have two more Resolutions, and we can finish them and come out of Committee of Supply. There are two simple Resolutions. If we finish them now, there would be no need to go back in Committee of Supply, and we could do something else when we come back.

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in consequence of the Civil Establishment Order, which the House passed two weeks ago in connection with the Staff of the Ministry of Finance. It is for provision for furniture and equipment for 5 new offices which the House approved the appointments of. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No.31

A Resolution for \$2,148 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum speaks for itself. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

2.05 p.m.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

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

On Resumption:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I observe that there is no quorum, I am asking that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the House resumes its business, there is a matter which I would like to draw to its attention which, I think, affects the courtesy which is due from this House to Her Majesty the Queen. Some weeks ago as you may remember, the House passed an Address of thanks in connection with the gift of books which had come to us from the House of Commons of Great Britain. As usual, it was expected that a copy of that Address would be forwarded by Mr. Speaker to the Governor-General for transmission to Her Majesty. I understand that that has not been done. I further understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the British High Commissioner asked the Clerk of this House for three copies of the Address which the Clerk delivered, one of which copies it was intended should be transmitted to the Queen that way.

Now this is entirely wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it is very unfortunate. The Governor-General is the Queen's personal representative in this country and is the direct link between this House and the Sovereign. The British High Commissioner represents the British Government, and has no connection whatsoever and is not in any way involved in any Message which go from this House to the Sovereign. This is a most unfortunate occurrence and I would not like it to occur again. I am suggesting — I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition would agree with me — that whether or not that copy has got to the Queen through that means, an authentic copy of the Address should still go from this House to His Excellency the Governor-General because if this is not so, this House would be put in the unfortunate position of having by-passed the Governor-General in a matter in which he is the method of transmission. As I say, it is most unfortunate and I hope it does not occur again, but I would like it to be perfectly well known that it is something which the House cannot condone, and through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like it to be known to the Clerks-at-the-Table that Messages from this House to the Sovereign must go through His Excellency the Governor-General and by no other means.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: When the Leader of the House informed me that this thing had happened, it struck me as being extraordinary that the Chief Clerk who has been connected with this House for so long could possibly not see that it was not for the High Commissioner, but for the Governor-General, to submit any Message from this House to Her Majesty. I did not say this to the Leader of the House, but I say it now: it looks to me that he is in an awkward position. I think the House will agree that you must send a copy, late though it be, to the Governor-General, but the awkward position would be whether the Queen has already received a copy through the High Com-

missioner. She might have been told of it, but might not necessarily have seen the actual copy. It would be difficult to ask the Governor-General now to officially send along a copy. On the other hand it might be best, and I throw out the suggestion to the Leader of the House, to find out from the High Commissioner in London who could by roundabout means find out from the Household, some one of Her Majesty's Clerks or Secretaries, whether she has received it as officially coming from Barbados already, and if she does not herself know, whether the High Commissioner will arrange that the Governor-General's copy should nevertheless go to one of Her Secretaries, maybe with an apology that it was not officially originally sent through the Governor-General's Office. In short, that they should go to the Governor-General, and the Governor-General's copy should go so that we would have it on the record that Her Majesty received it in an official way from the Governor-General; but there should be no question of duplication at the other end. Maybe Sir Lionel Luckhoo can clear that point up for us. I too regret with the Leader of the House. I feel as strongly as he does about it. It is one of those things that should not have happened, and we have to hope that matters of that sort do not happen again.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to put a suggestion to the other side not in respect of this matter we have just discussed, but in respect of the resumption of business. I am going to be quite frank. The remaining item of Government Business is a matter of which the Hon. Minister of Communications gave notice earlier today and of which he circulated the copies. Would the House like to deal with this and then do Questions and Private Members' Business, or would it insist that we put this off until 4.30 p.m.? I am asking this because the hon. member would like to be accommodated. I believe the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph would like to attend the funeral of someone in St. Thomas, and if we could just shift it around, everybody else on this side would be here except the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; so Question Time and what Private Members' Business we have to do can still be done. I am waiting for an indication from the other side. *(After a pause.)* I thank hon. members opposite.

3.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMATEUR TRANSMITTER) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2, under Government Business be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The instant Order of the Day is Order No. 2 and it stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

A Resolution to approve the Wireless Telegraphy (Amateur Transmitter) (Amendment) Regulation, 1968.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members on the other side will remember that about three weeks ago or a little longer, this item was on the Order Paper. I did not deal with it because I had some consequential amendments to make, and I wanted to make them all at the same time since they all dealt with the Wireless Telegraphy Act. This Resolution is asking the House to approve these Regulations, and I will read them back for the benefit of those hon. members who have not got a copy of them. The Regulations are as follows:-

"1. These Regulations may be cited as the Wireless Telegraphy (Amateur Transmitter) (Amendment) Regulations, 1968.

2. Regulation 3 of the Wireless Telegraphy (Amateur Transmitter) Regulations, 1953 (in these Regulations referred to as the principal Regulations) is hereby amended as follows:-

(a) By deleting the words "is of British Nationality" in paragraph (1) (a) and substituting therefor the words "is a Commonwealth citizen;"

(b) By inserting immediately after paragraph (1) the following as paragraph (1A) —

"(1A) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) a licence may be granted under that paragraph and in accordance with Article 41 of the Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, to a person who is a national of a foreign country as defined in section 2 of the Citizenship Act, 1967, if the Minister is satisfied that a reciprocal agreement between the Government of the country of which that person is a national and the Government of Barbados in relation to the granting of licences to keep, install, erect or use amateur wireless transmitter."

(c) by deleting the words "two dollars and fifty cents" appearing at the end of paragraphs (3) and (b) and substituting therefor "five dollars".

3. The Notes to the form of applications for a licence to keep, install, erect or use an Amateur

Wireless Transmitter set out in the Schedule are hereby amended as follows:-

(a) by deleting the word "British" wherever it appears in Note 1;

(b) by deleting the words "and who are themselves of British nationality" appearing in lines 3 and 4 of Note 2."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all know that we have "ham" radio operators throughout the world, and they serve a useful purpose too; but it has so happened that according to the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940 since Barbados has become independent, we are changing the words "British Commonwealth" to the words "a Commonwealth Citizen" which would include a Barbadian, a Trinidadian and Commonwealth people. It also gives the Minister the power that if somebody from the United States of America wants to operate this thing, once we know that there is reciprocity that a Barbadian can do likewise there, or a British National, but more especially a Barbadian, the Minister would grant that permission, but not necessarily the United States of America, Canada or anywhere else for that matter. It gives the Minister the authority to allow reciprocity in these matters. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I pointed out when I first got up, the reason why I kept back the Resolution to approve the Wireless Telegraphy (Amateur Transmitter) (Amendment) Regulations is that I knew about these amendments that were to come down in relation to the same Wireless Telegraphy Act and I did not want to come and have six or seven bites at the Wireless Telegraphy Act. This Bill, which is now before us, pertains to the same Wireless Telegraphy, but only in a different sense. That is why I circulated copies of this Bill early this morning and I hope that hon. members have read the Bill carefully. We will all remember that just a few months ago, I came to this Chamber and asked that the Government back a note for the C.B.C. to the tune of \$1 million, I think it was; it may be \$1.1 million. The reason why we are here is this

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. It does not appear to me as if I have anything of what the hon. member is introducing now. (ASIDES).

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to enquire through you if every hon. member has a copy of this Bill. I must apologise to hon. members who have not got a copy of it, but it is not my fault. The first thing I did before putting Gov-

ernment Business on the Order Paper was to issue copies of this Bill or I gave out copies of this Bill to be issued to hon. members. I must apologise for this because I do not want hon. members on the other side to think that anybody on this side was trying to pull anything fast on them. I say that because I brought down more than enough copies.

As the Object and Reasons of this Bill set out: "This Bill would amend the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940-22, in order to make provision for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to issue licences in respect of wireless broadcast television receivers and to collect fees for such licences and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith."

Years ago members of the community had to pay for radios whether they be Rediffusion, private radios or otherwise, but we did not think that we were collecting the amount of fees. We were getting a lot of trouble to collect the fees, and so forth, and that was dropped. After the Government got TV, my Ministry was responsible for collecting the licence fees through the Electrical Department.

3.10 p.m.

We found that it was not only cumbersome, but it was not working well, because a lot of the people who were selling Television Sets were more interested in making sales than in collecting revenue for the Government. The law as it was then, as far as I can remember, was that a Television Set could only have been sold on the presentation of a licence fee.

Hon. Members on the other side will remember that a few weeks ago we came here for a guarantee to back a note for C.B.C., because they were in straitened circumstances financially. The reason for this amendment to the Wireless Telegraphy Act does not mean that as the Minister of Communications I will be giving up the Wireless. Licences for Wireless will still be under my portfolio, but in order that C.B.C. would be able to collect the fees, which they will be able to do in a much better way than the Electrical Department — because this Bill also gives C.B.C. the right to enter on people's premises to certify if anybody has a Television Set and is paying for it. Hon. members on the opposite side I believe, must have read this Bill. It is late and we all want to get out, and I do not think I should detain the House any longer. Any question that any member on the opposite side wants to ask that is pertinent to this Bill, I will be quite willing to answer. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. LOWE: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to place the onus on persons. In other words, it puts a defendant in the position of having to prove himself innocent. The complainant has to prove the defendant guilty. An accused person is innocent until he is found guilty, but this Bill places the onus on an accused person to prove himself innocent, and I do not think it is fair.

I observe from the Bill that at all times the Minister of Communications can give a person the right to go into somebody else's house and determine whether he has a television receiving set. It states here:

"It shall be lawful for —

- (a) the Electrical Engineer or any other person appointed by the Minister in that behalf in respect generally of the provisions of this Act or any regulations made thereunder; or
- (b) any person appointed by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation

You know, Sir, that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has a record for doing things that are not always straight.

When we take, for instance, the recent appointment of the present Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the method employed therein, what went on behind the scene and so on, one has to be very careful when the Bill States:

"any person appointed by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation." Who is going to have the actual authority to act on behalf of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation? The Manager, or the Board as a whole? That is a point we would certainly like to have cleared up because, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, everyone did not show a general appreciation, or express satisfaction, at the appointment of the present Manager of C.B.C., and, as a result, we saw that a portfolio was split in two.

Now, let us for argument's sake, Sir — unless we know whether the Manager of C.B.C. is going to have the authority to act under this Act, one might find that persons who did not find it possible to accept the present Manager may one day or one night find that the Manager has given authority to wreak vengeance in a situation such as this to make up for all the wrongs, or what he felt was wrong during the consideration of his appointment. We would like to know in the case of any person appointed by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, who at the Corporation will have the authority to delegate someone to go into a man's home and make a search?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I much regret that I not only have not got a copy of this Bill, despite what, I believe, the Minister in his best efforts has endeavoured to explain, but I did not even know it was going to be dealt with. This business of wireless licences has been bothering me for a number of years, two or three years, ever since C.B.C. has been sending out notices demanding one's wireless licence when, apparently, C.B.C. had no authority to receive it, far less to demand it. I myself, after having paid my television licence, have had notices threatening me with prosecution. On one occasion I had occasion to remember the case of *Thorne v. The British Motor Dealers Association*, which Your Honour will no doubt recall, when the

Secretary of the British Motor Dealers Association was convicted of blackmail for demanding payment which he was not entitled so to do from a member of the Association. But still I knew that \$10 a year was the licence fee, and therefore, I paid it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the first thing that we, as a House, must go into is who authorised C.B.C. to receive the money without statutory authority, and to send out demands without statutory authority, if no such statutory authority has existed up to this time. Who authorised C.B.C. to send out documents threatening to lock up people for \$10, if C.B.C. could not at that time collect the money under the authority of the Act? That is the point. It would not be possible to make Regulations — in my guess, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would not be easy under Section 16, or any other Section of the Act, for the licensing of television broadcast receivers as opposed to the ordinary wireless apparatus which is defined by the Act of 1940.

Nevertheless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is quite a good idea for C.B.C. to receive the money, but I do not think the Minister is aware that in time one can envisage a situation when a licence fee on each television set begins to exceed the revenue actually required by the television station for its operations. 3.20 p.m.

The best known licensing system in the world, I suppose is that of the B.B.C., and the annual licence fees paid in England by owners of television sets is upwards of £60 million, which is more than enough for running the B.B.C. even though it had 17,000 employees. Sooner or later if C.B.C. continues to collect licence fees, we can imagine perhaps some day licence fees would go up to \$15 or \$20, you may find 50,000 television sets in Barbados — that after all would be the optimum point, a television in every household — and 50,000 sets even at \$10 would bring in a revenue greater than the present expenditure of C.B.C. Therefore you are going to have some provision for the payment back to the Government of some of the money that is collected. This problem was faced by the B.B.C. What happens in England is that the Post Office collects the money and hands over a certain amount to the B.B.C.; it is not a question of the B.B.C. doing the collections. I do not know how the Ministers' advisers could have told him that it was a clumsy system for the Electrical Engineer to collect it. It may well be a clumsy system for us, but it will be found clumsier in the future when C.B.C. is collecting more money from television sets than it needs, and then you will have to devise a new procedure to get some of that money back into the general channels of taxation. That may happen in the future.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must also mention the question of Clause 11 where any person appointed by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation in respect of the provisions of this Act or Regulations may at all times enter premises Mr. Deputy Speaker, what kind of business is this? We thought this was the kind of thing you got in Colonial days when the Gov-

ernment was regarded as all-wise, and therefore nobody would abuse provisions given like that. Can an hon. member sleep safely in his bed now when somebody can come and knock at the door at 2 o'clock in the morning and say he has come from C.B.C. to see if he has a television set? Think of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker! Let all hon. members sitting around this Table think if they want to put such a police power into the hands of their political opponents, whoever their political opponents may be? A policeman cannot come into your house without a warrant from a Magistrate, and the C.B.C. are to authorise somebody to enter your house at all times!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very serious business. The old power gave the Electrical Engineer authority to enter and inspect any vehicle, apparatus, motor, installation, machinery or appliance for the purpose of satisfying himself that such provisions of the Act and the Regulations are being observed. It is not too much to suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that provision is intended to prevent persons under section 10(1) which says "if a Magistrate is satisfied by information on oath that there is a reasonable ground for supposing that a Wireless Telegraphy Station has been established with a licence" It is not unreasonable to suppose that the situation that was envisaged by the framers of that Act was that they were aiming to suppress people, because this was after all passed in 1940, who wanted to broadcast information to the Germans. This is a war-time Act which we are amending, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Can it seriously be intended in 1968 to give C.B.C. greater power over a man's home than the Commissioner of Police or the Minister of Home Affairs? I call on the Government to have another look at this. We should be limiting the power under the old Section 11, not extending it, and I am not satisfied, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is constitutional. I am not satisfied that it is within the constitutional provision dealing with security of a man's home and matters such as that. The Act is very severe in any case because we are having a section now that says that the television licence can be recovered as a civil debt, and then it says you have to prove that you have paid the licence. This will be the only case in the Magistrate's Courts of District "A" where the plaintiff sits down, or where the Minister can put everybody that he does not like who has a television set in court and force him to the trouble of proving the case, and where the burden of proof is on the defendant. I know of no other situation in the Civil Courts of District "A" where the burden of proof is placed on the defendant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very severe Act, and I am very worried that I did not see it before. Any person appointed by C.B.C. can come into my house at all times! This is not right, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I repeat at the risk of going over it again and underlining it — suppose we even have confidence in the members of the Government! I cannot say I have confidence in all of them, and I do not believe that every member of the Government would get up and say he has confidence in all of us that such a power would never be misused. I am not talking about this year or

next year some time. I am talking about ten years or fifteen years from now. Is every Government that gets into power and appoints a Board to the C.B.C. to be trusted with the authority to send somebody in at people's houses at any time of the night to find out if they have a television licence? That could be a way of evading the safeguards that have grown up over 900 years under the Common Law to stop policemen coming into your house. If you want to get a policeman into somebody's house, say you suspect he has a television set in it and get the policeman in. I do not think it is good enough and I am very sorry this is being rushed through at this stage. After all, C.B.C. in collecting the money anyhow before hand may have been acting without authority.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point made by the hon. member that this is a war-time measure could not have been stronger. My recollection is that one of the things that urged people to get this Bill on the Statute Book was the fact that there was a suspicion that somebody, apart from the professional people, so to speak, in wireless, was or had been in contact with Germans who had landed in Trinidad, and that these men were in contact with him. It went so strong that in the actual 1940 Act it said "at any time of day or night". They had to be emphatic. You would wonder nowadays why a man has not got a wireless, loudspeaker and all that rather than the reverse, and therefore the question has not arisen as to whether you should go and see if this man has apparatus that he has not paid a licence for. When the war was over nobody was going to question it, and nowadays 20 years after with everybody trying to have a wireless in his house of one form or another, nobody questions it. If this Act had been the sort of Act that was intended to be operative in peace time, you would have torn this to pieces long ago. To give anybody authority to go at any hour of the day or night is a thing that can be defended only in an emergency or during the actual state of war. I am not satisfied that the draughtsmen of these amendments have paid enough attention to them, and I hope that the Minister or the Leader of the House would not think that we are just trying to be obstructive.

3.30 p.m.

This should not be dealt with this afternoon because, as the hon. member who has just sat down has said, he has not had time to read it. I did not have time to read it; I only got this Volume with the 1940 Act a few minutes ago. Obviously, you cannot, in ordinary legislation, put the onus on the defendant to prove that he is innocent, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has pointed out; therefore, I suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that he postpone the consideration of this Bill. The draughtsman has not paid sufficient attention to it. You have to cut out that section which puts the onus on the defendant to prove himself innocent. After all, look at the stupidity of it! You give an Inspector the right to go in to see whether the law is being broken, and then you tell a defendant: "You have to prove that you are not breaking the law". Why do you send in the Inspector except to find that out? You take this war-time legislation and you look at it forgetting when it was made,

and why it was made, and you pass something which is not at all suitable for peace time. It is easy to have amendments this afternoon haphazard, straightway as they are ready at all times, without referring to the old Act. If I had this legislation at home last night, I would have done what I have just done here. The obvious amendment is to say "at all reasonable times," but this haphazard amendment on the spur of the moment is not good enough.

This is why I have appealed to the Hon. Leader of the House to suggest to the Minister in charge to postpone consideration of this Bill so as to draft it in proper language, cutting out the bit about the onus being placed on the defendant, putting in the word "reasonable" and have the wording "at all reasonable times" as an interpretation that every police Magistrate would know. As soon as one Police Magistrate says that 8 o'clock at night is reasonable, all Police Magistrate will follow him provided that there is no appeal which upsets that. As I say, haphazard drafting, even by lawyers in the House, is not good enough. I suggest again and I sit down on that without saying anything more. (ASIDES). I am suggesting that whatever the appropriate language is, further consideration of this Bill be postponed rather than merely make the amendment which I have suggested, the obvious amendment "at all reasonable times"; but I do not think that that is a sufficient amendment for the whole Bill.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second the motion for the postponement, but before doing so, I should like to say that I did not have the chance to read this Bill; but listening very attentively to the Hon. Minister, he pointed out that the Electrical Department failed to collect these licence fees and they are taking the opportunity to give C.B.C. the chance to collect it. Also that they will be able to go into one's home at any time in order to discover whether he has a set or if he has paid for it. Sir, that is a very serious statement, because there is a certain time of the day or night when I cannot even go into my own place, and I suppose that you cannot even go into your own place. There is a certain time and a certain place that you cannot go whenever you like, and it is your place. I want to know how we can sit here and give a stranger power to go into my home or your home at any time. Sir, there is a certain time when the Minister cannot go certain places in his home whenever he likes. He has to knock at the door at least, and ask for permission to enter, and now we are giving a stranger permission to go into one's home to look-for what? A TV set.

If the Government was really taking this matter very seriously — and as the Minister has said, that the sellers of these sets are only interested in making money or selling the sets — the Government still has the trump card. Nothing can come into this country except through the Customs or through the Port, and you have Customs Officers, you have some of everything; you must produce your invoice and things of that sort in order to get the sets out. I believe that the Government will be able to say: "John Brown imported so many sets this year, May Atkins imported

so many", and put them together and make checks to see how many sets they have sold, and the onus is on them to see to whom they have sold those sets. It is not a question of leaving it to the Electrical Inspector or to C.B.C. to find that out; the Government has it in its hands to find out how many of these sets have come into the Island before even the importers. When you make a check that an importer imported 12 TV Sets for the year, and at the end of the year you make another check and you find only two sets, that means that he has disposed of ten sets and he will have to satisfy you as to who has or have bought these ten sets. You do not have to be running around or making legislation appointing people to go into other people's homes at any time to find that out, because I know the attitude of some people. There are some people who would be only too glad for that at election time; and if they are supporters of the D.L.P. and they want to expose a B.L.P. member, I know that can happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot vote for this amendment, not as it is worded. If there were no other ways and means that the Government could make sure that they are collecting these taxes, they would have to do something of that sort; but they can find out. The onus should be placed on the seller to give an account of the sets which he imported into this Island and to whom he has sold them and then the Government could work. When one is buying a set he has to pay the licence before he gets it, and this, I believe, will be only after that year is ended. After that year has ended, you still have on your books who is the owner of a set and to record what has happened, and that the particular owner refused to pay. There are other ways and means to collect the licence fees rather than send people into other people's homes — and at anytime? I wonder if the Minister was serious. I want to know if he has read this Bill because knowing the Minister as I do, I am sure that he would not agree for one to go into his home at any time looking for a set. Sir, he may go in and find the wrong set.
(Laughter).

3.40 p.m.

I believe that this Bill has been circulated to the Minister the same time I got mine, and that is just now. I did not get a chance to read my copy, and I do not believe he had a chance to read his. Imagine a Minister going home late from a dance and his mistress is dragging him over the coals for coming in late, and then another man comes to the house and knocks! If the light is on, he will knock. Are you to allow a man to call at your house at any time? I cannot get into certain parts of my house at any time? I cannot understand it, Sir.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has given way. I am going to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed. (An hon. MEMBER: That was done already.) I had forgotten that. If he were to look at the Laws of Barbados, Vol. V, 1928-5 — 1942-8, he would see on page 602, Section 11:

Entry on premises for purposes of inspecting installations, etc.

"(1) It shall be lawful for the Inspector or any other person appointed by the Governor in that behalf at all times to enter any premises, vessel or aircraft or to inspect any vehicle, apparatus, motor, installation, machinery, or appliance for the purpose of satisfying himself that the provisions of this Act and the regulations made hereunder have been and are being observed."

Now, going back to the Constitution. I am no lawyer, and I do not pretend to be a lawyer, but I, certainly, am no fool. If you were to look at page 18 of the Constitution it would allay the fears of hon. members. This is what the Constitution states:

Clause 17.
Protection
against arbitrary search
or entry.

17.(1) Except with his own consent, no person shall be subject to the search of his person or his property or the entry by other on his premises.

(2) 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 —

- (a) in the interest of defence, public safety, public order, public morality, public health, town or country planning, the development or utilisation of mineral resources, or the development or utilisation of any other property in such manner as to promote the public benefit;
- (b) for the purpose of protecting the rights or freedom of other persons;
- (c) for the purpose of authorising an officer or officer or agent of the Government, or of a local Government authority or of a body corporate established directly by law for public purposes to enter on the premises of any person in order to inspect those premises or anything thereon for the purpose of any tax, duty, rate, cess or other impost or in order to carry out work connected with any property that is law-

fully on those premises and that belongs to the Government or that authority or body corporate as the case may be.

I am accepting —

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I gave way, but the Hon. Minister is stretching things too far. He is making a speech; he is reading the Constitution and so on. He does not have a soft spot in his heart for lawyers, but he now allows one to sit at his side and confuse him. He reminds me of the Chairman of Committees, because he is reading wrong sections. He is far from the point, and I cannot allow him to go any further. Sir, ask him to take his seat; he is a Minister, but he is not the boss in here. When he is at the Pine, he is the boss; I am on my feet, Sir, you must ask the Minister to take his seat.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has made his point of elucidation. Would the hon. senior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a further point of elucidation. Why I am accepting the postponement of further consideration of this Bill is that I do not want hon. members on the other side to feel that —

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I wish to draw attention to May's Parliamentary Practice, page 448, Sixteenth Edition:

"A member may again be heard to offer an explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood, but he must not introduce new matter, or endeavour to strengthen it by new argument"

The hon. member is completely out of order. I thought the hon. members on that side were more anxious to get away.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph risen on a point of order? I am hearing the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who says that he is speaking on a point of elucidation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason why I am accepting the suggestion from the other side is that I do not want it to be said that we were forcing this Bill through because we have the numbers. Therefore I am accepting the postponement of the Bill.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, ask the hon. member to take his seat; two of us are on the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is quite willing to hear the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister got up and read the Constitution. I do not know if it is the one up by Fort Royal Garage. If I steal anything and it is suspected that it is in my home, you can apply for a search warrant and you can enter my home at any time. I will agree with anything of that sort.

3.50 p.m.

Do not tell me that I buy a television set or radio from a firm, pay the licence fee there and then, if I fail to pay afterwards, this Government or this House must agree to a Bill to send any sort or all sorts of persons into my home at any time. We have to be very careful, because after we say "AYE" to this Bill, it is finished.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am craving the indulgence of the House. I do not want to make another speech, but I am merely drawing to the attention of the draughtsman of any amended Bill he may send down, that under this amendment Section 10 of the original Act is not repealed, and in section 10 the apparatus that we find unlicensed is forfeited to the Crown. If you do not amend that, that can happen for the future; so tell the draughtsman to do the amendment properly before he sends it back to the House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must thank the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, but I was telling the hon. member that I was accepting the proposal which he had suggested.

The question that further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

QUESTION TIME

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

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

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

QUESTION re WATER SUPPLY IN ST. PETER AND ST. ANDREW

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 191 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that residents of Boscombe in the parishes of St. Peter and St. Andrew and Mount, St. Peter and St. Andrew, receive an intermittent supply of pipe-borne water of less than three hours in a period of a twelve-hour day?

2. Will Government take steps to remedy this state of affairs?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. A new well at Alleynedale is being put into supply shortly and this will improve the water supply to some of the intermediate level areas in the Boscobelle and Mount districts. Consideration is also being given to the erection of a reservoir in the Boscobelle area to improve the water supply to the high elevations.

QUESTION re NUMBER OF DRUGGISTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 212 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that the number of druggists presently engaged in the dispensing of medicine is hopelessly inadequate to cope with the needs of the Island's population?

2. Is Government aware that the list of Druggists as constituted at February, 1968, does not present a true picture as to the number of registered druggists, since some of the names thereon are of persons long dead?

3. Will Government assist the local Pharmaceutical Society in ways and means of enrolling more under-studies to fill the needs of the profession and assist it in discharging its very grave responsibility to the community?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health, the reply is as follows:-

1. No, Sir.

2. No, Sir. The list includes the names of two persons who died since it was published in February, 1968.

3. Yes, Sir. At present employment of an apprentice is purely a matter of private arrangement between the apprentice and a registered druggist. However, my Ministry has been investigating the possibilities of developing a regular system of training for paramedical professions, including pharmacy. Preliminary discussions have already been held with the Pharmaceutical Society.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. member, but I am surprised he did not give it to the actual Minister of Social Services to give the reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Don't stir up any strife. The question has been answered.

QUESTION re HOLETOWN POST OFFICE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 204 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

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

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is the Minister aware that because of the increased business at Hometown, St. James, the Hometown post office should be extended as soon as possible?

2. Is the Minister aware that the driveway leading to the said Post Office is too small to accommodate the members of the general public who attend there?

3. Will the Minister see to the extension of the driveway and Post Office referred to as quickly as possible?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works, the Reply is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir.

3. A proposal to extend the St. James Post Office is being examined in the Ministry of Communications and Works.

QUESTION re GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOUSE OR FLATS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 228 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister state the number of Ministers of Government (other than the Prime Minister) who during the past two years have occupied Government-owned houses or flats in this Island?

2. Will the Minister state the names of any such Ministers and what rentals each such Minister paid in respect of the occupation of such houses?

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

The Minister of Education occupied "Windmar", Flint Hall, from 10th September, 1967, to 7th October, 1967. The Minister of Communications and Works occupied the said house from 9th October, 1967, to 15th May, 1968.

2. Both Ministers paid the rental rates normally paid by other occupants of the letting at the rate of \$60.00 per month.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Minister be able to state if this is the policy of Government for Ministers of Government to have such houses or flats, or is this some preferential treatment given to either of the two Ministers who occupied the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was certainly not the latter. First of all, the hon. member may not know this, but Government lettings are administered by a Committee of the Ministry of Home Affairs. These two Ministers applied in the usual way, and the facility was granted to them on grounds which satisfied the particular Committee.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if the rental was arrived at on the basis of a percentage of the salary as is done in the case of Civil Servants.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member had heard the reply, he would recall that I said that both Ministers paid the rental rates normally paid by other occupants of the letting, that is, at the rate of \$60 a month. That is what, as far as I can understand it, is normally charged for that particular letting.

Mr. HINDS: I would like to have from the Minister some idea as to whether these are three-bedroom flats or four-bedroom flats or what. Is it a house with ten rooms or what? In other words, I want to know if the Minister was getting his \$60 a month's worth.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Since it is perfectly possible that the hon. member knew about this before I did, he is probably better informed. I really do not know, I cannot assist him in that. All I know is that this House is in Flint Hall.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Leader of the House has ever visited this particular flat at Flint Hall.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, I have never.

ACQUISITION OF LAND ADJOINING THE HOLETOWN POST OFFICE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 229, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James. That is on page 20.

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

Will the Minister take steps to acquire compulsory or otherwise, the parcel of land south of and adjoining the Hometown Post Office for the purpose of providing an Esplanade for the use of the parishioners of Saint James?

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

"Government does not at present propose to acquire the parcel of land South of the adjoining Hometown Post Office."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the Minister mean that the Government would consider acquiring this land at a future date?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, it does not mean that. It means that it is not considering it at present.

Mr. HINDS: I asked if he would consider acquiring it at some future date. I understand the Minister to say that the Government is not at present considering acquiring this land for this purpose. From that am I not to understand that the Government is likely to consider it at a future date?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is possible. When I say this, I do not assist the hon. member much. I can say it is possible that he would consider it, but the point is that, at the moment, there is no proposal to do so. This would not bind the Government for the future.

Mr. HINDS: Am I to understand the Minister that there is not a proposal to acquire the land at this present moment for this particular purpose?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, you understand me correctly.

Mr. HINDS: Are you presently acquiring this land for some other purpose? That is what I am asking the Minister.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Is the Minister saying then that the need for an Esplanade in St. James, south of Hometown is not really necessary.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir, I am not saying that.

ACCIDENTS OCCURRING AT FOUR-CROSS ROADS JUNCTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 193, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

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

1. How many accidents involving vehicles, persons, and other than vehicles and persons, have been reported to the Police Authorities as having occurred at the four-cross roads junction known as Eagle Hall Corner in the parish of St. Michael since the installation of traffic lights there?

2. How many such accidents have been so reported as occurring in the corresponding period previous to the installation of the said lights?

3. How many of the accidents occurring in each period involved two or more persons, and two or more vehicles in one and the same accident?

4. How many persons suffered injury in each corresponding period?

5. Is the Minister aware that the point of intersection of the highways converging at this corner does not afford a sufficient area for driving around same without endangering the safety of vehicles and persons not turning right or left, as the case may be?

6. If the answer to No. 5 above is in the affirmative, will Government take steps to make travelling at this junction safer for the general public?

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

1. Sixty-eight accidents involving vehicles were reported to the Police since the traffic lights were installed in 1960.

2. This information is not available since no records were kept.

3. Fifty-seven accidents of the 68 reported from 1960 involved two or more vehicles. There was one accident involving a vehicle and two or more persons.

4. Twenty-three persons were injured in the 68 accidents reported since 1960.

5. No, Sir.

6. Does not arise.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the Minister not consider that 57 out of 68 accidents involving two or more vehicles and the 23 persons present a somewhat dangerous situation at this corner?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As I understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, most of the accidents occurred in swinging right from Black Rock going to Barbarees and left from Bank Hall going into Barbarees; but never or rather seldom swinging right from Bank Hall into Eagle Hall, or left from Black Rock going into Eagle Hall.
4.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: From the information the Minister has just given us, does it not occur to him that there is something wrong at the point of intersection when coming from Black Rock and turning into Barbarees Road, or going from Bank Hall into Barbarees Road?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I agree with the hon. member that there does seem to be something wrong. It could, of course, be a mixture of bad judgment, fortuitous circumstances, or a greater concourse of people and vehicles making the right and left turns on that side than make the right and left turns on the other side. I cannot give any scientific reason, but it seems to me that it could be a mixture of all three.

Mr. HINDS: In the light of the replies that the Minister has just given, does the Minister still maintain that his reply to Question No. 5 is "No"?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I still, but only because I am not able to pinpoint the reasons for the frequency of accidents. If I could, I would agree with the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, was the object of the Questions not to cause the Minister to cause an investigation into what was the cause of these accidents?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This was done, but it would seem to me that the people making the investigations were in no better position to give a reason for these accidents than I myself or, perhaps, even the hon. member. They just could not find a reason.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister saying that the persons who were investigating the matter have reported before they completed their investigations?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have every reason to believe that the investigations were thorough, but there comes a point, in a matter like this, when you have to hazard sensible guesses because you cannot pinpoint the reasons.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us if any engineers were involved in the investigations?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. HINDS: Did the Police assist in carrying out the investigations?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. HINDS: Did your Town and Country Planning Officers assist in the investigations?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. HINDS: Did they go and try to observe the movement of traffic at this particular point?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: They did everything except become involved in accidents themselves.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister agree that they have done everything to cause him to come head on into a collision in this House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No. I do not believe that I have come head on into a collision. I believe that the hon. member's judgment is such that he will avoid me.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for half an hour.

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

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

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE
BARBADOS ASSOCIATION OF MENTALLY
RETARDED CHILDREN BILL

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg leave to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and Report on the Bill to incorporate the Barbados Association of Mentally Retarded Children.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE
LIONS CLUB OF BARBADOS BILL, 1968

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee which sat on the Bill to incorporate the Lions Association be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Report be adopted.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say, in respect of this Bill, that the Cabinet has no objection to it, and will be pleased to support it.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

BARBADOS ASSOCIATION OF MENTALLY
RETARDED CHILDREN BILL, 1968

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Committee on the Bill to incorporate the Barbados Association of Mentally Retarded Children be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Report be now adopted.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say, in respect of this Bill, that the Cabinet has no objection, and the Bill is supported.

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

4.20 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was just conferring with the hon. senior member for St. James. I do not propose to deal with any of mine, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for Christ Church not being in their places, I was just asking the hon. senior member for St. James which item standing in his name he would like to do. I understand he wants to do No. 16, in which case I beg to move that Order No. 16 under Private Members' Business be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE
(THIRD PARTY RISKS) ACT, 1952

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a Resolution of this nature would have taken the assistance of some of the legal luminaries, but unfortunately they happen not to be here. As the mover of this Resolution, I can only speak on it out of a case which was drawn to my attention by one of my constituents in St. James. I do not pretend to be any expert on this type of insurance, but I feel very unhappy, after hearing of the circum-

stances surrounding a man who found himself in the ignorant position of not having full third party insurance because he did not know any better, and because of the cost of it, he withdrew himself and decided to have what Government provides for as the minimum insurance which one should have for the purpose of having a vehicle on the road. This arises out of the unfortunate situation of a man who finds himself with the fantastic bill of \$327 to pay because this Third Party Risk Act as it now stands does not provide him with the cover which anyone should normally have. The difference which I have observed between the amount of money which one pays for the minimum amount of insurance on his car under the Act as against what he pays for Full Third Party can, I think, be filled in if this Act is looked into more carefully.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to proceed further with this Resolution at this stage because I believe that many of my colleagues in the Legal Profession would be quite eager to speak on it and are at present not in the Chamber. I therefore beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this comes to the end of all Government Business for today's sitting. I consulted with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in person as well as with my own colleagues on this side, and there is a consensus that we are all very tired and we do not wish to see each other for quite some time.

I therefore beg to move, and again I do this with the concurrence of the hon. member opposite and with the agreement of this side, that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 29th October, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

I take this opportunity to wish Your Honours, His Honour the Speaker and yourself, and His Honour the Chairman as well as all hon. members both on this side and the other, a very enjoyable and refreshing recess and to express the hope that we shall all come back after the recess ready for the fray again.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I second the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and heartily endorse all that the hon.

member has said especially as regards yourself, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman of Committees and the Officers of the House. I will repeat, without in any way wanting it to be taken as a suggestion that the Hon. Leader of the House would not have told his colleagues what I told him today, that I hope members of the Government will see that all Questions are ready for answer when we come back. He assured me that he has been taking steps to see that this was done; so I am glad of that. It would ease considerably the feeling on this side of the House that the Government does not really care whether the Opposition's Questions are answered. I wish to congratulate the Hon. Leader of the House in reaching the stage when he feels that these Questions have been hanging fire for too long, some as far back as the middle of last year. That is a little too bad, considering that as all hon. members must know, every day in the House of Commons a hundred questions are on the Order Paper and are answered unless hon. members happen not to be in their places, and they ask supplementaries. You buy Hansard every day and discover the answers are there set out. Spend more money rightly and properly in being up to date as much as possible. Nobody on this side of the House is going to object to the expenditure of money in the right direction; so I hope that members will pardon me for making use of this opportunity when it ought to be only a question of wishing each other a happy recess and all the rest of it, but which is perfectly lawful to use always on the question of the adjournment of the House to say anything.

I wish hon. members of the Government Benches a rest during which time they will have opportunity for reflecting as to their sins and becoming good Christians.

4.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in winding up I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the hon. member. I give him the assurance which he has asked for and to tell him that we should certainly reflect on our sins, but we may not do it quite well because the sins of the hon. members opposite are so weighty that we may not have time to reflect on both; but we will try. *(Laughter)*.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 29th October, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.34 p.m.