THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th March, 1964.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker)*; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, *(Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism)*; Mr. L.F. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education)*; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)*; Mr. N. W. BOVELL and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as Your Honour would appreciate, there has not been very much time which elapsed between the end of the Session yesterday and the commencement of this one today and the appropriate staff is working overtime to get the documentation which we intend to lay to-day. Therefore, I am going to ask leave to present any notices or messages which may be forthcoming in respect of today's meeting later.

Because of that, I am asking permission to proceed with the Order Paper as it is presently constituted, and later I would have to crave Your Honour's and the House's indulgence to present what normally we should do at the beginning of the House. I am sure the position would generally be appreciated.

DOCUMENTS ARRIVE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Notices are here and on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following Message regarding the prorogation of the Legislature.

The Message reads as follows:-

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he proposes to prorogue the Legislature on Tuesday, the 31st March, 1963, at 5.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

J. M. STOW
Governor

Government House, Barbados.
24th March, 1964
(M.P. 26/1 Vol. VIII).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am also commanded to lay on behalf of the Hon. Premier: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1964;

Also, The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1964;

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1964.

Sir, as I intimated yesterday, I propose to deal with the matters which we gave notice of yesterday afternoon as well as with those of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. SMITH: BE IT RESOLVED that this House disapproves of the reply to Oral Question No. 121 given on the 10th March, 1964, by the Hon. Premier relative to Statements made about Civil Servants who should have gone home in connection with the award of Government contracts.
12.15 p.m.

QUESTION

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

Will the Hon. Premier consider broadcasting "live" again the day to day debates of the Honourable House of Assembly over "Radio Barbados", as was done with the Federation debates over Rediffusion?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for today's sitting.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ORDER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1964," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 23rd March, 1964, under the provisions of Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Order provides for the following adjustments in the Establishment structure of certain Ministries and Departments. In the Ministry of Education, we are creating the following permanent posts on the Establishment of the Technical Institute:- One Instructor and one Housekeeping Instructress. In the Post Office Department, there is to be an increase in the number of postmen by one, and, in the Social Welfare Department, we are upgrading the salary of the existing post of Sports Officer from $4,128 - $5,904 to $5,904 - $6,288 and adding to the Ministry of Social Services the following posts:- One Assistant Sports Officer, $4,128 - $5,136; one Sports Assistant, $1,200 - $2,352 and One Messenger, $1,092 - $1,704. That will make the full complement. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Ministry of Education, the provision here is for an Instructor and a Housekeeping Instructress, and that is in connection with the Hotel School. This is a very laudable scheme, but enough is not known of it. I do not think that in a matter like this, the setting up of a Hotel School, the Government should embark on something of such a character without consulting the people who are involved in and concerned with it. I am making no special plea for my Organization, but I do not see that, in an age like this, the Government should set up a Hotel School without having any consultation with the organization which represents the hotel workers, to know what are the views of that organization. You set up a scheme merely between the employers and the Government, and it would be a strange thing in England or anywhere else to have this school set up and the workers' organization is not consulted in the matter. While I say that it is a laudable scheme, it looks to me that there is a very serious gap where consultation in the matter is concerned.

In so far as the Technical Institute is concerned, I am aware that this Institute has been asking the Government for some time now to go into the staff arrangements there, and I do hope that the urgency of the needs of that Institute will be met.

As regards the Post Office, Sir, I have been repeatedly stating in this House that the arrangement which we have for the Post Office system in Barbados is an antiquated one. It is not only that we need a Post Office building, but we have this disjointed affair where one piece of the Post Office is situated at the Wharf and we have two pieces in the yard of the Public Buildings. Then, Sir, there is this antiquated system of giving out mail or the transportation of mail on contract, and we do not have an integrated system of postal services. This is all out of date. The Government may be undertaking something which may be okay for now, but during last year, in London itself, a mail van was robbed. I understand that we have a practice here of sending to Seawell Airport for mails, and the mail van is driven without any security or protection and you do not know what the van is carrying.

I should like to say, Sir, that the transportation of mail from Seawell to Bridgetown should not be a question of anything insecure, and there is no point at all in waiting until something happens before you take the necessary precautions in the matter.
12.35 p.m.

I think it is an extremely serious matter. Some day some important document or documents or property, money and otherwise, are likely to go astray between Seawell Airport and Bridgetown. Let us not be unaware that as a country grows industrially, it grows in crime, and all countries have shown that. The more you grow industrially the more scientific your crime arrangements are going to be, and I think it would be wise if you took the necessary precautions.

I am very pleased to see the upgrading in the Social Welfare Department of the Sports Officer, and I would suggest to Government that these officers be removed from the Social Welfare Department. These officers should not be under the Head of someone who really cannot be in charge of a Department of Sports Officer. Let us be frank about it. How can you have somebody of the calibre of E. A. V. Williams, an international cricketer as Sports Officer, and have him under a woman who is going to tell him how he should perform his duties? Does she know if a cricket pitch should be north and south? Does she know the distance between one goal post and another on a football field? Does she know the area of a football field, or when you are marking out a 440 yard track in a circle on an athletic field, how it should be done? Why is it that you have this inexpert system continuing? If this started in the beginning, it should cease, because it has created a lot of unnecessary cleavages in that you have experts under inexpert Heads. In a thing like this, the people should be attached to the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry. You have Mr. Weekes, Mr. Williams and now Mr. Wedderburn, all international people in their own field, and you are asking them to report to the Social Welfare Head who looks after a baby whose parents have left for England, and is therefore trained in a different field. You will not get sports organised in a proper form if people are not given scope and freedom to exercise their talents and outlook, unfettered by having them bogged down in this departmental fashion. I feel that these people should be given the freedom that these officers deserve if we want the best to come from this money. In my own case I can ask the officer directly concerned, but those of us who have to deal with athletics do not want to go through this roundabout method.

I feel the hotel school is a laudable idea, but I am wondering why this school was established as part of your industrial relations matter, and the Trade Union that is really responsible for negotiating for hotel workers was not asked to express an opinion on the school. You have agreed about consultation and setting up a Committee, and we feel as the people concerned that we have a right to be in on these things.

I will repeat that I think the Post Office system is still antiquated, and it is about time we get out of that method and put all the Post Office facilities under the Postal Department. I do not see why the postal vans should be in the hands of private people as in the old days when somebody had a horse and buggy. This originated from the old days when Mr. So-and-So was coming to town and you asked him to put a little thing behind. The days for that are over, and the Government must be prepared to bring the postal services under the Post Office and not have them on a contracting out basis which is inimical to good postal arrangements, and inimical to the workers themselves who are involved.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to sound a note of warning to the Government relative to the very welcome change which we see now being gradually applied as to their attitude towards sport. Now it is no earthly use appointing coaches and paying lip service to the importance of sport and not having the equipment. It will be necessary for Government to think — and to think very early indeed — of obtaining some sporting equipment in this colony. The hurdles which are in use were built, I understand from reliable information, in the year of our Lord 1897. They are still in use at Harrison College. Excellent equipment for

breaking a leg if one is so minded, but certainly not for running a hurdle race. It is impossible to invite people here from other countries, asking them to take part in a sporting event and not have the equipment. It will be found that now that a step has been made in the right direction by the appointment of an athletic coach, it will also be necessary – and it is a concomitant – that some modern equipment be provided. For instance, no record which is created on any sporting ground in Barbados would be acceptable to an international body because there is no wind gauge in the Island, and it is one of the necessary provisoes for acceptance of a record that a wind gauge be in use at the time of the event for which the record is claimed. These are little things which could quite easily be rectified if the Government plans to consult the people who know about these things, whose attention has been forced to include matters of this nature. It is good to see that incubus of the Social Welfare Department is going to be removed from this sporting section. We all wish the new Department very well indeed, and although the lady who formerly was in charge may have been well-meaning, her knowledge about sporting activities must necessarily be suspect.

We are wondering what is meant here by the Sports Assistant, a strange designation, in the Ministry of Social Services. I have no doubt the Minister will be only too pleased to explain. The staff structure will provide for better organisation, but I would like at this time to sound another warning; it is going to be necessary and very soon indeed to appoint a lady who has had some form of training, so that the girls may be trained in netball and/or female basketball, because it is one of these games which is receiving a great deal of well merited popularity in many countries. Even in this Island netball is becoming more and more popular, and the Social Welfare Department is to be complimented at this time on the organisation of inter-club and inter-school netball games; but training is indeed necessary if the girls are ever to take a worthwhile part in games against other countries. One or two had the opportunity recently, and we noted that those countries which had provided facilities for training, notably Jamaica and Trinidad, did quite well against England, New Zealand and other Commonwealth countries which took part. We are hoping that one day some of our girls also might contribute in large measure to the success of a West Indies team.

There is a move afoot, Sir, to resuscitate the West Indies Championships which unfortunately have not been held since 1959. Some of us were fortunate enough to be in Trinidad on Sunday last. We held a meeting at which present were representatives from Grenada, Dominica, St. Kitts, Antigua, Trinidad, British Guiana and Barbados.
12.45 p.m.

It was decided there and then that these championships would be resuscitated, special emphasis being paid to this. If Trinidad has agreed to be the venue for the next meeting, it is expected that Barbados which has never held one of these championships would be the venue next year. How can we hold this championship meeting when we have no equipment? It would be necessary for Government to make provision for such equipment as shot put, pole vaulting bars and so on. This kind of sport is more important than many people realise. In fact, the obituary of many a politician would be passed and passed unnoticed by people in many lands, but the lives and injury of some athletes would be world wide recorded.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my colleague has taken care of that part of this Resolution which deals with the Social Welfare Department and Sports Officer. There is nothing which I can add to that and it would be just a waste of time if I attempted to do so because I am not *au fait* with the subject matter. Therefore, I leave that alone.

I shall deal with the question of providing for the creation of the following permanent posts on the establishment of the Technical Institute of one Instructor and one Housekeeping Instructress. I can hardly allow it to pass without mentioning that it is rather refreshing to see that people took heed and are doing something which might be a benefit to the community, despite the fact that it did not originate of their own Party. That is how I feel it should be. If something is worthwhile doing and worthwhile to the Government, then I say it is worthwhile; therefore, all I can say is that I commend the Government for its good action in this particular matter, more especially because those of us who go abroad and travel, who go into some of the hotels, find that it is absolutely necessary to have people who can put on more than a white suit and black tie to be a butler or a cook, but for whom training is absolutely necessary.

It is an absolute fact that a man came over from the United Kingdom to Canada to take up some job of management in a hotel, and when he got there, instead of taking that job, he said that he would accept the job of head waiter. Let me tell you that the head waiter of the Waldorf-Astoria in the United States draws more salary than the Attorney of the United States. Those people are trained. When the Attorney of the United States was drawing $45,000 per annum, the head waiter of the Waldorf-Astoria was drawing $50,000.

I commend the Hon. Minister and the Government for acting so swiftly, and I hope that we may also be included in this. I have found out myself that even when you have a couple of chefs around here, a number of young women who work with them in the kitchen after three or four years acquire such a good knowledge of the art that they are able to take posts in small boarding houses and give very good results.

I come now to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing and I hope he would pay strict attention to this. I am not a Minister of propaganda by any chance, but because of my position in the City Council, I cannot help knowing things. I must hear a lot of things. There has been a lot said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and he is correct. The changing of times do not permit you to keep a mule and buggy for transporting mail. Mail from St. Lucy or St. Peter – inland mail – may be one thing, but within recent months we were having very many complaints about mail and money coming from people in London and Florida being lost. The Hon. Minister must pay attention to this although all that has been said may not be true.

I am not one who makes any propaganda about any matter. I find it easier now that I have a Government whose members I can speak to than it was previously. What I want to find out is this. Can the Hon. Minister tell me if there has been an investigation into the tremendous amount of mail which was posted from the United Kingdom to persons in this country but which was found torn up somewhere in St. James where the Postmaster General and certain persons went? Here is where I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I believe nine-tenths of our incoming mail comes to the Seawell Airport and it is my opinion that the Government should have that type of motor van than to have mails transported from Seawell in the type of thing which I see. We know that the majority of mail coming into Barbados comes through Seawell Airport, and we realise, taking it from the Post Office statistics, that that mail is very important and carries a tremendous lot of money in it, in some cases cash money. As I have said, that matter has been drawn to my attention and I would like to know what actually happened. What did they find? I ask because many people have come to me and told me that their families had sent them money and so on, and up to now they have not received anything. In other words, they have become suspicious. This happened just last year. What happened when a woman came to you and reported that she found a lot of torn up mail somewhere behind Prior Park?
12.55 p.m.

What has happened is that Mr. McConney, if you want me to call names, found himself at Prior Park where he found a number of letters thrown out, and they got evidence from a woman that a number of cars were bringing

these things and dumping them there. This is a very serious matter. I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Removing mail from Seawell Airport to Bridgetown is not like the matter of removing mail from the Post Office to the parish of St. Lucy. The Hon. Leader of the House would know more than anybody else; when the last Government suggested lending money to send away people, the amount of money which was transmitted between the United Kingdom and Barbados was no less than $80,000; but today, Sir, we have millions of dollars being transmitted between other countries and Barbados. The majority of this money comes by way of Money Orders or notes, but it comes by air mail; and therefore, I repeat, that the transportation of mail from Seawell Airport to the post Office is something of very great importance and it must be given very serious consideration.

Sir, this is something which should be directly under a different form of control; this is not merely a matter of removing mail to St. John or to St. Lucy; this is a question of money which has come by air mail and it is being transported from Seawell Airport to Bridgetown. What I am going to say now is something commendable for our postmen. I have had the experience of a person who went to England and who sent back to me the sum of £200 in an envelope in actual pound notes, and that money was received. That money came by air mail and you may not get that sort of integrity being carried on. Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I feel that while this extra van is necessary for the Post Office, something better is necessary for the transportation of mail from Seawell Airport to the Post Office. I will say as to these mail which were found in St. Thomas, it was discovered that they were not just local mail which people got tired with and threw away in a particular area; they were mail which were addressed to people in the parish of St. John, St. Joseph and other parishes. These mail were not from St. James; they were dumped there from certain cars and I hope that the Hon. Minister knows about this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before my colleagues, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and others reply to the points which have arisen in respect of their particular Ministries, let me say something to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City. I must thank them for the praise which they have offered to the Government in respect of the Hotel School and I would regard this matter to be one of the utmost urgency. It was only four weeks ago, as hon. members will remember, that we made this House aware of our decision to ask for money to start the renovations which are necessary at the Technical Institute. The reason why not much more could have been said in the last four weeks was that the final preparations were started, and it is only today that we have come to the House for approval of the appointment of the senior staff. Therefore hon. members will see that we are working on a time schedule which is well in hand.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has raised the question as to whether it was our intention that the workers should be represented on the Advisory Committee or not. I will tell this House that it is the Government's intention and its policy to set up an Advisory Committee, and on that Committee will be represented the Tourist Board, the Hotel Owners' Association and the Government and under the Cabinet's direction I have given instructions to add two other members. I want the hon. senior member for St. Peter to know that I propose to exercise my discretion in the way I have suggested and in a very short while, he will be hearing of it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation. I thank the Hon. Minister for what he has said and I would like to say that I did not see in this Note that these Officers come within the purview and the responsibility of the Minister of Social Services. The points I have made have now been covered in this Note.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am very glad that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has discovered what this Order is all about. Sometime in November last year there was a Civil Establishment Order, it was Order No. 11, introduced in this House for the creation of a Sports section under the Ministry of Social Services. At that time, it was the intention of the Government to separate the Sports Section from the Social Welfare Department and to create a new section which would be directly under the responsibility of that Ministry; and that Department would take its instructions from the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Social Services. This Order, which is now before us, seeks to replace that Order which was made in November last, and because of legal technicalities, the post of Sports Officer has been upgraded and remains under the Social Welfare Department, but, administratively, it will be under the control of the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Social Services.

1.05 p.m.

Virtually the Sport Officer would be the Head of that Sports Section, but this would be done administratively. Going a little further down the Order, it will be seen clearly that the other posts of Assistant Sports Officer, Sport Assistant and Messenger would be directly under the control of the Permanent Secretary, and as I said before, the Head of this section will be the Sports Officer, hence the upgrading of the post.

In reply to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, it is common knowledge that the appointment of coaches and other officers in this section of the Ministry would go hand in hand with the acquisition of equipment. We have never had an athletic coach prior to the appointment of the one which has recently been appointed, and we have never had an established Sports Department as such. It is only on the recommendation of the Specialist coach that the Government can undertake to purchase equipment. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown can rest assured that when representations are made to the Government for the purchase of the basic equipment which will enable the coaches to carry out their duties satisfactorily, that will be done. The hon. member may not know, or on the other hand he may know, that the Government has undertaken to purchase the equipment for the coaching of cricket. That has been practised all along because there was a cricket coach, and the present Sports Officer himself specialises more or less in the field of cricket, and the necessary equipment for cricket was purchased. As a matter of fact, it is purchased year after year.

The hon. member would also remember that in the 1963-64 Estimates for the first time in the history of Barbados a special allocation was made for the purchasing of equipment to foster the growth of minor sports in this Island; so it is not fair to suggest that Government has not been concerned about the purchase of equipment. We have gone into this as the need arose, and as further needs arise we will also consider the question of the purchase of equipment. The hon. member also asked what is meant by Sports Assistant. Now this Sports Assistant is more or less a clerical assistant, someone having a knowledge of various types of sport, for example, athletics, cricket, basket ball and perhaps netball, but at the same time the person must be qualified in commercial subjects so that the person can do the office routine. That is why instead of terming the officer a Clerical Assistant, he or she is referred to as a Sports Assistant. I hope that the hon. member is satisfied with the explanation. He referred also to the appointment of a lady to assist in the coaching of basketball and netball. We can only go as far as our resources go, and we have to face the establishment of this Sports Department in sections. We hope we will see the day when we will have coaches in all types of sport. At that time we might perhaps be able to have one for basketball and netball, but as it stands, we depend on voluntary help. For example, the Island's basketball coach is a volunteer, and this person is appointed by the BABA, and we also have voluntary assistance from people who are well versed in the field of netball who go to the grounds and give what assistance they can.

The hon. member also stated that there should be a lady for the coaching of basketball to the girls, but we have discovered that greater assistance is given even in the

field of netball by males. The hon. member would remember that only last year one of the keenest persons who promoted netball in Barbados was a young man who is now out of the Island. He was mainly responsible for the growth of the netball carried on by the Social Welfare Department. We are sorry to have missed him, but he has gone to widen his knowledge further afield and we wish him well. A male however can do the job just as well as a female, as long as he has the necessary training, ability and knowledge of the particular type of sport.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, such strictures as I made were not confined to the present Government only; it does not matter which Government has control. What I am interested in is sport, and the fact that the Sports Department has been run for several years and does not possess a tape measure does cause me considerable amazement. However, as I said, I congratulate the present administration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. LYNCH: The substantive point, Sir, is that in a country which knows a great deal more about women's basketball than Barbados, notably Brazil, the national coach happens to be a woman. The game is not unknown outside the British Commonwealth. They play women's basketball and the national coach and the coach of every basketball club is a woman.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member will remember that I said that as our resources become greater we will consider the appointment of other coaches, and the point I was trying to make is that although we do not have the other coaches, we make use of what voluntary services we can have here now.
1.15 p.m.

I tried to point out to the hon. member that the service which we have in the coaching of netball is more or less at the Social Welfare Department and in other areas, and with the provision which we made in 1963 to 1964, we have been able to have the support of a male in order to assist in the coaching not only of netball, but of basketball. That is the point which I was trying to make; I was not saying that a female coach would not be perhaps better for netball, but I was saying that we did not have it and it cannot be gainsaid that there has been a great growth in the field of netball to what it was in the past. The hon. member can rest assured that we are aware of the advance in this field of sport.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is.....

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir, the Minister has something to answer.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown have mentioned something about air mail coming from Seawell, and both hon. members felt that the small motor van which is used in the transportation of this mail is not good enough.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I said that the mail coming from Seawell to Bridgetown was insecure and that a similar method was employed in bringing mail to the general Post Office from the country districts, and a private contractual basis was out of date.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. I too said that the mail coming from Seawell was not secure enough.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot agree with the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown when he says that mail is more important. Her Majesty's mail in any form is very important, and the ordinary man would not know whether it contains something more precious in this bag than in the other bag. (A VOICE: We know.) If that hon. member knows, then he knows something more than I, although I have been a captain of a ship bringing mail here. I consider all mail to be important.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to hear any speech or talk from across the Table. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. The Hon. Minister has mentioned that one bag of mail is not more important than the other. I tried to point out that the fact that we had in our Post Office Report that a large amount of money was coming into this country by airmail, actually 98%, we could only conclude that this money came by air mail and therefore, that mail should be very much more secured.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The amount of money which comes in does not mean that it comes in actual cash through air mail. These are things which the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown knows. I will agree that the days are coming, although I hope that I would not live long enough to see them, when mail will be rifled during the time that they are transported, and from what I have heard in this House recently, I can see that anything can happen. However, I hope that I would not live to see the day when the Island would be burnt out if the Government does not get out. I am quite aware of the effects which television, the theatre and such places and things can have on Barbadians as they have on people in other developed countries. However, the mail coming in at present from the Bridgetown Harbour is transported to the Post Office under private arrangement by the agents of the ships and not at all by the Post Office. Arrangements are now being made for the Post Office itself to pick up this mail from the ships; so hon. members will realise that we have our eyes on improvement of the situation in the light of what can actually happen today.

As regards the contract given out for the transporting of mail to and from the District Post Offices, there is one firm which deals with this contract. When mail is transported from Seawell to Bridgetown, it is transported under the supervision of a Senior Officer from the Post Office in the department's van, and as a matter of fact, all the drivers who work on this van are considered as Postmen. There are Postmen who actually do the driving; therefore, they must accept a certain amount of responsibility.

As regards the hon. member's information about missing mail, that is information which for the first time I am hearing. I have spoken already about what actually can happen and I consider this as a very serious problem, something which we have to go into with full force; therefore, I assure the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown that as soon as I hear something I will let him in on the matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not a question of as soon as you hear something. When an hon. member asks something, he is not asking something for himself; he is making the statement for the benefit of the public. I want the Hon. Minister to make an enquiry or cause an enquiry to be made into the matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did hear the Hon. Minister say that he started to make enquiries.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I said that that is something which is very serious because Her Majesty's mail is something which is considered to be very important. Not only in Barbados, but in Her Majesty's Dominions, mail is given first class security and protection; and if mail can be destroyed to such an extent or can be taken away and destroyed and officers have been found near or in the vicinity of where it has been destroyed, that is a matter for the Criminal Investigation Department to work on directly.
1.25 p.m.

As soon as I get that information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will release it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is speaking.....

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would give way for one moment, it has happened that both Ministers have replied to points which have been raised by hon. members, but you will see that, technically speaking, the Hon. Premier has the final right to speak and the discretion may be exercised in his favour. Let the hon. senior member for St. Andrew proceed.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say that I believe in integrity. It is a matter of justice and that is what I am here for. I have heard the hon. senior member for the City speak concerning the destruction of letters coming from overseas to this island and in a particular district. I am saying that anybody who sends money from any country overseas and that money is unprotected, that is his business. This money should be registered. When money is registered, then official account would have to be given of it; but when it is not registered, no explanation can be given about it. When a letter is registered, it is passed from one country to another and each government is responsible for that letter and for the money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, relative to the transportation of letters from place to place, I am saying that these officers who transport these letters should be protected and armed. I am sorry to think that in a small country like Barbados, the Government is not responsible for the transportation of this mail throughout the island, instead of allowing this work to be done by contract. I do not see the necessity for that; I hope that in future, this Government will find it possible to have its own transportation, its own security and protection in respect of this mail when they are being removed from one place to another. I repeat, Sir, I hope that these mails will be protected; I know that they will be protected when they come into this country. As long as mail is registered, we are responsible for it.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: As Your Honour was putting the question, you expected that everybody had spoken. You were putting the question and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition protested against the question being put before the Hon. Minister had replied. I just say that because it might have slipped you in so far as your giving all hon. members the opportunity to speak on this matter; you did so and you were about to put the question. It is not that hon. members were prevented from speaking, but that Your Honour had intimated that you were about to put the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As the hon. member has rightly said, I was about to put the question, but I reflected quickly on the intimation by the hon. senior member for the City as to where the final reply should come from. Let me hear the point of order of the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was only saying that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew means well in what he is saying, but it is misleading for the hon. member to say that the Government is responsible for registered letters. The Government is not responsible when a letter is not delivered.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. What I was saying, Sir, is that when anyone is transporting money from one place to another, that money should be registered in order that it can be delivered.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have made enquiries as to the matter which has been raised by the hon. senior member for the City, and I can give hon. members the report on the allegations which have been made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Hon. Minister would give way, not so long ago, he said that he would promise to have an investigation made. During that time the Hon. Minister has made some investigation and he is now willing to give a reply to the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Not to me, to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there is no objection to the Hon. Minister giving that reply, leave will be granted him to do so. *(After a Pause).* There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister to make that reply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a result of my investigation since the question was raised in this House, this is what I have discovered. Mr. Yearwood, the Postmaster of St. James reported to the Postmaster General in December that one of his Postmen had stated that he had overheard a woman living in the Husbands area of St. James saying that she was walking one afternoon and saw a car parked along the main road in Prior Park, St. James. In it were about three men and they appeared to be examining some letters. As she approached the car, the driver moved off. She did not recall the number of the car. On the day following the receipt of this information, the Postmaster General and the Assistant Postmaster General went to the St. James Post Office and they toured the Prior Park area with the Postmaster of St. James.
1,35 p.m.

They interviewed the woman and she repeated the story, describing the area where she saw the parked car. They went there and saw a few pieces of paper, but there was not enough evidence there to conclude that those were letters or fragments of letters. They returned to the woman for further investigation. She declined to say anything further on the ground it would involve Court work. When they returned to the Post Office they made a check of all incoming mail to see whether any was missing, and their record for the period September to November showed that all mail was received. Mail is numbered serially from the beginning of a year; it was a check against these serial numbers which showed that there was no missing mail. Meanwhile investigations are still being carried out.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER, 1964

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1964.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Order, which is entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1964, provides for adjustments in the Establishment structure of the Ministry of Education and the Port Department.

If I may deal with the Ministry of Education first, it is intended to replace the present temporary posts provided for Mobile Cinema and Visual Aids duties by permanent pensionable posts as follows - one Visual Aids Officer, one Long Grade Clerk and three Driver Operators, the only difference in the designation with the posts being that the temporary post of Typist-Clerk is now being replaced by one Long Grade Clerk.

In the Port Department, as a result of the bringing into operation of the second tug, it is proposed to reorganise the crews and the basis on which they work in

order that you will always have crews available for the two tugs, and this involves the upgrading of the post of Mate from $2,472 - $2,832 to $3,528 - $3,960, and the creation of the following new posts: one Tug Master, one Senior Marine Engineer, one Junior Marine Engineer and one Mate.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Ministry of Education there is this post of Driver-Messenger in the Civil Establishment list which is designated L.6 in the scale of $1,092 to $1,704. That is the same salary that is attached to the post of Messenger, and you are now creating this Driver Operator. I understand that there is a system in the Public Service that when you have a Messenger Driver or a Driver Operator, you give as in the case of Messenger some additional increments when he is a driver, instead of putting him on a different scale to make up his increments; so that he gets this accelerated increase to make up for this additional position. The Government has done this so that where they have a van they are not required to have a Messenger and a Driver also; but where they have a Messenger who is a Driver, without any additional post they give him two or three increments. I understand however, that the Driver at Erdiston College is not in receipt of this favourable treatment, and I would like the Hon. Minister to deal with it, because he will note that this post of Driver Operator is on the same salary range as a Messenger in the Public Service. As the Driver Operator is regarded as a Messenger cum Driver, he therefore deserves some increments. I understand this happens in cases at Government Headquarters, and I think it is equitable treatment and should apply to all officers concerned.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to let the hon. member know that that will be investigated, although I should like to tell him that in the case of the Driver-Messenger at Erdiston College, that officer had been employed as a Messenger, and was in fact only a Messenger and not a Driver, because it was only in the last few months that we did acquire a van; so his case may be a little peculiar and a little different from the others. But I will have that investigated.

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

RESOLUTION *re* GRATUITIES TO OFFICERS ON CONTRACT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to vary the conditions governing the payment of gratuities to officers appointed on contract as set out in Schedule II to Resolution No. 78/1959.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution which we now have is not Civil Establishment Order No. 3; it is Item No. 3 on the Order Paper. We have just dealt with Civil Establishment Order No. 3 which is Order No. 2 on the Order Paper. I hope you will forgive me for any delay, but I was just trying to get that straightened up.

The Resolution which we now have before us deals with the conditions governing the payment of gratuities to officers appointed on contract as set out in the Second Schedule to Resolution No. 78/1959, and it provides that an officer's right to the payment of a gratuity shall accrue at the end of each year's satisfactory resident service; the officer may opt to receive any gratuity payable to him at the end of his resident service in the island, but this option must be exercised within six months of the start of his resident service in the island or, in the case of a serving officer, within six months of the 16th January, 1964.

1.45 p.m.

It also provides that the payment of a gratuity to an officer should be subject to his completion, to the satisfaction of the Governor, of the contract or, as the case may be, each year of resident service.

It also has other provisions which are matters of detail.

I should point out that Resolution No. 78/1959 provides for the payment of gratuities at the rate of 20% of salary to officers appointed on contract to posts at the normal salaries payable to pensionable officers on the satisfactory completion of their contract.

It is proposed to vary the existing conditions so that the abovementioned officers may exercise the option to receive gratuities as at present at the end of each year's satisfactory resident service.

This Resolution therefore seeks to set out the conditions under which these gratuities should be paid.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

THE SAVINGS BANK BILL, 1964

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is also by nature an Establishment matter, but as Your Honour is aware, the establishment of the Savings Bank is controlled by the Act of 1914, and not by a Civil Establishment Order.

The purpose of this Bill is to seek to amend the Act to increase from three to four the number of Assistant Accountants at the Bank. The situation at the Savings Bank is such now that it is found necessary, in order for the service to function efficiently, that an additional post of Accountant be created.

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

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very glad to hear that Government is increasing the staff at the Government Savings Bank and I am hoping that the staff there is adequate. I hope that the Hon. Minister would be able to tell me if this is so. I pass there regularly and I find that the place is always crowded. I know that they are doing good business there, but I do not know if a crowd always around the counter is due to the need of more staff or what. I do not know but I hope that the staff is adequate.

What most people do not know is that the space alloted to the Savings Bank is very inadequate. I know that the Government is doing all it possibly can to get new premises for the Savings Bank. However, you have a small counter to accommodate the people. It is a fact that most people do not like you to see them going into a bank or to see them drawing money. There are some people who when they are going into a bank turn all around and make sure their friends do not see them going into it. There are some people who when they take money out of their purses back you. I am sure that the Government Savings Bank will do a lot more business if it can be made more private. As I have said, I see a lot of people at the counter when I drop in at the other counter of the Post Office to buy a stamp. I hope the Hon. Minister will let me know if the staff is adequate and if the Manager made any representation as

regards his wanting more staff. It really does not look right that you are going to increase the staff by one more Assistant Accountant and nobody else.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, it does not follow that if you increase the staff by one Accountant, you will have to increase the other staff. However, I agree with the hon. member, but not as regards his point of people going into the bank. If you are working, you have a right to have money. You get this bogus idea in Barbados that you do not have a right to money, and for what reason, I do not know. I do not subscribe to that nonsense. I wish I had some money so that people would see me going into the banks.

A good friend and colleague of mine has gone to the Great Beyond; but when these Civil Establishment Orders were first introduced he protested against their being dealt with in the House because he said that we were providing money for the running of the country, and he did not agree that they should be dealt with in the House as abstract Resolutions and said that they should be dealt with in Committee of Supply. However, he was outvoted, and as such we are dealing with this Order in the House.

I will say on this matter, now that we have the opportunity to discuss it, that I do not intend to utilise the time on the increase in staff. I just want to say that the premises of the Government Savings Bank are a disgrace and an outright disgrace to the community. The service and the staff which you would expect to get from a public institution like this is a disgrace. There is no bank in any part of the world which operates on the staff which this bank has with the accretions which the Government has made to this country. I say, Sir, that the Administration which allows this to come down should be condemned vociferously, and I hope that the Hon. Minister would get up and say today, that this community will get a Savings Bank in keeping with the country and the contribution which it has made to this country. Because of the layout of the Bank, the service which you would expect from the staff you cannot expect to get from this staff. The pride, the *esprit de corps* which one gets in working in a decent up-to-date office is something which the staff of this bank lacks. you cannot expect the *esprit de corps* of that bank to be high when the premises has little ventilation, when the staff is working at desk counters which are more akin to a public market than a public Savings Bank.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the way in which hon. members fulminate against conditions in various sectors of the Government and the various departments would make one think that we are creating a Department. What we have inherited is in the nature of the Augean stables which we are now trying to clean up. I am not suggesting, however, that the conditions obtaining in the Savings Bank qualify for the description but, at the same time, hon. members must realise that the Government is spending about $250,000 more on Capital Works than has been spent. You will find that while this Government is spending this money, we have to satisfy the demands of the resources of this country. We have to establish some system of priority when we are considering Capital Expenditure. The Savings Bank is a self-supporting Institution, and we think that the Bank should have a very high priority. Everybody knows that the overcrowding there is due to the lack of appreciation of the conditions of the last Government. If you go to the Customs Department you will find that. *(ASIDES).*

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot really do justice to hon. members who ask questions if they are going to have their own private discussions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see that there are two hon. members standing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rose to draw your attention to the private discussions which are going on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was not listening to them. My attention was directed to the Hon. Premier; let the Hon. Premier proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not concerned about the number of hon. members who try to obstruct and prevent the questions from being replied to. It is very difficult for an hon. member who is speaking.....

Mr. SMITH: Why do you not name your hon. members over there when they do it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Premier proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying, Sir, that I accept that the conditions at the Savings Bank are very far from what they should be. The conditions are not the best. What surprises me is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should say that the depositors do not want members of the public to see them transacting public business owing to the nearness of the Bank to the Post Office. Well, Sir, I do not know of one single case in which we have had a holdup in the Savings Bank. While I am on that subject, I will say that I notice that some observations were made today drawing attention to the manner in which Government mail is being transported, a lot of them being based on wrong information. I do not think it is right for hon. members of this House to invite the attention of irresponsible elements to creating a breach of the peace or of the law of the land. I do not want to say too much about that, but to suggest that the Barbadian does not want to see a person depositing money - I do not agree with that at all. If the Bank were next to the Income Tax Department, I could then understand the concern of hon. members; but in view of the fact that the Income Tax Department is far removed from the Savings Bank, I do not see that they have anything to fear at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may come to another point which has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I will say that we not only have a problem in getting capital for these projects, but we also have a problem in phasing the Government programme so that it does not appear that we start off doing a lot of work and when everything is finished, we have 3,000 people out of work and the programme has not been properly conceived. Because of the shortage of supervising personnel, we make sure that when one project comes to an end another project has passed the planning stage and is ready to be started. That is what is happening with the new Treasury. The testing of the building has already been completed by a Trinidad firm, and we propose that when the Hospital is finished, we will have the staff of the Income Tax Department somewhere in the old Hospital buildings on a temporary basis. We propose then to pull down the old Income Tax Department and start the foundations of the new building which will house the Savings Bank on the ground floor or on the second floor. Then we hope to have accommodation for the Department of Inland Revenue, the Barbados Tourist Board, and so on, so that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can go up and see all the Departments. After he has done that, he can come downstairs and send his cheque upstairs to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. We hope to move the Post Office somewhere across the street when negotiations for the acquisition of the buildings are completed. We are not at all quite happy about the Parcel Post Department on the Wharf. There again, that was a building which was existing as one of the business houses, but we do not think it is suitable for Parcel Post facilities. All of that is being studied, and when we have finished the Finance building which will take about ten or twelve *months to be*, erected, we can then move over the Post Office. We are programming and phasing our expenditure on Capital Works or projects so as to make sure that there is no dislocation of the labour force which we have available.
2.05 p.m.

Deposits at the bank have risen by $600,000 last year, and I think there are probably now at the highest level they ever have been. I said a few days ago, you will remember when I was introducing the Estimates of Revenue and Expen-

diture that the Savings Bank deposits had risen by $600,000 and they are well over $20 million. I cannot remember the exact figure, but we now have employed in the Savings Bank a staff of one Manager, one Accountant, three Assistant Accountants, sixteen long Grade Clerks, one Stenographer and one Messenger, and the amendment to the Bill will make it possible for us now to employ an additional Assistant Accountant, and a certain amount of re-organisation will take place to provide for a post of Secretary, and the replacement of the post of Stenographer by the post of Copy Typist at a suitable salary.

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:

2. Subsection (1) of section 5 of the Savings Bank Act, 1914 is amended by substituting the word "four" for the word "three" appearing immediately before the words "Assistant Accountants."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will take this opportunity on Clause 2 to reply to what the Hon. Premier said to what I said about priorities. It is true that it is the responsibility of Government to determine priorities, but if the hon. member had been in this Chamber as long as I have been and does not realise that the Savings Bank is a priority, I do not know what else is. I think thirteen years ago when he came to this Chamber, one of the biggest debates was the utilisation of the same site. You cannot expect, when a member of this Chamber raises a question, that he should determine what is a Government priority. What he has to determine is what is a public priority, and as the Hon. Premier has said, the Government Savings Bank pays for itself. Moreover what I have been saying in here is that in our time we have to project something as far-reaching as the people in those days who projected the Government Savings Bank which harnessed an economic situation which today is serving us well. That, in my view, shows foresight, and it does not matter in these things where the idea comes from. Knowledge has no boundaries or limits, and wherever a good idea comes from, I am prepared to accept it. If the Savings Bank was founded 60 years ago, today it is standing in good stead. The hon. member made a visit to Africa. Barbadians talk about Africa, but I would ask them to go and look at the Post Office at Lagos, and they would shut up when they begin to talk about the disparity between African societies and West Indian societies, because they will see the standards that the Africans have set.

Mr. Chairman, we need better services and better offices for the people, and I would say that proper designing is necessary so that you get the best service out of it. The question of priority will have to remain with the Government but the question from my point of view as a member of this Chamber is that I have to be continually raising this matter because it is an eyesore. The Post Office and the Savings Bank are two Departments that can be joined together, because they are regarded as supplementary services, and people can go to post letters and go to the bank at the same time. If the hon. member reviews some of his speeches, he will see that some of them called on the Government to do some of these things. Now that he is in Government he should not think that people calling on Government is going to cease, because even his own members sometimes call and he would have to look for $200 million instead of $33 million. I do not like these calls, however, because I am not a parish pump politican. I am not asking you to put anything in St. Peter, because the Post Office is in Bridgetown which is the constituency of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown; so I am not asking for anything for my constituency, but something for Barbados.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Hon. Premier whether he had received a request from the Manager of the Bank for more paying and Receiving Tellers when he received the request for an Accountant.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I was at pains to read out the present establishment of the Savings Bank. It is not the Government's Savings Bank; it is the Barbados Savings Bank. I pointed out that there was a Manager, Assistant Manager, provision now for one Accountant, three Assistant Accountants and sixteen Long Grade Clerks, and a Steno-typist, and then I went on to point out that there would be a certain amount of internal re-organisation; but as far as the established staff as laid down by the Act was concerned, we had to come to the House to ask for an amendment to the Bill, because the Bank is dealt with not as part of the Civil Service, although members of the Staff are regarded in the same way that Civil Servants are regarded.

We have in the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Finance several offers for the training of Bankers and Accountants which we intend to avail ourselves of this financial year both in Israel, Puerto Rico and Canada; so when that new Bank goes into the new buildings, you are going to find competition with the commercial banks, because the deposits in the Barbados Savings Bank exceed the deposits in any one of the commercial banks in Bridgetown. When we provide the same kind of atmosphere across the street and utilise the car park which was acquired at great expense and put up a building which would be in my opinion better than any Bank building in Bridgetown, much more impressive and having better access on both sides, and certainly an outstanding building for the institutions which are going to be housed in it, I am sure that business will increase. 2.15 p.m.

That business has increased. There was a temporary rescission with the banking deposits, particularly the Savings Bank, shortly before we came into office, but we have taken measures to counteract that, and the people now have confidence into their own institutions, and their own institutions may become far more important.

Sir, there has been no request from the Manager of the Savings Bank for staff over and above what we are asking the House now to grant. The request has come not from the Ministry, but from the Bank itself. There is no reason why the Bank should not have all the staff it needs, because the Bank supplies itself; the only thing which it does not do is to pay rent for the space which it occupies, but we intend to charge every occupant of the new building an economical rent for the space which they will be occupying, and it is highly possible that the Bank itself would be financiers of the new building. That is something which I am looking at now. If the public of Barbados demonstrates a willingness to take up every single issue, we will not have to go and get money from outside at all. Barbadians like to invest, it is true, in other countries, but not in their own. We do not want to institute legislation to prevent capital going out of the Island because that is contrary to our overall policy: but people should be taking an interest in their own country; and I think, the new Treasury building may probably be financed by the Bank itself because the Bank has considerable investments both inside and out of Barbados, and financially is always willing to buy shares. It is a great pity that a lot of people do not recognise the service which their own institutions have rendered to their country. Of course, a bank does not go in for lending money, as when somebody wants to buy a motor car and you go into a bank and get money but a bank does still have some sound investments.

I did not criticise the hon. member for asking the question. All I did was to get up and state that the conditions were not all they should be, but this is very high

on our priority list. Everything I said was to demonstrate why we have not started the building before.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Premier for letting me know that. I am a subscriber to local industry. I belong to an organisation which wanted to buy $55,000 in Government bonds and they said that they were not issuing anymore. If you had people like our organisation, I am sure that you would not have to go to the London Stock Market for money.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that they could not get Government assets to buy, but last week I said that we had a local issue open, and I intend to keep one open all the time so that you will not have to go and ask anybody when the next issue is because you can go now and take up the whole issue if you like.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affimative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.00 p.m. today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affimative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

2.25 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I ask that the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Minister for drawing that to my attention; let the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

FURTHER ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the House intimate what he intends to deal with next?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are two Resolutions seeking the approval of the House of two Civil Establishment Orders:- The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order and the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1964. Notice of these Resolutions was given earlier today and then there is a small amendment by the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Barbados Turf Club Imposition of Duty Act, 1941. Those are the matters with which the Government intends to deal, and then there is a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for the City under Private Members' Business, relative to the nomenclature of members of this House. I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1964, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 4) ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1964.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. Premier.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Order deals with the Police Force.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am sorry, Sir. The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order seeks to change the salary of the post of Director of Public Prosecutions by upgrading it. The existing remuneration is $9,720 a year, and the proposal in this Order is to upgrade that remuneration to $10,200 per annum, equating it with the remuneration of a Puisne Judge. It is felt that the responsibility and the obligation of the two posts should carry similar qualifications, and the salaries of the two posts should be placed on the same level. In addition to that, the Director of Public Prosecutions is expected from time to time to act as a Puisne Judge. It is therefore felt that there should be no differential in the salaries of the two posts. The post of Director of Public Prosecutions, which is more or less a new post, will, if this Order is accepted, be in the same salary scale as that of the Puisne Judge. The net result of the Resolution will be an increase in the present salary of Director of Public Prosecutions by the sum of $480 a year more. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is really one of those things which I do not know anything about and therefore I want some information about it. My little commonsense would still lead me to ask a question. This post is supposed to be a new post; I would like to know the qualifications of this person and I would also like defined the words "Director of Public Prosecutions". If I appear to be looking foolish, I admit that before I start to speak, but I would still like to have an explanation of it. This looks to me as if you are making a job for some person, and you are starting him off at the top; you are starting off this person at the same salary as that of a Puisne Judge because this person may have to act as a Puisne Judge.

Mr. Speaker, you have people who are lower down the scale and who may have in turn to act as a Puisne Judge. You do not give the Deputy Commissioner of Police the same salary as the Commissioner of Police when the Deputy acts as Commissioner. I would like to know what are the duties of this Director of Public Prosecutions; how will the Puisne Judge feel that you are going to bring in this Director of Public Prosecutions and give him the same salary as the Puisne Judge? I feel, Sir, that this is a person who has already been appointed. The Puisne Judge cannot do anything about it, but I feel that I should ask for some information. Let me know what the duties of this person are. I hope he will not be a person who is running around like a saga boy. You have to fire the ball which shot Nelson to raise this amount of money in some circles, but you may have some ends of jobs stirring about. I would like the hon. member to define what are the duties of this person for me.

3.10 p.m.

We do not have so many crimes, murders and such things occuring in Barbados as in the outisde world; things are going smoothly here, or as the old people say, like oil. What is happening now for you to take this action?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not got to my feet to raise the same point as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, but I am of the opinion that we established the post of Director of Public Prosecution. I think we are in error because I see that the Addendum somewhere speaks of upgrading the salary of the Director of Public Prosecutions from $9,720 to $10,000 per annum. I do not think I can crave to be as ignorant of the functions of the proposed officer as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, but I am wondering when they speak of upgrading in the memorandum, why it is that such an upgrading has been proposed. It must have been thought that the sum of $9,720 was adequate, but now $10,000 appear to be adequate. I should like the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution to give me the answer to that as I am not in a position to compare the salaries of other law men. I have already been told what the functions of this officer are to be, but I should like to be told the reason for the upgrading.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, frankly it is difficult to understand some of the points raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. One single point he made was valid in which he said there were many cases in which a junior is called upon to act in the place of a senior officer, and merely because he has to act in this office it does not necessarily follow that he must be paid the same salary for the substantive post he occupies. That is readily conceded; but he must have recalled that the post of Public Prosecutions had been already created. We are not creating any new post now. Following, Sir, on the change in the office of Attorney General which has now become a political appointment, it has become necessary to appoint a Director of Public Prosecutions, and when we established the post, his duties were set out, and the reasons why we want to upgrade his salary now are contained in the Resolution before the House; so I do not know why the hon. junior member for St. Peter should be asking us to give the reasons for the decision to upgrade the salary from $9,720 to $10,200.

If the hon. member would take the trouble to read the Addendum to the Resolution, he will see that the reasons for upgrading are stated as follows: responsibility of the office; the practice elsewhere in the area; the fact that the two posts are said to carry similar qualifications; plus the necessity for the Director of Public Prosecutions to act as Puisne Judge from time to time. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would like his memory refreshed as to the duties attached to the office, I will call them out for him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I would not interrupt the hon. member for him to regard the interruption as being just silly, but the hon. member has told me that the reasons for upgrading is already found in the Resolution. Obviously all this information we find in the Addendum was known prior to the decisions to upgrade; so I do not see why the Minister should tell me that the reasons are here. What he has interpreted as the reasons were obviously known to Government before today and when the salary of $9,720 was considered adequate.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think that hon. members must have very short memories, because I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. Peter who has just sat down query the functions and duties of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not query those functions today. I only asked for the reasons for upgrading the salary from $9,720 to $10,200. As a matter of fact, I said I could not plead the ignorance which was admitted by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I knew about the functions, and in a *sotto voce* remark, as he sat down I tried to remind him; so I do not think the Hon. Premier is justified in saying that I was querying the functions of the officer.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In 1963, some time in October, we passed an Act which is entitled "The Director of Public Prosecutions Act, 1963." In that Act the functions and duties and qualifications were set out, and in Section 2 of the Act, it was set out that a person shall not be qualified to hold or act in the office of Director of Public Prosecutions unless he is qualified for appointment as a Judge of the Supreme Court. I really very much deprecate the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, because he is getting on as if the question of appointment to the post of Director of Public Prosecutions has something to do with the Government, and that we have some member of the Government that we want to put in the post. Of course, this is now endemic to the Party to which he belongs which has never contributed anything to the country.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I do not want the Hon. Premier to think that I feel the Government is trying to make a job for a saga boy. I only wanted to know what were the increased duties because more money was being paid.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was not here, but the hon. member was heard to ask whether we had a job for one of the boys and if the person was actually selected, and that is what I referred to when I referred to another one of his colleagues as a mealy-mouthed hypocrite, because they get in here and make the most fantastic statements, and when you take them up, they quickly recant and double back and say they did not say so, that they said something else, and then one reports the other to the National Executive and somebody is going to be expelled, and this person is going to be put up higher and that kind of thing. 3.20 p.m.

Members should be responsible, and not come in here and tackle the Government and want to frame the Government as immature. The Act was passed defining the duties and I made a statement then. Only the salary is being provided by the Civil Establishment Order. I pointed out that when we introduced the repeal of the Attorney General's Act, the post would be free of any political connection at all, and the Director of Public Prosecutions would be an appointment made by the Governor acting on the advice of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission. I went further because it was suggested that as the Director of Public Prosecutions was the next senior man in the Legal Department, he should act for the Attorney General. I put my feet down on that by saying that any time the Attorney General was unable to act, we had enough legal people of integrity to put in his place, and it would be rather invidious to ask a Civil Servant to act as Attorney General.

The whole secret of the matter, if the hon. member read the Bill which has now been an Act of Parliament since five months ago, is that the very first operative clause says that a person should not be qualified unless he is qualified to be a Judge of the Supreme Court: and it was for this reason that the salary actually has been fixed slightly superior to that of Senior Parliamentary Counsel and slightly more than the present Solicitor General is getting. The other territories which have this officer have now abolished the office of Solicitor General; therefore, in normal circumstances the Attorney General would still have to advise the Labour Department and departments like this which have infringements under the Factory Act. The post of Solicitor General has been abolished, and it would be clearly unfair to say that the person who is to be the Director of Public Prosecutions must be qualified to be a Judge of the Supreme Court and not to pay him the lowest salary of a Judge of the Supreme Court. In other words, in fixing the salary sufficient attention was not paid to the requirements of the post, and the chances are that you will not get a person to accept a post unless it carries the same qualifications as a Puisne Judge or a Judge. For the hon. member to come in here and say that we are upgrading the post because we are making the appointment is entirely wrong.

I was looking at the section dealing with the appointment of Director of Public Prosecutions. Right through the Act the Director of Public Prosecutions is the one who is appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission. For instance, you will find in Section 3, subsection 5 of the Act of 1963 that if the office of Director of Public Prosecutions is vacant the person qualified for appointment in that office may be appointed thereto and any person so appointed shall continue to act until the Director of Public Prosecutions has resumed the functions of his office or the appointment of that person is revoked by the Governor acting on the recommendation of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission.

Right through the Act, you will find that the actual appointment is a matter for the Governor after having the advice, not by me, or any politician, but by the Judicial and Legal Service Commission. What the Act says is this. He shall receive such salary and other emoluments as may from time to time be prescribed by or under any law or by a Resolution of the Legislature: Provided that – (a) no such resolution may reduce any salary or other emoluments for the time being prescribed by or under any law or by any such resolution; and (b) the salary of the Director of Public Prosecutions shall not be reduced during his continuance in office.

Therefore, all the way you will find that the Director of Public Prosecutions is in the same position *vis-a-vis* security of tenure and conditions of service as Judges of the Supreme Court. His office is, in my opinion, more important than that of a Puisne Judge. He has very great responsibility. The most important point is this. It has exactly the same qualifications required for a Judge of the Supreme Court of this Island, and it is for this reason that, having another look at the constitutional arrangements upon which we have been embarking during the past few weeks, and tidying up all the legislation before we have the Senate and the reconvening of our Legislature, it was then discovered that there was a discrepancy between the proposed establishment of the office of Director of Public Prosecutions and what the qualifications demanded. It is as simple as all that. It is an upgrading from the previous Civil Establishment Order which we made. We found it unworkable and we are changing it. That is the answer to the hon. member. The Government makes mistakes sometimes, and every few years you will find that we have a Civil Service Commissioner and he says to add 10% to such-and-such a salary.
3.30 p.m.

We are just correcting the mistake before it is too late. It is as simple as all that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when I ask questions, I am not inviting any anger. I am not speaking to irritate members of the Government. I believe that a simple question deserves a civil answer. Where I do not know a thing I think I should ask.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that I did not give a civil answer?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with the idea of provoking any anger. I think of calling for facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is rather a question of an explanation.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the House intimate what he desires to deal with next?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when we resumed the sitting today, I said that we would deal with the Civil Establishment Orders Nos. 4 and 5, and then with the slight amendments to the Bill to provide for the operation in the island of a Company to be known as the West Indies Hospital Funds Ltd. and for various matters connected therewith.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 5) ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1964," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 24th day of March, 1964, under the provisions of Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Order makes provision for additional staff in the Police Force. You will remember, Sir, that from time to time we have had various questions raised about the Establishment of the Police Force, and I had promised hon. members that we were working on the revision of the Establishment in order to provide better opportunities for promotion within the Force itself and in order also to get greater efficiency in the administration of the Police Force. This is not merely being done to make certain people feel happy, that there are more opportunities for promotion; it is a question of increased efficiency in the Police Force which is highly desirable, and to this end we are also spending in capital works about $1/4 million in order to create better facilities at the Central Police Station. Next year we hope to do something for the barrack accommodation of the members of the Force. We cannot do everything in one year; we already have plans for that project in the next financial year.

Mr. Speaker, in this Order the following new posts will be created. There will be two posts of Assistant Commissioner. That is found in Trinidad and Jamaica, but there is no rank of Assistant Commissioner in the Police Force here. It is now proposed that we should have two Assistant Commissioners who will have specialised duties to perform and who will rank immediately after the Commissioner of Police. As far as the hierarchy of the Police Force is concerned, you will have the Commissioner of Police, the Deputy Commissioner of Police and the two Assistant Commissioners. We propose to create the additional post of Senior Superintendent and then there will be the additional post of Assistant Superintendent. We will have four additional Inspectors, which will mean that some Sergeants will be promoted and there will be three additional Corporals making a total increase of eleven, and in all, opportunity will be given for promotion of various members of the Force.

Despite these improvements in officers gazetted and non-gazetted officers of other ranks, we are still very much below that of the Police Force in other parts of the Caribbean; but they are different, of course. There are more chances in some of these places, and there is still room for improvement. We have come to the conclusion, after studying this matter, that this is the best we can do within the limits of our financial capabilities. I think that this should result in some improvement in the Police Force and, to some extent, it will answer the criticisms of the Police Association that there is not enough scope for promotion in the Force at the present time. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know something from the hon. senior member for St. John. These two men, the two Assistant Commissioners of Police, are in the same salary grade; but for the sake of argument, if the Commissioner of Police and the Deputy Commissioner of Police were indisposed, we have two Assistant Commissioners and how will seniority come in?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciate this Resolution which seeks to approve this Order, but there is one observation which I would like to make, and it is this. I am not criticising any former vote of this House; I am just making a comment. Some time ago it was suggested that the Police Force in Speightstown should be closed down,

and that was done; and now those Constables who formerly patrolled the streets of Speightstown are stationed at District "E".
3.40 p.m.

I know there have been many complaints on the part of residents in Speightstown that policemen are not seen as frequently as they might be on the streets of Speightstown neither by day nor by night. Now I think Government proposes this year to build a market in Sand Street very near the building that formerly housed the Speightstown Police Post. When the market is built, I am very sure there is going to be a certain amount of traffic by day, and certainly to a great extent later in the evening that will call for the use of more than the number of policemen that we presently see patrolling the streets of Speightstown. I wonder if Government proposes to do anything as far as policing of the town is concerned. As I said, I do not want to reflect on a vote of the House, but experience has shown us in Speightstown that since the constables now operate from District "E" Police Station, they are not seen as frequently as they might be, and when you put a market almost on the same site where the former Post was, you can visualise that there is going to be a tremendous amount of commerce and traffic at that end of the town, and I wonder if the situation might not be reviewed or a district patrol van would not be necessary to do proper patrolling in Speightstown. I just want to make that observation because I know it is the concern of residents in Speightstown, and it is to some extent a complaint that since closing down the Speightstown Police Post, sufficient patrolling by policemen is not being done in the streets of Speightstown either by day or by night.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member propose to speak on the matter?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Thomas wanted to know about seniority. That is not a matter for the House to discuss; that is an administrative arrangement. There is at the present moment one Commissioner, one Deputy Commissioner, one Senior Superintendent, four superintendents, four Assitant Superintendents ten Inspectors, 21 Station Sergeants, 27 Sergeants, 88 Corporals. If all the people above them had gone away or were sick, it would be academic to know which of the 88 Corporals would have to act. This is a matter of internal administration; but because you have two Assistant Commissioners, the question is not any more relevant than the situation where you have one Deputy Commissioner and one Senior Superintendent, which would be three in the immediate hierarchy and then four Superintendents; so you can very well understand which of the four Senior Superintendents would act, and it is not even of academic interest to me. It is not a problem I have to resolve, because I do not think it likely to be resolved if you give leave to the two Senior Officers of the Post at the same time. After the passing of this Establishment Order there will be 464 Constables. The Establishment is for 475, but we are reducing the number of constables by eleven. As a matter of fact, they never had 475 because we never allow them to recruit 475. We have always kept them eleven short for a number of reasons.

We are trying to get the Commissioner to close down a few more of these small stations. Crab Hill is now being rationalised into a two-man Station. I think the Station at Brittons Hill can go, and in the stretch between Trafalgar Square and Oistins, we have no less than four or five Police Stations on a route which is four and a half miles long. There is one at the Bridge; we closed the one at Bay Street; then there is one at Hastings by the Garrison, one at Worthing and another at Oistins. I feel that some of these Stations may be unnecessary, and what we would like to do is to make the Police Force a little more mobile than it is at present and cut out some of these uneconomical stations.

As far as the Speightstown Station is concerned, there is a Station at Speightstown, but it is not in the centre of the town. It is at Station Hill, St. Peter, which is half a mile or three quarters of a mile from the centre of the town. We thought it was uneconomic to have a Station half a mile away from another with good communications, mobile transportation and everything else, but the policing of Speightstown is still being maintained at the same standard that it was before the Station was closed down; so I do not think there is any problem, and if the market is opened down there, then the Police authorities will have to look at the general conditions and decide whether there is going to be any increase in the number of constables patrolling the town. Again I should not like to say what the police should do in a matter like that, because I am not really a policeman and I do not know the full extent of police duties and what they involve. I just try to make an intelligent interest. The question of patrolling and so on is not a matter for my concern; but when the market comes into operation and the hon. member finds there is rowdyism and they have some complaints, I am sure it will be attended to.

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

BARBADOS TURF CLUB (IMPOSITION OF DUTY) ACT, 1941

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated earlier, the next Order of the Day will be the amendments from the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941 and the amendment reads as follows:-

"BE IT ENACTED by the Governor, Council and Assembly of this Island and by the authority of the same as follows -"

That is the introductory paragraph which should have been included when the Bill was before us, but through an error was not there.

I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

END OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end and, as we intimated earlier, we will revert to Private Members' Business in order to permit Order No. 20 under Private Members' Business to be the next and final Order of the Day.

I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken in order to deal with Item No. 20.

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

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

RESOLUTION *RE* DESIGNATION OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown: To move the passing of a Resolution re designation of members of House of Assembly as "M.H.A."

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution might well be considered as of high importance in that it seeks to change the designation used for members of this Honourable House.

This House was established, I think, in the year 1639 when a number of citizens got together and decided that they would elect certain burgesses to handle their affairs.

Up to the year 1865, as far as research can show, there was no designation used after the name of honourable members of this House. In 1890, according to an early Barbados Almanac in which I have delved at some length, we note the letters 'M.C.P.' after the names of members of this House. The reason for the adoption of this title is not quite clear; perhaps it might be some form of colonial emasculation. The appearance of what the House wanted to do was the right that they do designate themselves as "Members of the Colonial Parliament".

Sir, perhaps you will agree that it is high time that this designation should be changed. In 1839, there was 700 million people on this earth under colonial rule. Since that time, matters have changed considerably and now there are less than two million people under colonial rule. There was a reason for the power exerted by the West. Because of transportation, communications and the large industrial development, the Western powers ruled over a large number of people who inhabited this earth's surface. The only method by which a colonial power might disassociate itself from the metropolitan power to which it owed allegiance was trial by battle. The colonial power would have to engage itself in some foreign war or in some local commotion or Civil War or attempt a rebellion and then break the ties which held it bound to the metropolitan power. That time is now long past, and all over the British Commonwealth we see the heartening picture of former colonial territories being liberated; and while some yet remain under the tutelage of the metropolitan power which once had a say in all their affairs, we find them now seeking their own places in the sun, if I use a hackneyed phrase.

This liberation is done in different ways. Some of the metropolitan countries lived in considerable duress and left behind them a bad taste in the mouths of the people whom they once governed. Let us take, for instance, the case of Indonesia when it was governed by the Dutch who left political turmoil, and compare it with India which had very pleasant relationships with the Mother Country of Great Britain. There, we see the difference of the manner in which a metropolitan country left one of its former dependents. The French in their administration of their colonies and the Portuguese in their administration and the Belgians may have maintained better inter-racial relationships with the colonies which they administered than the British. I, myself, am minded of the example which I saw when I was in Rome, Italy, when a West Indian won the Olympic 800 metres and held the Imperial record for a single night. This, to me, was an earth-shaking victory, but it was not so to Englishmen *en passant*. I did not see an Englishman applaud even for one second. The next day there was the case where a Senegalese won the 100 metres heat which caused Frenchmen to throw away their berets and cheer vociferously. Then I was convinced that the Mother Country to which we owed allegiance did not care very much about her colonies. That, however, is by the way.

Sir, we are heading towards either a Federation or independence or both. If we are heading towards a Federation, then we must have a designation for members of this Honourable House which will not conflict with whatever designation we bestow upon members of the Federal Parliament and, perhaps, the initials "M.P." may not fit us because that may have to be reserved for members of the Federal Parliament. Another thing is that we do not always remain on our native soil but travel abroad; and so if we are in England, we would have to write "M.P. of Barbados" after our names - which is derogatory - and so the designation "M.P." might be considered to be entirely out of place.

4.00 p.m.

We must all agree that the designation "M.C.P.", with the "C" in it, carries with it certain connotations of subservience with which the young people of this territory will no longer be satisfied. We have to think of some designation which carries with it some connotation which present and future members of this House might wear with some pride. Independence will not be enough. We can think of many independent countries whose example we would not like to emulate. The mere shouting of Independence for independence sake will not be safe enough. We can think of countries like Afghanistan, Lybia, Haiti and even Zanzibar; they have achieved independence, but they are not examples to us of economic self-sufficiency. We must not find ourselves with an illusory self-sufficiency.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, what did the hon. member say about Zanzibar? Did he say that Zanzibar was more self-supporting than we are?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the Hon. Leader of the House would listen, he would hear. I said that places like Liberia, Thailand, Lybia and Haiti – places which wanted independence – got it; but they did not get the economic self-sufficiency which might have been expected by the more favoured members of the electorate. The source of leadership outlined in some of the emergent territories, seems to devote a large percentage of its energies to the struggle for independence. Therefore, let us not be deluded into thinking that with independence will come economic self-sufficiency. I have already given the reason why we might not attempt to adopt the title "M.P.", but there are other titles which may be considered. There is a strong feeling of nationalism abroad, especially among the young people of our communities, and this feeling cannot and must not be condemned. In most of the large territories which were once colonies, there is always evident a restored self-esteem, and there is in the minds of many of the people a terrific upsurge of feeling against the humiliations which have been suffered formerly both in the social and in the economic sector. These resentments have been built up over many years, and if we are to avoid the more pathological forms of nationalism, we must also, at this time, consider the dangers which are associated with it.

One of the dangers of an extreme nationalism is that it impels no international or inter-territorial co-operation. We will find that there are certain territories which seek to extend their national boundaries, but which are not willing to exercise the spirit of compromise with their neighbours. Another danger of extreme nationalism is that it stifles the growth of individual freedom. We have the example of Hitlerite Germany where it was felt that the national freedom was much more important than the mere freedom of individuals. Hitler's storm troopers swooped down upon freedom; we want national freedom, but we hope never to arrive at that point in our territory.

I was much intrigued myself on Sunday afternoon last when the Army and the Trinidad Band was beating the Retreat – a very solemn thing to me – and, to my amazement, they swung into a calypso which was followed by "Abide with Me." That was at the beating of the Retreat. I had nothing against it, but it shows that there was a nationalism rampant in the community which was willing to accept a calypso when, not so long ago, the Band had played "Abide with me". All that is a strong nationalistic feeling. We cannot hide in this territory but we must notice and respect it.

There are two possible designations which we might consider for the designation of members of this Hon. House. Designations have a way of an awakening in the minds of certain people. We remember the O.C.P.U. of Russia, the German, S.S., the very name of which struck fear in the hearts of many a man. Going back we will remember reading of proscriptions written on the walls of Rome and signed S.P.Q.R. carrying with them just by the mere reading of these letters, a certain amount of weight. *Senatus populus que Romanus* – The Senate and the people of Rome. We think of certain titles like the O.A.S., G.A.T.T. and others. We must have some designation which must command respect in the minds of men, and so I come to the suggestion which I would like to put forward to this Honourable House, that is, that we accept the designation "M.H.A.", Member of the House of Assembly. That is a designation which has been foisted upon us for many years. When I get the Journal of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I see your name, Mr. Speaker, and I see written after it the words "M.H.A." which is the designation given to you by the Commonwealth Parliamentary

Association. That is also a recommendation which does no violence to commonsense. A person's name is written down as a member of the House of Assembly to which he belongs, and not to the absurd and humiliating idea of a member of a Colonial Parliament.
4.10 p.m.

I have already given the reasons why the letters "M.P." would not be acceptable, because we must leave room, if we are not making fun at the idea of Federation, for the designation of members of the Federal Parliament. And so it would seem, Mr. Speaker, as if we are left with only the letters "M.H.A.". This designation is used, to mention only a few Parliaments, in Newfoundland, Singapore, Nigeria, and in certain other Parliaments in metropolitan territories, notably the territory of Nova Scotia. We are on the verge of a definite change perhaps before the end of this year. We must either move into a Federation with the other territories near us, or we must establish ourselves as independent. In either case it would be necessary for us to command the respect, status and esteem of our fellows if we are at all serious about promoting a national well being.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I know that it should not carry with it any long debate. I think that most of the reasons that can be adduced for changing from the letters "M.C.P." to "M.H.A." have already been given by the mover of the Resolution. As he pointed out, the letters "M.H.A." meaning "Member of the House of Assembly" have been foisted on us. I remember, Sir, being at pains on more than one occasion, when visiting the headquarters of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to tell officials there that we were designated at home as "M.C.P.", and on that and many occasions, I and maybe other members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association representing Barbados or the Council of the area, have made that point already with officials to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at home, and yet they insist. Whenever a Journal comes into our hands, we see a member of the House of Assembly being referred to as "M.H.A.". There are other reasons undoubtedly, and although I did not hear the hon. member's speech in its entirety, I am very sure he made the point that all of us realise with pending constitutional changes and even accepting the length we have gone already in constitutional progress, that "M.C.P." meaning "Member of Colonial Parliament" does not in any way reflect in the best way on members of this ancient House of Assembly.

I know, Sir, that such a feeling is shared by every other hon. member of this Honourable House – at least that is my presumption – that we would rather be styled as members of the House of Assembly which is a distinctive way of calling ourselves. There are some people who get confused as to what "M.C.P." really means. I have heard people say it means "Member of Common Parliament"; I understand it to mean "Member of Colonial Parliament". Barbados is not a nation yet; you do not know what is going to happen with the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation of the Seven or Six, but whatever does happen, I think the time is now reached when we should not want to continue to be styled as "M.C.P's" It is rather peculiar that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association never would refer to us as "M.C.P." They never did. From the time I have been seeing their Journal, I have always seen "M.H.A.", and I have, thinking I was correcting them or bringing everything up to date, pointed out in London itself to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Officials that we in Barbados called ourselves "M.C.P."; and although they have been told that repeatedly, they insist and continue to refer to us as "M.H.A." This is not the first occasion in this Parliament on which this idea has been mooted. It seems to me that we have not bothered ourselves, and we have been rather lethargic in asserting ourselves in this direction.

Unlike the hon. member, I am not going to commit myself on what may be a Federation of the Six or Seven. If there is a Federation, the title "M. P." might be accorded to the members thereof. We would just be a unit Government in that Federation; but as we see matters very factually at the moment, there is no reason why we should wait to change the letters signifying the appellation "M.C.P." I think we should by Resolution have ourselves declared and known as "Members of the House of Assembly". This is one of the oldest Parliaments in the British Commonwealth -- the third oldest, I am told – and from time immemorial we have been called a House of Assembly. There was a time when people used to refer to the House of the Burgesses, but for a very long time we have been called a House of Assembly. I think we can be proud of our history. A Parliament of 300 years has got nothing to be ashamed of. We have democratic institutions and ancient institutions, and I think we can but hold on to our distinctiveness and have ourselves styled as "M.H.As", which indeed and in effect we are.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, to some extent hon. members on this side sympathise with this motion, and I qualify our sympathy at the moment by saying "to some extent" because we were rather puzzled as we listened to the Hon. Mover and then to the speech of the Seconder, because we thought really that they were willing to go much farther than their speeches indicated. Indeed, listening to their speeches, one did get the impression that they were in some instances arguing against the motion and not for it. Our position on this matter is simple, and I should like to outline it to the House in a few points.
4.20 p.m.

First of all, we agree wholeheartedly that in very few instances in the British Commonwealth is there such a thing as Colonial Parliament except in the few colonies dotted here and there which have not yet attained internal self-government. Almost every part of the former British Empire is now, with one or two exceptions such as Burma, a part of the British Commonwealth, so that all of the Parliaments of these territories are nothing else at all than Commonwealth Parliaments. In fact, we enjoy that point of view at the annual meeting of representatives of these various Parliaments of the Commonwealth. At these conferences, we are designated today as members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; before that, we used to be called the British Empire Parliamentary Association; despite the fact that so many territories of the former British Empire were non-self-governing, at no time at the annual getting together were we known as the Colonial Parliamentary Association.

Sir, the second point which I want to make is this. With respect to any Parliament, and certainly with respect to this colony, in a Parliament designating a name for itself, it is not incumbent or obligatory for the Parliament to seek advice as to what it should call itself or the designation under which it should be known. That is why I say that there is such a vast overload of designations for the same thing. In one place, the elected House may be known as the House of Representatives, in another territory, the elected House may be known as the Commonwealth Assembly, in another, as the Legislative Assembly and yet in others, as the House of Assembly, and so on. As we come to our near neighbours in this area, their Legislative Chamber is known as the Legislative Council although they are elected in contradistinction to the Other Place of this Parliament; therefore, as Your Honour can see, there is not a hard and fast rule under which Parliaments, whether elected or not, should call themselves. Therefore, there need be no example as to how we desire ourselves to be known in the future. The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown was quite right when he said that it requires only a simple Resolution of this House to re-designate its name.

Everybody says on all sides that this House is of ancient origin. It ranks number three in the Parliaments of the British Commonwealth, and it is younger only to Bermuda, and Bermuda is younger only to the Mother of

Parliaments itself. It can be said that Great Britain is the Mother of Parliaments and we are one of the step-mothers of Parliaments in the Commonwealth.

There is one thing which we have to bear in mind. We call ourselves the "House of Assembly". The word "House" we have borrowed from United Kingdom practice and custom because the people who are elected to the United Kingdom House are really members of the Common House of Parliament in contradistinction to the members of the House of Lords who are members of the Peerage. In truth and in fact, we are not the House of Assembly at all, but members of the General Assembly of this Island, and a General Assembly is entitled to give itself any name it likes.

I rather suspect that it was not we or our sisters who first called ourselves "Members of Colonial Parliament," because I imagine that the first representatives of the people in the General Assembly of Barbados thought of themselves exactly as Members of Parliament as soon as they claimed for themselves the privileges and rights in 1639 in the same way as their compatriates would have claimed in England at the same time, because they would never admit that there was a distinction between one Parliament and another. The Barbadian in the 1630's would have thought himself in no way a bit inferior to the Legislator in Sussex who sat in the Commons House in Westminster. Therefore, it was not we who gave ourselves the title "M.C.P.". If we did so subsequently, we did not do so at the beginning. I rather believe it was towards the end of the last century when the term "Member of Colonial Parliament" came into use, and it may have been done by some people on the other side of the Atlantic who wanted for the purpose of convenience to have a distinction between a Member of the Commons Parliament in England and a Member of Parliament overseas. Therefore, the word "colonial" is not only because of geographical reasons, but to distinguish a legislator in a colony from one in the Imperial Parliament.

We are members of Parliament. The feeling that Federation when it comes might in some way inhibit the use of the initials M.P. does not at all worry us since, if we are not one of the Mothers of Parliament, we can be called one of its step-mothers. We can therefore give hon. members on the other side the assurance that in future we can be designated "Members of Parliament", and we have no objection to their using the letters "M.P." after their names if they so please. The point, therefore, is that on this side of the House, we agree with members opposite that the designation "M.C.P." is no longer possible, and it is out of tune with the times – and we go further than they do by saying that to call one side "M.L.C." or "M.H.A." is going out of one's way to give a designation which could be given, because since all of these are Parliaments, all of their members in whatever country they may be are exercising their rights as members of Parliament. I will, therefore, suggest that members eschew the letters "M.H.A." and settle with the letters "M.P.".

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member substituting an amendment?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Sir. My motion is an amendment to the motion of the Hon. Introducer substituting the letters "M.P." for the letters "M.H.A." which appears in the hon. member's motion.
4.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that, on this side of the Table, we had no conception that this matter would have been discussed today, and therefore we cannot make the contribution which, normally, we would desire to make. In my opinion, the important consideration is that the title of members of this Chamber should reflect the constitutional position of the country. That is the main consideration. If you are a colony, then you should designate yourself as a member of a Colonial Legislature; if you are not a colony, then it is a misnomer and it is erroneous to have the word "Colonial" as part of your designation. It is important to recall at this stage how effectively, and we may pat ourselves on the back, the Government has taken its duties in this Chamber. No sooner than the hon. junior member for the City raised this question here, the Government got its proper officers to do the necessary research, and we were able to tell him the procedure involved in changing the designation of members of this House within a very short space of time.

About seven or eight years ago, I mentioned to the Government of the day that we should drop the title "Colonial", but the Government at the time did nothing more about it. We, in the Opposition, did not have the machinery at our disposal as they had, for explaining to the House the steps which were necessary to be taken in order to arrive at the desired result, and so the matter remained as it was. Even at the risk of being charged with patting ourselves on the back, I must say that this is but another indication of the serious manner in which the Government deals with every serious matter which is brought to its attention. We are considered to be one of the oldest Parliaments in the whole Commonwealth, as an hon. member has said. If other Parliaments superior in age to us feel that they are entitled to use the designation "M.P.", there is no reason why we should; neither is there any reason why we should call ourselves other than "M.C.P." without the "C". It is as simple as that. We have always been called a Parliament. When we were established as a Parliament, there was no such thing as a Colonial Legislature in the accepted sense of the term. The British House of Commons was regarded as the British Parliament and we were regarded as the Barbados Parliament, as a Parliament then under the jurisdiction of the British Government; therefore we were appropriately called a Colonial Parliament. We are still a Parliament, but we are no longer a Colonial Parliament; and I do not think the hon. junior member for the City should attempt to diminish the status to which we have been entitled all down the centuries.

Why should we call ourselves an Assembly in this context? We were not members of a Colonial Assembly, but members of a Colonial Parliament, and we are entitled to have the same title with the omission of the "C". I therefore warmly support the amendment which has been moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that the designation of "M.P." should be used. If and when a Federal Parliament is established in Barbados, as I think it will be, it should not be a difficult matter then to differentiate effectively between the Barbadian "M.P." and the Federal "M.P."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be too long in speaking on this matter. I merely want to reply to the remarks used by the last speaker. He said that sometime ago he hinted this matter on the floor of this House and the present Government pooh-poohed the idea; and he did not have the machinery to carry on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member said the previous Government did that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I actually tabled a motion in this Assembly.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, the hon. member says that he tabled a motion, but he did not have the necessary machinery at his disposal. I am wondering if the hon. junior member for the City has any more machinery than he had.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has failed, as he has done in so many cases, to grasp the point which I was making. I said that I tabled a motion and got no assistance from the then Government at all. In this case, the hon. junior member for the City has tabled a motion, and the Government told him what machinery he should put in motion in order to effect the necessary change. In other words, the hon. member tabled the motion in ignorance and so did I; but the difference is that we could tell him what to do, but the hon. member's Government did not tell me what to do *(Laughter)*.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I really thought that the hon. junior member for the City, knowing his capabilities in everything he goes to do and how succesful he is with it – I may say that I never expected that he would have had to ask the Hon. Leader of the House or anybody else how to handle his Resolution. I did not expect that from the hon. junior member for the City. Up to now, I do not know how to believe him when he said that he had to appeal to the Government or to the Hon. Leader of the House for instructions as to what to do in this matter. Even up to the time when he tabled the motion he did not know what to do? Dear me, I am very sorry, Sir.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member is present in this House every Tuesday, but he expresses the most absolute ignorance of what goes on in here.
4.40 p.m.

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown tabled a question and I have sent for it. As a matter of fact, when the hon. member comes in here.....

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said he would not expect that a member like the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.....

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph allow the point to be made so that I may determine whether it is a point of order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he did not expect the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who is so omniscient, who is so successful in everything that he goes to do, would come in here...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the Leader of the House to make the point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said that he did not expect the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, who is all these things wrapped up in one, would come in here and ask us what to do. I am saying that if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph were paying any attention to what was going on in here, he would not have stated what he did, because the hon. junior member for Bridgetown actually tabled a question asking for enlightenment on this point, and less than three weeks ago Government in reply to the question told him what steps he should take; and I have sent for the Question Book in order to read the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the point of order has been made.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour says so, but for the enlightenment of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph I will repeat the reply later in this debate. The question was tabled on 6th March, 1962 by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and it reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Does Government agree that in view of the constitutional developments in this island members of the General Assembly should cease to be referred to as "Member of Colonial Parliament" (M.C.P.)?

If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, what action will Government take to put an end to the practice?

Will Government direct that members of the General Assembly be designated "Members of the House of Assembly" (M.H.A)?"

This is the reply we tabled, Sir, in answer to the question.

1. "Yes, Sir.

2 & 3. Research into this matter has failed to produce any legal or constitutional authority for the use of the term "Member of Colonial Parliament" in reference to members of the House of Assembly. It appears therefore that a Resolution of the House of Assembly is all that would be necessary to effect any change in the designation of members of the General Assembly."

We told him what to do and he immediately implemented our suggestion. He has brought in the Resolution. As a matter of fact, the hon. member will recall that we tabled a reply to the Question, and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown asked you whether on his feet he could then draft a Resolution, and Your Honour said "no", you preferred him to do it with his head.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the point of order is now complete.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a question of the Government, and the Government replied saying what to do. It is not complete nonsense that the hon. member did not know what to do. He wanted to see the action Government would have taken, and this is what happened. If the Government did not want to waste time on this matter, no sooner had the question been laid and they had done the research they could have come down with a Resolution rather than sending the hon. member's Resolution back. I wonder what steps the hon. member would take if he had tabled a motion or asked a question and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown did the same thing to him.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I have asked the Clerks of the Assembly since about 2.30 p.m. to let me have the record of my motion, and they have been searching for it from then until now and cannot find it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member will not curse me for my belief.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in here.

Mr. SMITH: If he had asked the last Government the question which the hon. junior member for Bridgetown posed, they would have to give him a reply. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Education is speaking too loudly; if he wants to speak, he must wait until I sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad I cannot hear him or any other member when you are addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: I hope he does not carry that behaviour with him down in St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have no worries there.

Mr. SMITH: You must have trouble enough with him down there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nothing to do with M.C.P.

Mr. SMITH: Now the Hon. Leader of the House wants this House to believe that the last Government ignored him with his motion, and good luck for him the Clerks or whoever is responsible for keeping the records cannot find it, and I am glad they cannot. I would swear he did not ask the question; he is not the type of person to ask questions. Anyhow the hon. junior member for Bridgetown took the right step, and now we are told that the hon. junior member did not know what to do and they had to tell him. Mr. Speaker, the Government is just like a father in a house waiting for the children to come in ask questions on what they should do and what they should not do. They are to guide members and not to say that people did not know what to do. I take it as an insult.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I am absolutely sure that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown does not interpret my remarks as being in any way offensive to him. All I said was that this was an indication of the serious manner in which the present Government takes every matter referred to it on the floor of the House,

or by any important organisation in the country. We were asked a question and we replied.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that is a point of elucidation on a matter raised by the hon. member in his own speech.

Mr. SMITH: I am not going any further. I only say I am not pleased with the remarks used by the Hon. Leader of the House that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown did not know what to do and they had to tell him.
4.50 p.m.

I am not going any further. I will finish up by saying that I am not pleased with the remarks by the Hon. Leader of the House saying that the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown did not know what to do and they had to tell him. I do not know how the hon. member is taking it, but when the public reads it tomorrow, they would think that the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown was so duncy that the Government had to put him right.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on the 6th March, 1962, the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown asked a question which has been referred to already; but the hon. member, somehow or the other, was not given a reply readily due to the fact that the question asked — Question No. 25, in the name of the hon. member — was addressed to the Appropriate Minister, who in this case, happens to be myself having charge of the Home Affairs section of the Ministry and the reply was duly given on 30th March, 1964.

The first question asked was:

Does Government agree that in view of constitutional developments in this Island, members of the General Assembly should cease to be referred to as "Member of Colonial Parliament" (M.C.P.)?

The reply to that given by me was: "Yes, Sir." In other words, the Government, at that stage of the reply in view of the constitutional developments in this Island, thought that Members of the General Assembly should cease to be referred to as "Member of Colonial Parliament."

Then the other two questions which were tabled by the hon. member were:

2. If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, what action will Government take to put an end to the practice?

3. Will Government direct that members of the General Assembly be designated "Member of the House of Assembly" (M.H.A.)?

The Government said in its reply to the first question that it agreed that it was anachronistic and the reply to two and three was to the effect that:

"Research into this matter has failed to produce any legal or constitutional authority for the use of the term "Member of Colonial Parliament" in reference to members of the general Assembly. It appears therefore that a resolution of the House of Assembly is all that would be necessary to effect any change in the designation of Members of the General Assembly."

The hon. member asked what action Government would take to put an end to the practice, and whether Government would direct that members of the General Assembly be designated "Members of the House of Assembly." What we were saying is that it was not a matter of the Government, but the exercise of a free vote of the House of Assembly. The Government could not designate; it would have to be done by a free vote of the House. The hon. member asked us specifically to do it and we said that it was to be a free vote of the House. This is a classic example of the willingness of this Government to recognise the right of private members to introduce matters and to have them supported by the Government, such matters which are in the general interest of the colony and dealing with the reputed rights and privileges of this Assembly because what the Government had done was to take a whole year — it was not a pressing matter — to look into the whole matter and a whole lot of research had to be made.

As the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown said that he delved into the matter, we too delved into the matter and it took us nearly twelve months to date to do. If we wanted to fetter the rights of members here, that is to say, to do what the hon. member wanted us to do, we could have done so; but we said that all that was necessary to effect any change was to bring a Resolution. If we had done what the hon. member asked us to do, the hon. member would not get any credit. The hon. member when he was on his feet after we replied to the question wanted to introduce the Resolution on the spot, but we gave the hon. member one, and as a result of that, he has introduced the Resolution today with which we are now concerned.

When the hon. member asked, what action will the Government take and will the Government direct, all that we said was that it appears that a Resolution of the House is all that would be necessary. We did not usurp the position of the hon. member, nor did we undertake to do it ourselves.

This is a matter which one of our backbenchers or a member on the opposite side could do, and it was clear from the reply that the Government would support any action: but we did not at that stage say that we agreed with the hon. member that members of the House should be designated "M.H.A." All we said was that a Resolution was all that appeared to be necessary.

At more than one stage we referred to the General Assembly, and we referred to the General Assembly because our researches have revealed that the proper designation of this House is General Assembly of this Island. "House of Assembly" and "General Assembly"; but if we go back to when this House was first named, it was named as the General Assembly of the Island, and you will find it in all the enactments relating to remuneration of members. You may say that, if this House is referred to as the General Assembly of this Island, we should designate ourselves then as "Members of the General Assembly"; but the letters "M.G.A." sound as if you were designating some kind of sports car. We know that the initials "M.H.A." are adopted by members in some other Assemblies in these parts, but we do not have to follow them slavishly.

What the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has said is that we are the third oldest Parliament in the Commonwealth, and I am going to demonstrate that members of Parliaments of more recent vintage than ourselves have designated themselves as Members of Parliament. I am referring to Parliaments which have come into being during the last hundred years, and some in the last hundred days. I have done a little investigation and this is what I find. In Canada, the members of Parliament are referred to as "Members of Parliament." In Ceylon, they are referred to as "Members of Parliament." I will never forget what the late Mr. Albert Marryshaw said some seven years ago at the time when Ceylon became a dominion. He said that Ceylon 'and all' has become a dominion. He had been going up from 1920 to the United Kingdom talking about federation, and his whole thesis was that even Ceylon has advanced in front of the West Indies, and Barbados institutions are antidated. Every Parliament outside of Bermuda has come into being since we had ours. It antidates the Congress of the United States by 160 years; it antidates the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada by over 200 years. Our Parliament has been functioning for over 300 years.
5.00 p.m.

The independent territory of Trinidad and Tobago did not have internal self-Government or a representative institution ten years ago. The Jamaican gave up their representative institution about 1862, and they only retrieved the position in the late 1930's. The other neighbours we have to the north and the south of Eastern Caribbean have not got representative institutions, but they have got internal self-government. Outside the United Kingdom, outside the Assembly of Bermuda, there is none of the British

Commonwealth there is no territory which has this long history of Parliamentary Government as this territory has had. Yet in Kenya, Ceylon, Southern Rhodesia, the African States and Nyasaland, members of Parliament have been referred to as Members of Parliament. In Nigeria, you have Members of the House of Representatives; in the regional provinces, Members of the House of Assembly; in Jamaica, Members of the House of Representatives; in St. Kitts, Nevis, Grenada and St. Lucia, Members of the Legislative Council; in Bermuda, Members of the Legislative Council and in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Report, Members of the House of Assembly. The Bahamas has recently instituted a Senate and, as far as I have gathered, they have changed their designation to Members of Parliament. When you come to the Dominion of Canada, in the last one hundred years, fortunately the Federal Members are referred to as Members of Parliament, and in some provinces they are referred to as Members of the Legislative Assembly, whereas in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland they are referred to as Members of the House of Assembly.

It was only within the past twenty or thirty years that Newfoundland was annexed to the Dominion of Canada and in the province of Quebec, the members of the provincial Parliament are called Members of the Provincial Parliament. In Australia, which is another Federation, some states refer to their members as Members of the Legislative Assembly, while Victoria and South Australia refer to their provincial legislators as Members of Parliament. In New Zealand, they are referred to as Members of Parliament and in the Union of South Africa, which should be left not mentioned, they are also referred to as Members of Parliament. We have canvassed the position in most of the territories around us, and there is absolutely nothing to prevent us from calling ourselves whatever we like. People call us things which we do not like to hear but, as far as the official designation of the members of this Chamber is concerned, we, on this side of the House, want to take the word "Colonial" not only out of the designation, but out of the thinking of the people of this island. We want to achieve two things and we do not expect to achieve them by changing the name. For the things which were attributed to Colonialism, you may be able to argue very strongly with people; but if you annex these titles to people, they are inhibited by the Colonial atmosphere.

As to the speech which was made by the hon. junior member for the City, I may say that I am a harsh critic of the hon. member. I am a harsh critic of the hon. member for this reason: I do not think that any hon. member is expected to read a speech like a fourth form essay, and it is rather unusual for people to get on their feet and have recourse other than to extensive notes or *verbatim* notes written out by himself. When the hon. member went into his discussion and dissertation of nationalism, right away we had the clue as to why he does not think that we should arrogate to ourselves the right to call ourselves Members of Parliament because, in his opinion, he says it is pejorative misleading, and therefore, "How dare we to assume a title which, only in the Mother of Parliaments, is attached to members' names as Members of that Parliament?" That was the gravamen of his argument. Canada can do it, Victoria can do it, Rhodesia can do it and even the Peers can do it.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rather regaled by the argument of the hon. member, but I cannot allow him to go any further. If he had been listening to me, he would have heard me say that, in order to avoid confusion, if we were to adopt the title "M.P." we might have to place in brackets after it the name of the territory represented and that would be rather pejorative.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the hon. member in that way. I wish he would re-read the passage for me. It is like saying to him, the man whom I thought to be a Barbadian Negro was coloured or over twenty-one, in order to make sure that you are not perjorative. You cannot call yourself a man or you must say I am a man *(ASIDES)*. That is the kind of Colonial thinking which is not only masquerading and misrepresenting the country, but it is the kind of thinking which is being ruled and regulated by an attitude of mind which some of us find is very difficult to overcome.

5.10 p.m.

When we talked about independence here on this side of the Table, the other people threw up their hands in horror and asked what we wanted independence for, that it is going to cost a lot of money, and that American tourists like to see the Union Jack; so we cannot waste time. We have too much work to do to have to apologise for our attitudes either on nationhood or on having our people in Barbados recognised as citizens of this country and part of the larger sweep of the history of mankind. I am not apologising by having any qualifications attached to any titles — I do not mean in the imperial sense — to any posts in this island or to members of the Legislature of this Island. I very much regret that the hon. member took the opportunity which we allowed him, because we felt it was an excellent right of floor members of the Chamber to introduce Resolutions of this kind, to fulminate against nationalism and people wanting to be nationalistic. We are nationalistic and we are making no apology for it, and if the hon. member does not like it, he can lump it. The hon. member talked about Germany and this place and the other place, which have nothing to do with this Resolution; but if the hon. member wants to frighten us off using the term "M.P." on the grounds that it sounds too nationalistic, I would like to make it abundantly clear that we are "M.Ps" and better "M.Ps" than the people in the United Kingdom Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to support the motion that the title be changed, but we have an amendment which has been moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy which has been seconded by the Hon. Leader of the House which reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the letters "M.C.P." used to designate Members of the General Assembly connote a status of colonialism which has happily now ceased to exist;

BE IT RESOLVED that Members of the General Assembly of Barbados from this date forward bear solely the official designation "M.P." (Member of Parliament) in respect of their membership of this Chamber."

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I should just like first of all, if I may, to point out to the Hon. Premier that I neither read the speech nor did I fulminate.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just interpose to say that if the member had been reading his speech, I would have drawn his attention to Standing Order No. 26 (1) which points out that a member shall not read his speech? it never occured to me that the speech was being read.

Mr. LYNCH: I will continue to make notes, just as the Hon. Premier does, and refer to them. It is something which Mr. Churchill does because he does not want to give misinformation. I should like to tell the Hon. Minister of Education that it is two years that this has been hanging fire. I realise that the Government was caught in a cleft stick and could not really oppose a Resolution of this kind. It was not made by one of their backbenchers....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, one of the Standing Orders of this House requires that hon. members in the course of debates should put the best construction on what is done by other hon. members. It is certainly not fair to say that the Government was in a cleft stick by the introduction of this Resolution.

Mr. LYNCH: That was inspired by the remarks of the hon. member, and I had no such intention, as the Hon. Minister of Education must be well aware. However, I must always refute the suggestion that I in any way abused a healthy nationalism. Had he been listening to what I said, he would have heard me advocate a healthy nationalism. I only referred to the inherent dangers in an extreme and pathological form of nationalism; that is all I did in the interest of the community; however, I am willing to accept the proposed amendment. I daresay there would have had to be some change in what I suggested; It may have been

"M.D.P." or "M.D.A.", but I am willing to accept "M.P.", although in these says of easy travel there might be a proliferation of "M.Ps" from the different parts of the Commonwealth. This is a House of Assembly; so why should we be called "M. C. Ps"? If the feeling is that we should be called "M.Ps", I am happy that the word "Colonial" has been deleted from the appelation, and the Hon. Minister of Education has given a strong indication this afternoon as to the possible formation of a Federation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to make it clear with reference to the last remark made by the hon. member that what I said was that if there is a future or an imminent federation...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking leave to rise on a point of elucidation?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may rise on that point.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the very last sentence which the hon. member, the mover of the motion, made was to the effect that he was thankful to me for clearing the air on the future of a Federation. What I did say, Sir, in the course of my remarks with reference to our calling ourselves "M.Ps" was that so far as we were concerned, if there should be a future Federation, it would not be part of our duty to dictate to the members of a future Federal Parliament what they may or may not call themselves, and that if they wished in such a Federation to use the designation "M.P.", there would be no reason for us to object.

The question that the Resolution as amended do now pass, was put and resolved in the affimative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings an end to Government Business for today. Hon. members will recall that the Government had pledged itself to allocate a special day for the debate on the motion of "No Confidence" in the Government tabled by the hon. junior member for St. George. Now we are going to move the adjournment for Thursaday, 26th March at 3.30 p.m., and this item of "No Confidence" will be the first Order of the Day. I also want to inform hon. members that the Government proposes to broadcast the debate.
5.20 p.m.

This item of "No Confidence" would be the first Order of the Day. I also wish to inform hon. members that the Government proposes that the debates will be broadcast, and Your Honour has agreed to the request of the Government for permission for these debates to be heard over the radio; therefore, Sir, the proponents of this motion would have every latitude and facility given them to have their debates directed to the entire community.

The hon. junior member for St. George is not now in his place and in the normal course of events Your Honour will see to it that he along with other members will be notified of the decision of the Government today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will undertake to instruct the Clerk to notify the hon. junior member for St. George personally, and all hon. members who are not now present will be summoned in the usual way.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Clerk cannot be instructed to do this.

Mr. SPEAKER: As Speaker I am entitled to act as I think fit. I give the undertaking that the Clerk will notify the hon. junior member for St. George that the Government, in consequence of the undertaking which it previously gave to provide a day for the discussion of the "No Confidence" vote, has intimated that Thursday of this week shall be the day.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In fixing the Order Paper, I further propose that Order No. 15 be the First Order of the Day when we meet on Thursday.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Fixing the Order Paper has absolutely nothing to do with the adjournment of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the House said that he was making a motion for the adjournment of the House until Thursday, 26th March and the motion was seconded by the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. WALCOTT: Fixing the Order Paper has absolutely nothing to do with the adjournment of the House. The adjournment is the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The fixing of the Order Paper is done immediately prior to the adjournment.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I would like to express myself quite clearly on this matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order? Disorder, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter rose and said, "on a point of order." I have not yet heard him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I would like to have this motion clarified. A motion has been made for the adjournment of the House and another motion has been made for a certain Order to be put as Order No. 1 at the next meeting. When it comes to fixing the Order Paper, that is done immediately before the adjournment.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I had finished speaking and the hon. senior member for St. Peter had finished speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Peter make his point of order?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, not only in this Parliament but the Parliament from which we take copy, the Leader of the House consults with the Leader of the Opposition in the fixing on the Order Paper. The hon. member who was promised a day to discuss his no-confidence motion is absent and is not now in his place to take part on this debate, and I think that a certain amount of inconvenience is bound to take place if this motion for the adjournment passes in the way it is proposed, today being Tuesday and Thursday being one day off.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather now that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is speaking on a date instead of the point of order on which he rose.

Mr. HUSBANDS: As I rose, I was interrupted temporarily by the Hon. Leader of the House and I used the term "disorder"; but I rose to speak on the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Am I to understand that a motion has been put?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Clerks at the Table that there is a motion which has been put and it is that Order No. 15 under Private Members' Business be the first Order of the Day at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Clerk is saying that he has put a motion and I am saying that there is no record that the Clerk put the motion that this House be now adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion which is now before the House is that Order No. 15, which is under Private Members' Business, be the first Order of the Day at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: As regards that motion, the method which we are now pursuing is going to usher in a rather dangerous precedent. On the fixing of the Order Paper, to give a member's motion a place on the Agenda of the next meeting, that is usually agreed to by an understanding. Usually, the Leader of the House consults the Leader of the Opposition – and there is no Leader of the Opposition in his place – and the hon. junior member for St. George under whose name this motion stands is not now in his place and I think it is rather unfair to proceed in this way. It leaves the onus on you, Mr. Speaker, when next Thursday that hon. members may not appear and no one would be able to take part.

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly have not mentioned that I would accept the responsibility to see that the hon. member is present, and that he takes part. All I said was that I would instruct the Clerk to notify the hon. member that Government has intimated by virtue of the undertaking which they gave in accordance with my Ruling that it would provide Government's time to discuss the hon. member's motion, and that they would do so before the end of the month so as to enable this motion to be threshed out. All I said was that I would instruct the Clerk to notify the hon. member of the decision of the Government that is was providing Thursday, 26th March, as the day when they would be ready to discuss it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I may rise at this stage, Your Honour will recall that the Government has committed itself to set aside a day to deal with this motion. For the last three weeks we were dealing with the Estimates, and if we propose to adjourn until tomorrow, that would be too short a time; so we said Thursday. Friday is Good Friday; Saturday and Sunday are both days on which this House does not meet, and Monday is a bank-holiday. I want to ask hon. members what other day can we devote before the end of this month to this discussion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: To continue, in deference to Your Honour, I have to mention that you mentioned that no onus was involved on your behalf; but I did hear an hon. member saying that the onus would be on you.
5.30 p.m.

I do not think it is just fair, looking around the horseshoe at this particular time, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not in his place and the hon. junior member for St. George is not in his place, for us to name a date in the very near future when the debate would not be given full coverage. In motion of censure, whether I take part in it or not, all concerned should have full opportunity to debate such a motion. For those reasons I am opposed to the motion now before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I, too, am going to join the hon. member in this matter and I am going to state why. We have Standing Orders and I am surprised, I am very much surprised, to hear the Hon. Leader of the House utilise this method of dealing with this matter. I bear no special position for the hon. junior member for St. George; that is known. Since the debate which took place in this Chamber, the hon. member has passed me by like the Levite, that is to say, on the other side; so that you can understand that I am not taking up the hon. member's cudgels. However I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to the Standing Orders of this House. Standing Order 15 paragraph 3 reads as follows:-

"3. Any Member who wishes to raise a matter under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Order at a particular sitting shall give notice of the matter in writing to the Speaker not less than three days before the sitting concerned. Subject to the giving of such notice, the right to raise a matter shall be allotted for each sitting through such arrangements as the Speaker may make."

That is in relation to the adjournment of the House. There is no particular mention in our Standing Orders, because Your Honour had to look through a long list, in order to determine what is a vote of "No confidence." We have no such thing in our Standing Orders; we have what "May's" would regard as such a motion. What I do not understand is how Your Honour could agree with a Minister – you have allowed a private member to put down a private matter on the Order Paper and Your Honour is going to allow a Minister to put it as the First Order of the Day on that date. I am surprised that you could allow a Minister to say the date which we will set aside to debate this thing, that is, the day after tomorrow. The Hon. Minister and the Hon. Leader of the House decide that this is the day for this discussion. In these circumstances, I say that it is not playing the game; for one to react in this manner is as stupid as the action which the hon. junior member for St. George had taken on a previous occasion when he attempted to try to get through his motion. I feel that, in a matter of this sort, a matter under Private Members' Business, the Speaker should not permit any Minister to remove such a matter. I have my feeling on this motion, but I do not think it is fair for the Minister to get on his feet and say that the matter would be debated on Thursday. We are not little children, and, in any case, this is Easter Week. The hon. junior member for St. George was in here for a short time yesterday, and the Hon. Minister took about three days before he talked about this thing. Do you think it is fair to say to hon. members that Thursday is the day when you are going to have this matter debated? I am saying that when you practice these methods which are not fair and just to people, they will react on you.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I object very strongly to the hon. member saying that we were engaged in anything unfair or unjust to anybody. Your Honour will recall that we stood committed to make this day available for this discussion. The fact that the hon. junior member for St. George is not here is not my business. (Mr. WALCOTT: It is) The hon. member should have been here.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. I am not misquoting the hon. member in any way; that is his argument. If the hon. member does not like what I am saying, he can reply. I am saying that this is a matter for you also.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you think it matters to me whether you do it or not? What does it matter to me what you say? I am saying that it is not fair to the hon. junior member for St. George. The hon. member is always bringing forward arguments which cannot hold water. Do you say you would set aside Thursday for discussing this matter?
5.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Government said it would set aside a day, not Thursday; so it could have been Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday. Why is it that you want to come and say the day you will set aside will be Thursday, the day after tomorrow? We met yesterday and we are meeting again today. How could it be fair to the hon. member? I am not going to join in this, because I have been here long enough to know that the hon. member who made this motion complained in this House on many occasions of the actions of the past Government in doing its business, and the records of this House are replete with instances where he protested. I have protested too. It is unfair to the hon. member to ask for a debate on Thursday, the day before Good Friday, on a motion of "No Confidence", and calling the House at 3.30 p.m.. Any Government should welcome a vote of "No Confidence". I was not in the island when this motion was made, but I read your ruling to the effect that the motion was in order, and the Government agreed to set aside a day.

Mr. SPEAKER: A day during the month of March.

Mr. WALCOTT: Today is the 24th March, and Your Honour's ruling was given on the 3rd March. Let me make

it clear, therefore, that a day to debate a vote of "No Confidence" need not have clashed with the Estimates, because the Estimates started last week for the first time, I am not even opposing the idea that the day should be Thursday, but what I am opposed to is that the hon. member is not in his place. As a matter of fact, he was not in his place for the whole day. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the common Parliamentary courtesies must be extended to your bitterest enemies in Parliament, and such courtesies would demand that the Minister in charge should be prepared to consult with the person concerned in whose name the motion stands, and inform him that the Government intended to set aside Thursday. One of the things we want to have in Parliament is Parliamentary good manners and Parliamentary propriety...

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I object to any insinuation that any action of mine could be interpreted as bad Parliamentary manners; obviously if the hon. junior member for St. Goerge were here today, we would have consulted with him. Thursday is the only day we have available; do we go and search for him or send a detective and call him in?

Mr. WALCOTT: The Speaker gave you a lot of latitude. I am saying it is Parliamentary bad manners, because the hon. member is not here. I have heard the same Minister get up and make an excuse for the Premier not being here when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that the Premier had a right to be here. You asked him whether he thought the Premier had to be tied down in the House of Assembly when he had to do the business of the Government; so what nonsense you are talking now about a person not being here? We have always refrained in here from saying anything against a member who was not in his place and could not answer for himself; so I am objecting to the motion, no matter who has made it. Why should any Minister be permitted under Private Members' Business to make a member's motion of "No Confidence" the first Order of the Day when that member has not been consulted? What sort of high-handed business is this? The hon. member said that the hon. junior member for St. George has a right to be here. Do not let us get down to these legal distinctions that each time the House meets a member has a right to be here. The House met last week, and the Clerk of this House was walking about with a summons for members to attend a meeting yesterday at 2.30 p.m., and if somebody wanted to legalistic, they could ask you to bring an injunction to prove whether the House was properly summoned. You have no guarantee that they had a summons before 2.30 p.m., but I do not worry to quibble about these things.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am instructed by the Clerks at the Table that all members of the House were summoned for that Special Meeting before 2.30 p.m., the time fixed for the meeting, with one exception of which I am now hearing for the first time, that of the hon. junior member for St. Peter who was summoned at 2.40 p.m. The House did not meet until 2.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: The time put down was 2.30 p.m. and not 2.40 p.m. The same Minister, Mr. Speaker, told a reporter that the House had been adjourned until 1 o;clock, because he was under the impression that he had moved the adjournment for that time, and came more to suit 1 o'clock that noon. Do you ask me now to say that in those circumstances there should have been no House yesterday because the Minister was not here at noon? He is the Leader of the House and he was not here at the time when it is alleged the House should have met, as he thought the House should have met an hour afterwards; but Your Honour accommodated him and the Government by summoning a Special Meeting to meet a situation that they had created. And now the Minister is pontificating today that the hon. junior member for St. George has a right to be in this place, and he must come on the day that they appoint! How can any member in his senses or with any modicum of reason sit down and agree with this procedure? I say with all due respect to Your Honour that you should not permit this motion to be made and allow a motion standing in the hon. member's name to be made the first Order of the day for this purpose.

5.50 p.m.

I say I will vote against it as a parliamentarian because I do not feel it should be done to him. You intimated earlier in March that you are going to set aside a date; therefore, you know that the date of the 26th March is the only date you can fix. The Hon. Minister had plenty of time to do it. The hon. junior member for St. George is not here. The same way that they could send to Speightstown and get in touch with the hon. junior member for St. Peter, they could have indicated to the hon. member concerned. He is a man of business. At least you could have paid him an amount of courtesy by telling him that you are going to deal with this matter on Thursday and ask him if that date is suitable for him. He is a member of Parliament. Whether his motion is stupid or not, I am going to vote according to the dictate of my conscience; I am not agreeing that this matter should be done behind his back in the manner in which it is proposed to do so now.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have this matter clarified? It is not for the Speaker to decide when the House should meet or should not meet. He only has power when there is no quorum or there is grave disorder to adjourn at a certain time. I cannot decline to accept any motion for the meeting of the House unless it was proposed to meet on a Sunday or a public holiday.

In respect of courtesies between members, I do not know if any courtesy has been extended. This does not come within my purview. In respect of the other point as regards the fixing of the Order Paper, it is a matter for the House to fix the Order Paper. It is fixed by the House and when there is any dispute, that is resolved by a vote of the House.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, too much power always ends up in dictatorship. We have all these dictatorial rulings and doings. Here it is, yesterday was Monday and I was told that they are going to deal with this matter on Thursday. A chap said to me " They are going to discuss Freddie on Thursday." I have heard from the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the hon. junior member for St. George was here yesterday. Could not the Hon. Leader of the House have hinted to him that he was going to discuss the matter on Thursday or ask him out of sheer courtesy to be prepared to come in on Thursday to discuss the Resolution standing in his name under Private Members' Business? The Resolution is not under the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip; it is under the name of the hon. junior member for St. George. Here it is, just because the hon. junior member for St. George is not in his place, the hon. senior member for St. Philip can get up and say that he is going to do this thing behind the back of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must enter the strongest protest against this observation by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He said that only because the hon. junior member for St. George is not here we have decided to deal with his motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph Standing Order No. 26 (7): "No member shall impute improper motives to another member."

I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I withdraw only and because only. I withdraw it both ways. The same way that I knew yesterday, could anyone think that it is only this morning or after the hon. junior member for St. George left this House yesterday that the hon. senior member for St. Philip decided to deal with this matter tomorrow? Who would believe it? I would not. It is the Resolution of the hon. junior member for St. George; and the hon. senior member for St. Philip should have taken the matter up with him yesterday or should have told him that we only have a very short time in which we can deal with the matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I ask with whom could I take it up when he did not tell me that he was not coming today?

Mr. SMITH: That shows that the hon. senior member for St. Philip knew he was going to deal with it. He knew it. Listen to me carefully, because I know everyone will get up and ask me to withdraw unparliamentary remarks. Some people would call it tricks, some people would call it smartness, some would call it crookedness, some would call it dishonesty. I am not calling it so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on a point of Privilege. *(Loud noises from the Gallery)*

Mr. SPEAKER: I want it to be clearly understood that persons in the gallery are here on sufferance and there must be proper behaviour.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking on a point of privilege. I intend to exercise my right to reply to this matter, but I cannot sit down and listen to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph accusing hon. member s of using tricks or being dishonest.

Mr. SMITH: I am not accusing any hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member may not be conscious of the full meaning of what he has said. I am going to ask hon. members to keep quiet. It is rather peculiar that they themselves cannot observe the Rules of the House. The hon. member who used those words is not fully aware of the law of libel because it is no defence for any one to say: "Some people may say so, but I am not saying so." First of all, I think I should draw to the attention of the hon. member that remarks in this Chamber are not privileged. Secondly, I will draw to his attention that he said: some people will say that some people are dishonest but when he said so, some people are not saying it; he is saying it and he thinks it is rather clever to say so. The law however, does not permit you to make a slanderous statement by saying some people would say so. The fact is that the hon. member is the first member to use those remarks, and since nobody else has used them, he must stop speculating and withdraw them because I regard this as a slander not only on the hon. member, but on the whole Government.
6.00 p.m.

I am asking Your Honour to ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw what he has said, because we regard those words as a slander on the whole Government. I am asking Your Honour to ask him to withdraw those words. What the hon. member is doing is accusing us of dishonesty and trickery. That sort of thing may be all right for Sugar Hill and it may have some kind of currency in Black Rock, but not in my precincts.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to support what the Hon. Premier has said. I take objection to what is being done by the Hon. Leader of the House, and I also take objection to what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said. If he says that some people will say this and some people can say that, I want to say that the term "some people" cannot apply in here. If an hon. member says these things about another hon. member, they will have to be withdrawn. "Some people" cannot have any relevance in this Chamber; only hon. members can speak in here. The inference is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was making a statement which will have reference to the Hon. Minister. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants to be on my side in this debate, then he must be decorous and parliamentary in his behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection has been taken by the Honourable and Learned Premier to the words used by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in the context in which they appear. He has taken objection to the use of the words "trickery, smartness dishonesty and crookedness" The hon. member went on to say that he would not extend to hon. members the use of these words. I know that there is this type of Ciceronian device whereby one may say something which he intends to convey as having application to the other person without saying that it is applicable to that person. Standing Order 26 (5) says this:-

"It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House."

Do I have an unqualified assurance from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that he did not intend any of these words to have any application to any hon. member of this House?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of using those words in reference to any hon. member because I said I would say so. If the Hon. Premier wants me to withdraw those words, I will withdraw them. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully beg to withdraw those remarks.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am moving that those words be expunged from the record.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that Order No. 15 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business be made the First Order of the Day at the next meeting of this House.

Mr. SMITH: I am objecting to the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the House. The Hon. Premier is always ready to defend the members of the Cabinet whether they are right or wrong. We have nobody to defend us over here, but we can defend ourselves. I do not know how far the actions of the present Government are going; the Government must be made to respect backbenchers and other hon. members of this Assembly. It is not because they are in power and they have the numbers that they must be doing these things. You have the Clerk who heard the hon. member say that he could not tell the hon. junior member for St. George anything yesterday because he did not know that he was not coming out today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I said nothing of the kind. The hon. member said that the hon. junior member for St. George was here yesterday and asked why I did not whisper to him of our intention to deal with this matter on Thursday. All I said was that I had no knowledge that the hon. junior member for St. George was not coming here today. In other words, even if I wanted to tell him about this matter, there is no reason why I could not say that the House will be meeting two days and the hon. member would be here on the next day.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member said that he did not know if he would be coming out today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I said is that I did not know whether the hon. junior member for St. George would be here today or not. That was not in reference to my not telling him yesterday.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying, Sir, that Resolution is under Private Members' Business and in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George, and he should have some knowledge of when it is to be debated. It is not the hon. member's private affairs or anything of the sort, and he should know because I am not sure.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, this is getting absolutely ridiculous. I do not think the hon. member could have been awake when the proposal was made by the Hon. Leader of the House. Nobody has decided to discuss this matter behind the hon. member's back. What the Government is proposing today is that the special day should be Thursday for the debate and that the hon. member should be notified; but the other side are talking about being unfair! We assumed when the hon. member gave notice of the Resolution that he was fully seised of the fact that the country and the House had no confidence in the Government. If he is too busy — and I hear the fire engine passing — to attend the House today, that is no concern of mine; but I will deal with the hon. member when he sits down.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Premier should be allowed to make that innuendo, because it is not fair. I said that we in here do not talk behind a man's back, and the Speaker should not have allowed you to say that you heard a fire engine just pass, and the hon. member is not here. Those things do not do the country any good. You cannot arrogate these charges unto yourself. The hon. member should say those things in the person's presence when he can reply. By innuendo, what action is there in hearing a fire engine passing? That is where I say I am afraid of independence, because it would get people ganging up and with all unrighteousness saying "Let us do this" as a Government or a Party. I am not representing the hon. member because he passes me, like Levi, on the other side.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you have heard everything. He just got up to let this talk about the fire engine slip off his breast. It was worrying him from the time he heard it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, every time I hear a fire engine I think of the speech made by the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, something will have to be done at some time. I can remember when I was sitting in that Chair as Chairman of Committees that I threatened to name the present Premier if he did not behave himself, and you and the Chairman of Committees will have to threaten the Premier to bring him to himself.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member said he threatened to name me. The hon. member, when he was Chairman of Committees, threatened to name me because I insisted that I was on my feet when he was adjourning a debate, and the then Premier of the island, Sir Grantley Adams, told him to put the motion when I was on my feet; so do not let us have any nonsense about telling me to behave. Whom does he think he is?

Mr. SMITH: He was not listening to me, Mr. Speaker. I said the Premier at that time. Was he Premier when I was Chairman of Committees? What is wrong with him? All the same, he lives near to it; only a stone's throw away from it and he will soon find himself in it. He could not have gone this morning for his injections.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member and members of his Party are in the habit of getting on public platforms and making all kinds of slanderous, wicked and unnecessary statements, not only about me, but about other Ministers as well. The hon. member who has just sat down said he does not know if I went this morning for my injections. What injections is the hon. member talking about? Because I will ask him to withdraw this statement. I think the time has come that we should name the hon. member as a result of his behaviour. He is saying that he threatened to name the Premier. He is the most wicked person I have had to deal with in this Place. Every time he gets an opportunity, he makes references to me which are completely untrue, and therefore I will ask you to ask the hon. member to explain himself in detail on the statement he made a few minutes ago. He is asking me if I went this morning for my injection. Does he mean for venereal disease, lunacy or what? I think the hon. member ought to explain that. I would like to inject my fist in his face.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I do not know what the hon. member has in mind, but what he did say lent itself to the only interpretation that when he was Chairman of Committees.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have made a submission, and I think Your Honour is not now merely in the position of a referee. I am not going to sit down and allow hon. members to make all kinds of slanderous statements and accuse people of things. If they do that on public platforms it does not mean I have waived my right, but I am not going to put up with it in here, because if we cannot get redress, I will take the law into my own hands or as I am advised.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am also objecting to the remarks made by the Hon. Premier that I am the most wicked person in here, and that he will inject his fist in my face.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, there is some stupid theory in this country that it is ungentlemanly to knock down somebody if he is the most scurrilous, wicked, contemptuous person, who would destroy the whole country, blow up Government House or the Public Buildings. Nobody ever accused me of being a gentleman, and if that is the qualification for being a gentleman, I do not want any part of it. I spent seven years of my life fighting, and if the hon. member is prepared to act like a wicked, contemptible animal all the time, I am prepared to knock him down. They slandered my uncle and the members of my family, and all the Ministers; and if they can take it, it is a matter for them.
6.20 p.m.

I am saying that I am prepared to knock him down. I am not prepared to listen to members slandering members of my family. I am not a gentleman; I have never been a gentleman. I am quite prepared to fight for my rights. I am prepared to knock him down because I think his action is comtemptible. I tell the hon. member that seriously. I am very serious about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I strongly deprecate any member saying in this Chamber that he would or might attempt any physical violence to any other member of this Chamber.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to say that I would knock him down; I would like to hit him in his face with a rule; I would kick him to the moon.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an unfortunate and quite unparliamentary method of redress, and if it is to be used at all - I am not for one moment suggesting that it should be used at all - certainly it should not be used in this Chamber where we are observing, so far as we can, the Rules of Parliament, decencies of procedure, and the maximum of decorum. This afternoon we completed the passing of a Resolution during which it was stated that we are one of the three oldest Parliaments in the British Commonwealth, the mover of which named the United Kingdom Parliament, next Bermuda, and then Barbados, and it is to be deprecated that we have arrived at this stage this afternoon.

May I suggest that the continuation of the debate proceeds on the motion which is before the House. From both sides there have been harsh and deplorable things said. I cannot express any opinion on which had the better or which the worse, but if there is anything more approximating to what has already been said to raise further disorder, I will use the powers vested in me. I think that this afternoon we have approached a new low, and I would like immediately, as from now, the House to resume at the highest possible parliamentary level. Just let us discuss the motion before us. Just let us stick to the motion and forget personalities, and anyone who is within this Chamber or who is without. Let us confine our remarks to the motion that Order No. 15 under Private Members' Business, be the first Order of the Day at the next meeting of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, to resume on the highest parliamentary level, I object to certain statements. When the hon. member has finished explaining himself, I will say what I have to say on the substantive motion. People are only concerned about slander, lies and matters of that kind; they are not concerned about the truth. If you get up and say that you are going to defend yourself against people, they say that you are not a gentleman.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph will have to withdraw those remarks, and I think that since he has made them he ought to explain them to members of this House. The last time that a member of his Party got up

and made statements about a member of this House who was my uncle, it was only because of a bit of luck that he did not end up at the bottom of the stairs. I am not going to let anything be smoothed over. When I say that I am going to knock him down, you must get him to refrain from using such remarks.

Why don't they shut up?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier always likes to get besides himself. He looks across here and shouts some words to me and say that you better shut up. The hon. member looks across to me and refuse to address you as "Mr. Speaker", but tells me to shut up when my voice could not be heard even by Your Honour. The hon. member is advising you to make rulings and he is asking hon. members to withdraw certain remarks. He offends himself without knowing it. There is something which we cannot understand, which we cannot accuse him for. I never attempt to commit myself to any definition, but, certainly the Hon. Premier can be rather provocative to certain members who do him nothing. Your Honour is in the Chair and he certainly ignored your person and said to me, "You certainly should shut up". This is real disrespect to the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If Your Honour thinks I was referring to him ------

Mr. HUSBANDS: I have never yet thought that we would have lived to see the day when we would all get so warm, that the Hon. Premier would say things and then disown saying them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph completed his speech?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying --

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to raise my fist at the hon. junior member for St. Peter. If I cannot invoke the assistance of the Chair, I am going to get quieter and quieter, but I am not going to allow the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to get up and explain himself without first withdrawing the derogatory statements which he made about me. You are not going to ask the hon. member to continue; you are going to ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier cannot dictate to me. He may be only expressing his opinion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I made an objection, and there is only one way in which an objection has to be made. If you do not want to deal with the objection, you must adjourn the House under some other pretext; but if you want to deal with it in accordance with how I feel any objection should be dealt with, you will call on the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the objection which has been raised?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not going to repeat it. This is reducing the thing to a farce. You are calling on the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has objected, but his objection so far is not definite not specific.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have never been a nice boy, because if I were a nice boy, I would have gone out and tried to make money by working on a ship; I would not have been what I was. I was never a nice person. I think this is something to be defended and I object to those remarks. There are rules under which the matter has to be dealt with.
6.30 p.m.

I think that this is something to be defended. I object, and I resent you or anybody else telling me to be a nice boy and forget it when there are Standing Orders of the House under which it has to be dealt with. I do not care what affiliation there is between hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member state the specific matter to which he is objecting?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Are you choosing to suffer from amnesia?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to what precisely he is taking objection.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have taken objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of the objection?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: To the hon. member saying that I could not have been down for my injection -- and you heard me say I am objecting to that all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not conscious of any innuendo or implications of any particular word which has been used.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have made my objection and I want it to be regulated by the highest traditions of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I am asking that the remarks to which specific objection has been taken be read by the shorthand Writer. *(After a pause).* I have received the following from the Shorthand Reporter via the Clerk:-

Mr. SMITH: He was not listening to me, Mr. Speaker, "I said the Premier at that time, Was he Premier when I "was Chairman of Committees? What is wrong with him? "All the same he lives near to it, only a stone's throw away "from it. He will soon find himself in it. He could not have "gone down this morning for his injection."
6.40 p.m.

Let the Hon. Premier state what he has taken exception to.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand your request at all, because I have stated verbatim on three separate occasions what I was taking objection to. I am not suffering from amnesia, and I do not have to be reminded. What I took objection to is exactly what you read out there. When you asked me and I repeated them, you were surprised I remembered apparently; and now the Reporter has directly confirmed that the hon. member said what I was objection to, you are asking what I am objecting to. Are you trying to make a fool out of me, Your Honour?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have never tried to make a fool out of anyone in this Chamber, or anything else; and no one is going to make a fool out of me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am sure Your Honour would have taken a note.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not take down any notes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I saw Your Honour writing at the time, and therefore I was assuming you were treating us with that courtesy, since you could not remember, of putting it on the record so that you could not forget again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member which word or words from what I have read; is he taking exception. I will read it again.

"He was not listening to me, Mr. Speaker. I said the Premier at that time, Was he Premier when I was Chairman of Committees? What is wrong with him? All the same he lives near to it; only a stone's throw away from it, and he will soon find himself in it. He could not have gone this morning for his injections."

In respect of Standing Order No. 26 (5) - Rules of Debate – "it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House." So far as the words which I have read out are intelligible, none of them as such appears to me in the category of being offensive and insulting. I am not reading anything into them, other than the actual words which have been taken down, and in respect of Standing Order No. 26 (7), "no member shall impute improper motives to another member." I do not regard it as coming within the scope of Standing Order No. 26 (7). I am not as Speaker entitled to read any innuendo into the language from the standpoint of deciding whether a word or phrase is parliamentary or unparliamentary. There is nothing in the actual words that have been used which I can regard as unparliamentary. It is more unintelligible and possibly incoherent, but I find nothing unparliamentary in what has been said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is no trouble in finding anything unparliamentary because Your Honour does not have to wait for a member to get up and object; but the point is that I have objected to specific words, and if Your Honour does not want to make a ruling, you are not going to get me to raise my voice to adjourn the House for disorder. I pointed out the words to which I objected, and it is not a question of whether you find any words unparliamentary because you decide to describe them as unintelligible. We know the hon. member is unintelligible; that is his difficulty. He is so unintelligible that he is always making slanderous allegations against members of the House who are not members of his Party. I take objection to specific words, and Your Honour has to rule. That is what I am asking you to do, not to say that you do not see anything on the face of the words; somebody who has spent 25 years in the law courts does not see anything objectionable on the face of the words – asking somebody if they went for injections this morning. You are not sending this over to Siam for somebody to interpret. You are in Barbados, and I want to say that I do not think any member of Parliament is above the law. Whether he is Speaker, Chairman of Committees, Minister or floor member, the law applies to him.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Standing Order No. 26 (5) says that it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 26 (5) says it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House. What I am trying to explain is that the words qua words, apart from any possible implication, innuendo, connotation or imputation, I do not regard as offensive.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour does not regard them as offensive, the Hon. Premier objects to their use.

Mr. SPEAKER: The words have to be in the opinion of the Chair unparliamentary before the Chair calls on a member to withdraw. There is nothing which taken on its face value, so far as I can see, is offensive and insulting. These words may or may not be in good or bad taste, but there is no word or phrase here which in my view, taken at its face value, is offensive and insulting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am rather surprised at Your Honour's ruling. After all, the Rule is quite simple. It says "it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House." Normally, Sir, even without straining the interpretation of the sentence used by the hon. member, it is obviously meant to be offensive and insulting. I must confess that, without in any way challenging Your Honour's ruling, it is difficult to understand how Your Honour does not find those words offensive and insulting.

Mr. SPEAKER: My point is that none of the words as such do I regard as offensive or insulting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: But it is a question of the interpretation to which the words put themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only deal with the words as they are expressed, not with any interpretation, good or bad, which may be put on them.

6.50 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is a question of the interpretation of the words by themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot imply anything other than their normal meanings. I can only deal with words as they are words, not with any interpretation which can or which may be put on them.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: For instance, if Your Honour was told by a member of the House that he did not know whether you had your injection this morning, I know we would take the strongest possible objection to the remarks. There is not a single member around this Table who would not take the strongest possible objection to a remark like that. It is distinctly offensive and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph intended it to be offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is another point which I cannot read into a man' mind. I cannot speak for any other member; but so far as I am concerned, I would not have regarded it as an insult.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What happens now when an hon. member objected and ask that the words be taken down? Apparently, we are not going to have the debate continued as long as the hon. member does not withdraw, because Your Honour is firmly of the opinion that the remarks are not offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Order which used to obtain in this Chamber in respect of words being taken down, so far as I am aware, and so far as I am advised, no longer appears in our Standing Orders. Certainly, there was formerly such a Rule of this House of Assembly.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I respectfully enquire, Sir? Your Honour has said that it is for Your Honour to interpret whether the words used were offensive or insulting. May I ask under what Standing Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 26, (5).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That says: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House." It does not say that the Speaker has to say that they are offensive or insulting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 35 says that the decision of the Chair is final. It reads as follows:-

"The Speaker in the House or the Chairman in Committee shall be responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and Committee respectively, and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion. Notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 20 (Manner of giving Notices), such a motion shall not require more than two days' notice."

Standing Order No. 26 (5) is in my opinion read in the light of Standing Order No. 35.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour, on reflection does not regard the words complained of as being in any way offensive or insulting?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard the words complained of, qua words, as constituting offensive and insulting language, and that is the exact phrase which is used in the Standing Order No. 26 (5).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Apart from your interpretation, is the hon. member entitled to examine the contents of those words?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not entitled to introduce words or thoughts which are not a part of the record. In respect of

the very last word which is used in the passage which I have read and re-read, if the principal exception is taken to the word "injection", personally, I would have no reason to read into it or to qualify that word with "injection" for any particular cause or matter, or to assume that the word is used in any sense other than the normal sense of the word. To say that one has had an injection does not impute anything dishonourable, offensive or insulting.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Is it Your Honour's opinion that this phrase could have led to disorder in this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would see no reason why it should have led to any disorder in the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that there are two accusations, if I may put it that way, in the words which were taken down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for Christ Church questioning my Ruling?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am not questioning your Ruling. I am just saying that it is a sort of double barrelled statement, one referring to the fact that the Hon. Premier lived near a certain place and we all know where the Hon. Premier lives and where is that place. The Hon. Premier does not live in Bathsheba. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said the Hon. Premier lived near a place, and if he does not watch his steps, he will fall in there. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that if he not taken his injection this morning, you know what he meant; and to say that is not offensive or derogatory, that is acting childish.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member using the word "childish" in respect of my Ruling?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I mean "childish" in the way of reasoning, coming to the realisation of what was intended. I do not mean lack of comprehension.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me say this. It is not for the Chair to call on any hon. member to interpret things for him. He has no power to require any member to explain anything which he said. It is a matter for a hon. member if he likes himself to be drawn further into any discussion. As I have said, my view is that neither (5) nor (7) of Standing Order No. 26 has been contravened, but I am prepared to do this so that the debate might continue if it is so desired. I would address to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph this: in the light of everything, which I have said about my view of the words as such, will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph state whether or not – in his use of the phrase – he had any offensive and insulting imputations?
7.00 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to an exhibition of vacillation, lack of decision and vigilance and of putting words in the hon. member's mouth so as to give him an opportunity to exculpate himself. That may be all good in family relations, but not in the House of Assembly. I would prefer that you do not worry to mention anything to him on this matter at all. I will not be listening; I will not be here. If the Chair wants to be impartial and strict, it should not look for excuses on one side or on the other. I am not sitting here in the face of an hon. member being asked to be judge and jury in his own case, and to make his own rulings when we have important business to discuss. I think that the Government and members of this House are being treated with disrespect. Our intelligence is being insulted, and members of the House and those outside cannot have any respect for us if we go on like this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair is strict, the Chair is firm, and it is impartial. The Chair has given its ruling, that in this phrase offensive and insulting language is not proven; it is not offensive in respect of any of the remarks which have been read out as they were taken down by the Official Reporter. The Chair has no power to ask, although it was invited some time ago to ask, the hon. member to explain anything. I was not asking the hon. member to explain anything, nor was I giving the hon. member any opportunity to exculpate himself. I was merely seeking to satisfy myself, apropos of the Ruling which I have given, as to whether or not there was an offensive and insulting intention in the language, which did not appear in the words themselves as they have been taken down.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is really very painful. The context in which the words were used was recalled by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Clearly it was the intention of the hon. member to be insulting, to be offensive, to cast aspersions and, in that way, to be slanderous. There is no question about that. If the hon. member had used the phrase about injection only, it might have been stretching the point to infer these things; but there is no room for doubt at all.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is assuming a role and I am not asking to retract. Don't go through any books, because you will not satisfy anybody on this side of the House who knows anything about Parliamentary conduct, to ask the hon. member to say whether he thinks the words are offensive or not. You are surrendering your right to him which we could not tolerate. In respect of everything which has taken place during the last 30 or 40 minutes, we ask ourselves a simple question; whether you and the hon. member take injections and whether you had them this morning, which is not unparliamentary, and whether you are in the habit in going with the hon. member in taking injections.

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly take no exception to that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If any hon. member went any further and asked another hon. member if he had a bath, that would be all right too. Well, you can say whatever you like in Parliament. (A MEMBER: Question.)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: No question is being put unless no other hon. member gets on his feet. I will now deal with this matter and I will talk at dictation speed. On the 11th February, 1964, *(ASIDES)* the hon. member has only stirred up a lot of trouble here because he has the right to lean over backwards in order to accommodate .....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If you are dealing with me, there was nothing to be stirred up. I said that I do not agree with the method with which you are taking in dealing with the matter. This was nothing which was stirred up because 'stirring up' connotes that somebody is looking for trouble. I do not agree with the method adopted in dealing with this matter, and what the Hon. Premier must get in his mind is that every member of Parliament need not agree with him; I feel that I can disagree with any person without making any improper motives or imputations. I did not make any imputation that the hon. member was anything other than an hon. member. What I said was that the action was not fair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that it was not fair. Well, that is the French way of saying: "This animal is very wicked; the more you attack him the more he defends himself." This is the position. On 11th February 1964, the hon. junior member for St. George, who is not now in his place gave notice of a motion in the following words:-

To move the passing of a Resolution that the Government no longer enjoys the confidence of the Country and calling upon the Premier to advise His Excellency the Governor to dissolve the Legislature so that a General Election can be held.
7.10 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter also had certain observations to make as to the propriety of that motion. Your Honour gave a ruling for which we could find no precedent in the history of Parliament for any other person than the Leader of the Official Opposition filing notice of a motion of that kind. Despite the absence of any precedence anywhere in the wide world or in the history of the universe, Your

Honour, as is your entitlement, said that you were disposed to allow the motion. Your Honour also said that I as Leader of the Government had informed you that the Government would set aside a day for the debate. I should like to make it clear that I gave Your Honour that information before Your Honour's ruling was made known to me. Your Honour actually attempted to tell me what your ruling would be, but I said that I was not concerned with what your ruling was going to be nor did I care, but I informed Your Honour that the Government considered it in the interest of good Government that the hon. member should move his motion of "No Confidence", and Government was prepared to set aside a day before the end of March. I told you on the 3rd March that I did not want to know the ruling, but that it was in the interest of Government that the hon. member should be allowed to debate his motion; so what is happening now?

On 3rd March, Your Honour gave your ruling and it was known to the general public that we would set aside a day before the end of March. We were engaged in the exercise between the beginning of March and today at 5.30 p.m. of getting all the constitutional matters cleared off the Order Paper. We answered in one day no less than 42 questions, I believe, so that they would not say we had questions on the Order Paper and did not dispose of them. We introduced several Civil Establishment Orders including an Order for the remuneration of the Director of Public Prosecutions, an Order for the re-organisation of the Police Force, the Harbour and various other Departments. We did several constitutional Bills between 1st March and today's date, and on the undertaking which I gave, Your Honour said that Government was not bound to set aside a day for it; it could remain on the Order Paper. I informed Your Honour that we would set aside a day, not as a matter of whether or not the House would like us to. We made that decision, and the fixing of the Order Paper is entirely a matter for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, let us get the whole picture abundantly clear. I hope the Press does not find me speaking too quickly, because I do not want them to make a single mistake on this issue. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was not in the Island when Your Honour's ruling was given to a motion which was previously filed but was hastily withdrawn, when it was found that it would reflect on a vote of the House, by the hon. junior member for St. George. Your Honour gave a ruling; no precedent was found. We welcomed that ruling, and I would like to make it abundantly clear that Your Honour said in that ruling that you did not find a precedent for a person other than the Official Opposition making that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the United Kingdom, I only did research in respect of the United Kindgom Parliament and this Chamber.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand that Your Honour wrote to the Speaker of the House of Commons, because you awaited a reply from him. You did not choose to write to Australia, because your research does not disclose anything in Australia, and I am sure that the senior Clerk of the House would not have found anything as a precedent in Australia if you gave him an opportunity; so do not let us talk about the United Kingdom Government. You did not find a precedent and you said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said I did not find one in the United Kingdom and that does appear in my Statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your Honour did not say you found one anywhere else. We are two lawyers and we can have it out now. *Expressio unius exclusio alterius*. Is Your Honour saying that the Clerk found a precedent for it in another Parliament?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know about the Clerk.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will give way to the Clerk. Let him write down the name of that Parliament. The motion, Sir, was that the Government should resign. We know what has happened since; so we said the House should debate it and we would give a day before the end of March. His Excellency the Governor sent down a Message today to prorogue the House on 31st March. I said in February that the House would be prorogued in March and we had to get a new Senate in April. We dealt with the Colonial Estimates which by law must be dealt with before 31st March, and therefore we sat two or three days last week and two days this week in getting the Estimates ready for the Other Place so that we could comply with the provisions of the law, and I turned to the financial procedures, the Executive Committee Act and the Orders so that Civil Servants could get paid, and there would be supplies voted for the support of Government in the coming financial year.

Now yesterday I discussed this with the Official Leader of the Opposition on the other side, because he is the person we normally consult – I do not care what Party he belongs to – because he is recognised by the constitutional law of this island as being the Leader of the Official Opposition. It stands to reason that the person who knows so much that is going on in the country, who has the courage to file a Resolution and to give notice of it six weeks ago, has not only had ample time since the tabling of the Resolution in this Chamber on 11th February, but before he tabled it; he would have had all his forces marshalled and he would have all his facts, if there are any facts, and all his arguments in support of the Resolution, so that it could be debated at any time during Private Members' Time if the Government did not give him time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would just ask the hon. member to give way.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member wants to argue logic with me, I am not prepared to give way. I am asking no quarter and giving none in this issue; so just sit down and cool off.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has risen on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is it anything on a dialectical point that the hon. member wants to rise?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not in any way suggest that this matter should not be debated at the shortest possible notice. I suggested that the hon. member in whose name the motion stood should have been informed that it was the intention of the Government to do it on Thursday.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member would not let me finish. I am saying that if a member files a second motion amended for him on 11th February and puts it down under Private Members' Business and he knows that the House is going to prorogue, he should have all his material and arguments ready at a moment's notice to get up and debate that point. We out of an act of supererogation on our part, doing something out of the excessive resources of grace, – I think that is the definition given in ecclesiastical circles – said that we would set aside a special day before the end of March for this debate. Now yesterday when we saw the programme being completed, we had a cursory discussion with the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member was not around, because at that stage of the day yesterday when we saw we could possibly get through the Civil Establishment Orders by some time during today's sitting, we then said that we still had another matter outstanding, and we should set aside a day between now and the end of the month. The hon. member had notice since 3rd March that we would set aside a day. The hon. member who is now being defended for being absent from his duties at no time approached the Leader of the House or myself or made any inquiry. He has been lucky up to last week when he made somewhat of an exhibition of himself and arouse disgust of the whole country, and I do not want to say anything stronger because he is not here. I will deal with him during the debate, because I have chapter and verse from the day he was born into politics in the election in St. Peter when he opposed the hon. member running in St. Peter as a paid agent for the Conservative Party.

7.20 p.m.

I am not going to say anything of him now. I am only sort of serving notice, if he wants a vote of no confidence, that he can have it. The hon. junior member for St. George has been in here and has taken part in debates and he never suggested that the Government was squeezing him out. The hon. member like all hon. members was cognizant of the fact that His Excellency the Governor would be sending down a Message for prorogation of the Legislature, and hon. members know that by law the Estimates must be finished by 31st March. The hon. member therefore did not ask for any special day. When we began to see the programme coming to some finality and when we tentatively suggested Thursday as the day when we should discuss the hon. member's motion, we consulted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and he never issued any remarks of its being unfair or of not giving sufficient notice. In fact, it ought to be in the records, if the Clerk does not prevent the Reporter from writing it, that the Hon. Leader of the House got up to say that he was inviting the Clerk to notify the hon. member since the hon. member was not in his place.

The hon. member was given notice since the 3rd of March. The way the hon. junior member for St. Joseph got on today, one would think that we were going into debate and saying all things about him and coming to a decision and throwing his motion out. Your Honour knows that we have had all these constitutional changes which had to be given priority. Along with that, we had to get through with the Estimates in time so that the Other Place might have them before the 31st March, 1964. If you consider that today is the 24th March, 1964, and that the only other day would be Wednesday 25th March, — tomorrow — we have proposed instead Thursday, 26th March, because the 27th March is Good Friday, the 28th March is a day which we do not normally work on and besides that, it is part of Easter, the 29th March is Easter Day; and Monday is Easter Bank-holiday, a day on which the House would not meet except there was a demise of the Crown, The Queen will have to pass on in order for this House to meet on that day. On Tuesday, 31st March, the Queen Mother arrives in the morning, and in the afternoon His Excellency has notified us that he intends to prorogue this House and dissolve the Other Place. That is a Message from His Excellency the Governor which is well known to hon. members. What day is the hon. member suggesting that we could do it? The only other day which we could set apart to discuss that motion is tomorrow, and then the hon. junior member for St. George would have less notice.

The Hon. Leader of the House asked Your Honour to notify the hon. junior member for St. George. May be, that hon. member has some pressing business which has prevented him from coming here. However, I think it was safe for him to remain knowing that we would not deal with his motion today. I do not understand what the hon. members on the other side expect us to do. It is either that you do not appoint a day at all and that would be the end of the matter, because everything on the Order Paper will be expunged as soon as the House is prorogued. The result would fall to the ground and we would be breaking our promise to give a day before the 31st March. What the hon. senior member for St. Philip has done is to say that that Order will be taken as the first Order of the Day at the next meeting so that it does not get relegated to the limbo of Friday morning. The hon. member has done that so that the hon. junior member for St. George would have full opportunity to ventilate his motion and, if it is possible, to overthrow the Government.

We have given instructions that the whole debate must be broadcast so that hon. members would have the opportunity of hearing themselves; but we are saying that the debate must be completed between 3.30 o'clock and midnight. I think that we have done all that we possibly could do in the circumstances. For the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to get up and talk about being unfair, quite apart from the slanderous remarks made by him, I am not concerned about what Your Honour had to say on that. I would have to say what I think about it too. I am not worried about it. If it is not unparliamentary, it is not unparliamentary; but to say that somebody is not in his place and you are giving that person only 48 hours' notice when he is not out of the Island, to the best of our knowledge, I cannot see how that is not sufficient notice or how it can be unfair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I do not think it is right to say that I said it was unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir,. I said and I repeat, if the Hon. Premier is now making an excuse for the inexcusable, then there is nothing to excuse him nor the Hon. Leader of the House for not giving the hon. junior member for St. George the courtesy of knowing that you were going to debate this motion on Thursday. I said that you had the opportunity of doing it and you failed to do it. Yesterday you knew that you were going to have this thing done on Thursday, and the hon. junior member for St. George was in here and you made no attempt to serve him notice that you proposed doing it. You knew it and you did not do it, and then the Hon. Premier said that he told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Yes, you told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but you did not have the common courtesy to tell the hon. junior member for St. George. If you could tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, certainly, you could have told the hon. junior member for St. George when the debate was going to take place. It is courtesy which you owe him and you did not express it. You are going to leave a record for discourtesy, as well as the Hon. Leader of the House. A lot more can be said than I care to say now. I will wait until the right time to say it.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. senior member for St. Peter is saying now, is it pertaining still to a point of order?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think the hon. member quite illogically is just interrupting me. If the hon. member was listening, he would have heard that I said what we had to get through with before the 31st March; and after I realised that I possibly could get through with these Civil Establishment Orders, I mentioned it to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, The hon. junior member for St. George was not then in the House, when the discussion came up yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to know that we had to summon a Cabinet meeting at 10.30 o'clock this morning to discuss it.

7.30 p.m.

We had to summon a Cabinet meeting, because it is a Government decision, at 10.30 o'clock this morning. I discussed the matter with the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I was not aware that the hon. junior member for St. George was around. I do not think that any hon. member should suggest that it is part of my duty to go, certainly not within shooting distance of where the hon. junior member for St. George is living and the cemetry is in the other direction from my home — I do not consider that I should ring up hon. members and say to them: "We are going to have a Cabinet Meeting." The Government made a decision about 11 o'clock this morning and I first notified the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we were satisfied that Thursday of this week would be a suitable day for this discussion. The hon. member took part in the debates and said that if we did not resign we wanted the country burned down. This animal is very wicked; the more you attack him, the more he defends himself. Because we are doing what we promised to do, we are characterised as being wicked and unfair! We are unfair because we are giving the hon. member a chance to debate what he wants to debate; we are unfair because we are allowing him to debate what he wants to debate on a day before the end of the month! I should like to say that far from being able to please everybody, we can hardly please two of them. We will be here and we will do what the hon. member wants to do. We cannot please everybody.

The question that Order No. 15 under Private Members' Business on today's Order Paper be the first Order of the Day under this Head at the next meeting of the House was put. A division was being taken as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON, HON'BLES. E. W. BARROW; W. A. CRAWFORD; C. E. TALMA; G. G. FERGUSSON, J. C. TUDOR, MESSRS. LOWE and YEARWOOD – 8.

On being called upon to vote,

Mr. WALCOTT: *(Sitting)* Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that there is some confusion about this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Vote against it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Man, you cannot tell me how to vote. I did this on purpose. The hon. member has been behaving badly all the evening. If he can get on like this, and, now that I am speaking, he is telling me how to vote, that is where there will be positive disorder. For the whole evening you have been castigating the Chair in a way nobody has ever done in this Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member heard from me.....

Mr. WALCOTT: You may be looking for something.....

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the grave disorder, this sitting now stands suspended for fifteen minutes.
7.40 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When this Sitting was suspended, a vote was being taken.

AYES: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. BOXILL .

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. HUSBANDS and Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ten hon. members having voted "Aye" and three hon. members having voted "No", I accordingly declare that the "AYES" have it, and in consequence Order No. 15 under Private Members' Business will be the first Order of the Day at the next meeting of this House.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 26th March, at 3.30 p.m.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to speak on my objection and give the reasons. We have heard today a lot of charges being made against me by the Hon. Premier, as if I do not have any right to disagree with anything that is proposed by this Government. I want to make my position unmistakably clear. I have an inalienable, God-given right to express my view on any matter at any time in the way I deem fit, and that is not to be subjected to any prior approval of any member from the Government, Premier or anyone else in Barbados. When I said earlier in this debate that I was not in agreement with the methods that were used in dealing with this matter, I made my position unmistakably clear. I was at pains to point out, even when I was interrupted while speaking, from my seat that the Premier seems to be growing into the belief that he has a right to sit in his seat and interrupt anyone. When anything like that is done when he is speaking, he asks people if they do not understand they have to listen and talks about the decorum of the House; so he regards himself as having the right to pass any remark he feels like passing to any other hon. member. That is all right if he is passing a joke or making fun; but when he reduces that to seriousness, he must bear in mind that other hon. members are not members of his Party, and even members of his Party cannot be subjected to that sort of business.

I want to explain to Your Honour that as far as I am concerned, the Order can be the first, second or third, because Your Honour has already ruled that it is a matter that can go on the Order Paper. I will maintain, however, that the Government could have set aside a day earlier than Thursday, because I do not accept the view which the Premier has expressed about the Estimates. If it were the Government's intention to set aside a day, it need not have been on the day we meet. It must be remembered that prior to the Estimates the Leader of the House asked the House to postpone Private Members' Business in order to deal with Government Business; so it was not during the Estimates alone that Private Members' Time was set aside. There were days other than during the Estimates on which Government was accorded the facility of doing all Government Business, and nobody voted against Government utilising all the time. A day could have been set aside prior to dealing with the Estimates, and if an excuse is made about getting the Estimates to the Other Place, it is the same excuse that the last Government used in here about the Estimates, and the Premier himself said that they were not responsible for bringing down the Estimates. If you bring them to the House late, therefore it is not our fault.

Now we can remember very clearly a very classic debate during the Estimates on a vote to increase the cost of a car for the Governor, in which the Hon. Premier, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and myself took part. It started at 12 noon one day and ended at 7 o'clock the next morning. I would like to know what would be the Premier's attitude today if the House felt strongly about anything his Government proposes, and what he would do if that took place. It was nearly nineteen hours in debate; so when I heard these charges made against any member for exercising his right, I would like the Premier to understand that he was the bitterest debater in this Assembly on anything he felt strongly about, no matter what it was. He must bear in mind that he cannot look upon me as a member of his Party whom he has something to offer. I hold no Ministerial position for him to use the strong words about expulsion. I am not telling him what words to use, but if his members can sit down under a statement that he can expel them, I never knew that you can be expelled by a Party unless it was Nasser's Party. You have to be expelled by membership.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue speaking on the motion for adjournment until Thursday.

Mr. WALCOTT: I just went off there because the Premier went very far and wide off the mark on a matter not concerned with the adjournment, and accused me of stirring up something. If I were a character who used to stir up things , I could stir up a lot; but I leave that for minds that like stirring up things. Whatever is there to come to the fore will come to the fore without me. I am saying, however, that none of the courtesies were extended to the hon. member to which he is entitled. The suggestion of sending an hon. member to another hon. member's house to summon him to a meeting is vulgar. Yesterday when hon. members were summoned to meet, neither the Premier nor any other member went to other members' homes; other methods were used.

Mr. Speaker, Parliament is the highest place in the land, a place for making laws, and a place you ask people to look up to, and I feel that members should conduct the affairs of this country in such a manner that it leaves nothing for doubt as to out attitude towards our Parliamentary colleagues, whether or not they are in our Party. I spoke on the hon. member's original motion when it was brought to the House, and some of the members did not seem to know that what was being placed on the Order Paper was out of order. I said it from the outset and it was withdrawn by the hon. member. I want the Hon. Premier to get it into his mind that if he looks upon me as someone who is going to say what he would like me to say, I am not one of those members. I am going to say what I feel I should say, and if he does not like it, he can lump it. I have absolutely no apology to make to anyone for anything I say in here. When I say what I say in here and it does not please those who sent me here, they can make their own decision; so I want the Premier to understand that I do not support the idea of dealing with this matter without giving the hon. member an opportunity. So far as I am concerned, it does not matter to me if you debate the matter tomorrow or Thursday; I come to the House whenever I am in the island. I was here yesterday and left, and I was re-summoned and came back. I take my parliamentary duties seriously; so it is not a

question of staying away. What does it matter to me whether or not the hon. member debates his motion? If you summon the House to meet on Thursday for the precise purpose of dealing with this matter and the hon. member does not turn up, what are you going to deal with? Your Honour cannot deal with a Resolution in any person's name if he is not here, and commonsense would lead me to see that all this tirade has been made against those of us who spoke about this matter purely from the point of view of utilising courtesies, because if you inform the hon. member that we are going to have this debate on Thursday and he does not turn up, at least you have something more to demonstrate that the hon. member made a motion and he does not want to deal with it.
8.05 p.m.

But now, what have you done? The hon. member is not here and you agree to do this. What is going to be the result if he does not turn up? You cannot pull him in here. That is why I say if courtesy had been extended to the hon. member, he would have had no excuse. There are those of us who spoke against that motion by the hon. member and, now he is on the run, it can be said that we did not want a debate on it. How can any sensible, sane person contribute a thing like that to me? What is really very outstanding is that I find myself in this invidious position that some times we have to support people, some times, you have to support the Government and what you find coming from that side of the people and from Government is some of the most uncharitable and harsh statements. I have tried my best and have completely ignored some of the extremely sarcastic remarks which have come from the Hon. Premier; but it seems to me that it is endemic in him; he cannot help giving vent to those unnecessary sarcastic remarks. But I would say that there is a limit to that sort of thing which people are prepared to accept and take as an excuse, and it does not do the Hon. Premier's image any good.

Sir, I am not going to say anything more on this matter because it is clear to me that what I said earlier is that there should be an indication given to the hon. member. Courtesy is nothing which you pay for. Treating any person with courtesy is something which any one can do, and too many people try to underwrite it and there is nothing in our parliamentary life without it. We should be prepared to bend over backwards and extend parliamentary courtesy even to our most dangerous enemy.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I only want to mention that at all times we are asked to facilitate the Government with their business by giving up all our time to get along with theirs: but at no time do members of the Government want to facilitate us. Last week, we met to help them three times. We have met yesterday and today, and if they thought that Thursday was the only time that they had at their disposal to deal with this Resolution, surely, if they did not mention it to the hon. junior member for St. George, there are others to whom they could have mentioned it. The Hon. Premier has come with the excuse that Thursday is the only day before the end of March to deal with it. Suppose it was not even dealt with by the end of March — and as we know, everything comes off the Order Paper as soon as we are prorogued — if the hon. junior member for St. George wanted to carry on with the debate, he could re-introduce the motion. The Government could not be blamed for holding it up, if there was no time to deal with it; but they had the time to deal with it all before last week. As the Hon. Premier has said, the 3rd March was the date on which the Government said they would allocate a date before the end of March to deal with it; so there was a lot of time to deal with it. They had from that time to deal with it and could have dealt with it from that time up to last week.

The Hon. Mover has said that it will be broadcast and he has all his ammunition ready. If that is so, it can be done the next week. The hon. member has said that it was only today at 10.00 o'clock that it was decided to deal with it on Thursday, although all yesterday it was hinted by people other than members of this House of Assembly that the date fixed to deal with it was next Thursday. If the hon. junior member for St. George does not come out on Thursday, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, what will happen? Hon. members will turn out on Thursday for nothing, because we cannot carry on with it. This is the first Item on the Order Paper. I go further, why fix the time for the meeting at 3.30 o'clock? Why not make it 12 o'clock, if they want to give the widest scope and they want a full dress debate and they want to give every hon. member a chance to speak on the motion? I say that because if it is only from 3.30 o'clock to midnight, I will be on my feet from 3.30 o'clock to 10.00 o'clock and then the Hon. Premier would not get any chance to say what he intends to say. He said that he has chapter and verse and all his notes on the matter, even before the hon. junior member for St. George went into politics. He will get no time unless he has mentioned that only in passing. If we meet at 3.30 p.m., the hon. junior member for St. George will take up his part of the time, I then would take up my part, which would be a great part and then there would be no time left. We are sure that on the motion going to the vote the backbenchers will be there willing and ready to knock it overboard and I believe that we will be more successful in getting a Minister to vote with us than a backbencher; therefore, we cannot get any further than to talk. So, we must talk and talk and talk and surely, there is not going to be sufficient time.

I am not speaking for the hon. junior member for St. George but I daresay that he can re-introduce the motion. If he cannot, I can, because I am not going to be tied down. If the hon. member does not agree to bring it up again, I will bring it. I will not be here next Thursday and I am sure other hon. members will not be here. I cannot speak for my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. George. We are, therefore, only wasting time to adjourn the House until Thursday next because the hon. junior member for St. George up to now knows nothing about it.
8.15 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. George does not know anything officially about this. He might just hear by the way, and he might be doing some other business of his own. The Ministers would not be losing any time because they can afford to come here every day of the week and on Sundays too, because their bread is buttered with fat; but we who have something to do for ourselves, have to think of our time. I am not in favour of meeting here next Thursday, and that is my reason for voting against the motion. Again, the hon. junior member for St. George is not in his place to know about this matter, and it is not fair to summon him tomorrow when you are not even giving him 48 hours' notice. Yesterday somebody gave me a summons to appear here at 2.30 p.m. of the clock and when I looked at my clock it was then 2.20 p.m. I cannot dress in that time; I was being given ten minutes' time in which to appear here.

The hon. junior member for St. George got his notice after the time. I do not know what the Government is doing now; they are in now, but there will be a time when they will be outside and they will want to get back in. All of these things will be thrown at them by the electors. It is not the individual members whom they are treating in this manner; it is the Electorate who have elected us here. When you disregard the people's representatives, then you are disregarding the people as well.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of detaining the House for another few minutes, I must make the Government's position clear in this matter. It astonished me that, in a matter like this in which the Government is so openly straightforward, so blatantly honest and aboveboard, that we should be accused of being unfair and unjust. The facts of this matter have been told in the course of two speeches which have been made on this side of the House this afternoon, despite the interruptions, and in the explanations which have been given from time to time. In the first place, I must reject the contention that the hon. member is unfair to the hon. member who is not now in his seat. If you give notice of your intention to move a motion of "No Confidence" in the Government of the day, that is the one motion which is punitive in its effect. You do not suddenly decide that you do not have any confidence in the Government,

but after a series of bad doings and mal-practices and they convince you that if the Government does not get better, then things will be worse for the country. You do not table a motion of "No Confidence" and then look for the facts; from the time you give notice of this motion, you should be ready to initiate the debate on the motion. Therefore, the charge that this House is being unfair against the hon. member is not founded because the hon. member's absence from the Chamber this afternoon is not relevant to the issue.

It was open to the hon. member after the announcement was made and he could have asked when the matter will be debated; but the hon. member well knew from the time that the announcement was made – he knew from that time to the 31st day of the month -- that the matter would be debated. Any such discourtesy was obviated when the Hon. Leader of the House had the foresight to direct the Clerk to inform the hon. member that Thursday was the day which the Government had set aside for this debate. If you argue that the hon. member is being given a very short notice, how would you argue about yesterday's Special Meeting of the House, when all hon. members, with the exception of one hon. member, were given short notices? It would be a very strange kind of logic to argue that a member was properly summoned for 2.30 o;clock at 2.20 o'clock or 2 o'clock yesterday, but that a member is treated discourteously when he is notified 38 hours before Thursday that the motion which stands in his name can be debated, because the Government has given the time which it promised to give for the debate before the end of the month. The charge of discourtesy therefore cannot hold; the charge is wide of the mark. The hon. member's rights are therefore entirely safeguarded in his absence.

The hon. member who was speaking before I got up, must think that this Government is as silly as we look; but the hon. member who was so stern in his speech that he said he wanted to move this motion, is no longer interested in the matter. He does not know whether he will be here. That has been taken care of, so much so that Your Honour has kindly consented to have the absent member notified. If an hon. member in whose name a motion stands, cannot be got at, and if the hon. member who is now present and who would ordinarily be expected to second the motion, cannot tell us whether he will be here or not, and he was present today and heard the announcement yesterday, and further, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who, in the course of another debate, made his own position clear by saying that he does not know whether he would support the motion for "No Confidence" or not....

Mr. SMITH: *On a point of order.* Did the hon. junior member for St. Lucy say that I said in the course of another debate that I would not support the motion for "No Confidence"?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I apologize to the hon. member; I meant the hon. junior member for St. Peter who said that he did not know whether he would support the motion for "No Confidence" or not.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I think I remember saying I did not know if I would speak. I do not remember using the word "support".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think the hon. member who is not usually grammatically correct said he does not know whether he would "spoke" on the matter of "no confidence".

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I would like to ask the hon. member to repeat what he just said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. and Learned member for St. John repeat what he said?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like to make my position clear. We understood the hon. member to say "support". The hon. member is an old academician, and I did not really think that he would have said he did not know whether he would "spoke" on the motion, and that is why I said "support", but he is not saying if he would speak on the motion or not.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I understood the hon. member to say he did not know if he would support the motion, but here is the situation: if for some reason Your Honour is not successful in passing on the courteous message which the House is sending to the tabler of the Motion, or if further, having received Your Honour's intimation he does not take that as a hint to make himself scarce, and if further the person who would normally be expected to second the motion does not know if he will be present or not – I am told that the hon. member said he is not coming, and then the other hon. member next to him does not know whether he will speak or not – what sort of debate are we going to have? I would hesitate to say of the hon. members either that they are mad or forgetful, but those members who would normally be expected to bear the brunt of the debate on the attacking side are serving notice in the various ways, one by absence, one by diffidence and the other by his pronouncement, that they would not be here. If they are not here, I may say that we will be here. We have given an undertaking that there will be a quorum, and since it is the duty of the majority to provide quorum, we will be here and it will be entirely up to the hon. members present whether or not they wish to take part in the debate which they themselves have initiated. But we want to make this absolutely clear: we reject entirely the charge that we have been unfair or discourteous to them, because the facts of the case deny that charge. Secondly, it was decided at Cabinet this morning that this matter would come up on Thursday, and if the hon. member opposite knew before, one would assume he had told the hon. member, and that may have been responsible for that hon. member's convenient absence today. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our position is clear.

Your Honour gave a ruling that the debate on the matter was permissible. Apart from that ruling, but in consequence of it, the Hon. Premier intimated that a day would be set aside. The arguments of hon. members opposite that they have given up Private Members' Time for three, four or five days previously have proved conclusively that we could not set aside a day before the day now set aside, because we were too busy with the Queen's business in this country, and hon. members are convinced that we are busy, because at no time, except when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made a scruple, did they resist our request that they should give up their time. That day is set aside. We have covered all possible contingencies, notified hon. members present, have asked Your Honour to do the same thing in respect of the hon. member, the kingpin of the motion who is not now in his place. We guarantee on our side that we will be here, and if they do not come, that is a matter entirely for them. If they do not come, they will be serving notice that the motion was foolhardy, that it was entirely unnecessary, and they will know what consequence they will reap in so far as their reputation politically and otherwise is concerned both in this House and in the country.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, there is only one point I should like to take up with the Minister of Education who has just sat down. I am an independent member in Parliament, and I am under no obligation whatsoever on a vote of censure. As a matter of fact, I might be employing better tactics by withholding myself and then discharging myself of my political fury when an election is on. I belong to no Party that can tell me when to speak; I decide when I am to speak. I am in sole control of the times when my voice will be heard in Parliament. When it comes to a vote of censure, there are so many hon. members who may speak and who may not speak other than myself that I have no control of; so I do not see the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy in pinpointing me as somebody who means so much to the debate. I am an Independent, and I can sit quite silently and listen, and at any time determine whether to speak or not to speak; so not granting the hon. member sufficient notice has nothing at all to do with my position. I have expressed my opinion on it; so I cannot see that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has made any point at all in making his particular reference to me.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 26th March, 1964, at 3.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON; Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. LOWE; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. BOVELL; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. LYNCH – 11.

NOES: Mr. HUSBANDS and Mr. SMITH – 2.

8.35 p.m.