THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st March, 1964

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker)*; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, *(Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education)*; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing)*; 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. BOXILL; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Social Services)*.

PRAYERS

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform hon. members that the Chaplain is not present. I will ask hon. members to stand for two minutes in silent prayer.

Members stood in silence for two minutes.

MINUTES

I again regret to have to inform the House that the Minutes of the past several meetings are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st January, 1964.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 172 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip is ready, and notice was given to that effect at the last meeting.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the motion been seconded yet?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am objecting to that, Mr. Speaker, because not only is it stupid and superflous, but the Government has no business on the Order Paper for which to move the suspension. It is 3 o'clock and Private Members' Business, and I do not see how the hon. member can move the suspension of the Standing Orders. There is something standing in my name with which I am prepared to deal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be now suspended.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I point out to you, Sir, that leave has to be asked for? And I am opposing leave being granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that these Standing Orders be suspended, and the only way I can determine the general assent is by putting the question.

"Hon. members in favour.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member cannot get up and make that motion. The Standing Orders concerned are to deal with the suspension of the orders of today's business for which there is an Order Paper. The purpose of suspending the Standing Orders is for the Government to proceed with Government Business and delete the time that exists in today's meeting. It is now 3 o'clock and no reason has been given why Government wants to suspend the Standing Orders. In the absence of any reason being given, and there not being any Government Business, I want that clarified; otherwise, what is going to be the next motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has intimated that there is a motion under Private Members' Business with which he is desirous of dealing. May I point out that if the motion for the suspension is carried, it will be entirely within the competence of the Government to acquiesce in having that motion called at any stage that may suit the hon. senior member for St. Peter, if they have no other business for which they want priority? So it would not exclude Private Members' Business whatsoever. There is also an answer which has been given to Oral Question No. 172.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that it is not a question of acquiescence. It is 3 o'clock, and the Standing Orders to remove that time cannot now be made. It is not a question of removing the Standing Orders at 12 o'clock or 12.30 p.m.; it is now 3 o'clock when automatically it is Private Members' Time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 19 - Notice of Motions - Section 10 is as follows:-

"Unless the Standing Orders otherwise direct, notice shall be given of any motion which it is proposed to move with the exception of the following:-

(10) a motion for the suspension of a Standing Order put with leave of the Speaker,"

The motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders had my leave which was under Standing Order No. 62 - Suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this. How can we meet at 2.30 p.m. and you are granting leave to suspend the Standing Orders to suspend what is at present going on, which is Private Members' Business? The Government can give notice of something at the opening of the sitting, as they have done; but I do not see how Your Honour can say you gave leave, because if any one person objects to leave being granted, there is no question of a motion being put.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the House says it wants leave, I am bound to give it, and I am taking the general assent of the House by a vote of the House. That is the only way I can determine its general assent.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I point out that if one hon. member objects to leave being granted, it is not a question of a vote of the House? Leave is not a question for a majority vote of the House. Leave is Your Honour's privilege, and if I object to leave being granted, that is enough for leave not being granted.
3.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: My consent will be given after expression of the general assent of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to you that you have already ruled that if one hon. member objects therefore, you cannot put the question? Are you saying that ruling does not stand now?

Mr. SPEAKER: Far from that. That reference which I cited from "Decisions from the Chair" edited by the Clerk of the House of Commons is applicable in this particular instance. This is a question of the general assent of the House as determined by a vote.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I point out to Your Honour that it is not a question of the general assent of the House. This is now Private Members' Time by the Standing Orders of this House. We are now in Private Members' Time. It is 2.30 o'clock and any private member has a right to proceed with the business under his name. I cannot really understand how Your Honour is going to proceed with the matter when it is not on the Order Paper. Today's Order Paper has nothing under Government Business, and it seems a strange ruling to suspend what is on the Order Paper to proceed with something which is not printed.

I really cannot understand what is the validity of printing an Order Paper and then Your Honour is going to grant leave under Private Members' Business to do something which is not on the Order Paper, and then, when a private member has objected, your saying that you are getting the general assent of the House. It seems to me rather strange.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is that these Standing Orders be now suspended. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those of the contrary opinion, will please say "No".

The question was decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Honourables W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, Messrs. LOWE, YEARWOOD, CARMICHAEL, and BOXILL - 10.

NOES: Messrs. WALCOTT, SMITH and LYNCH - 3.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House informed the Chamber that the answer to Question No. 172, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip has been duly laid. Is the hon. junior member for St. Philip disposed to put that question now? If so, I suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that he move the motion that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. WEEKES: Yes, Sir.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

GRAVE DISSATISFACTION AMONG PEASANT PROPRIETORS

Mr. WEEKES: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that there is grave dissatisfaction amont peasant proprietors in this Island in that they have been unrepresented during the recent negotiations in the payment of the windfall monies paid to cane growers and workers, and as a result thereof may not have received the maximum amount of monies due to them?

2. Will the Minister use his influence and ensure that in any future distribution of monies in any future windfall payments, the small cane farmers obtain fair and adequate representation in respect of any monies that may be due to them?

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

1. No Sir.

2. The distribution of windfall monies in respect of the 1963 sugar crop was the result of direct negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation. The Government sees no reason why small cane farmers cannot themselves form an organisation to negotiate with the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association or any other body for any benefits which they feel might be due to them in the future. Such an Association of Cane Farmers has already been formed in the Scotland District. However, the Government is willing to provide whatever assistance is essential to protect the legitimate interest of small cane farmers.

STATEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER
re ARTICLE IN "TRUTH" NEWSPAPER

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the business of the House is further proceeded with, I intimated to the House at last Thursday's meeting that I would give the undertaking to consider the matter of an alleged Breach of Privilege which was drawn to my attention by the hon. senior and learned member for St. John.

I have the following to say:-

On Thursday last, 26th March, 1964, the Hon. and learned member for St. John drew to my attention an article appearing on the front page of the issue of "Truth" newspaper of Wednesday, 25th March, 1964, (which he tabled) under caption (HOUSE DEBATES "UN-ORBIT" U.K., U.S., & U.S.S.R. MAY LOSE SPACE RACE - BARROW TO KICK MAN TO MOON - INJECTION TALK LEADS TO GRAVE DISORDER" in which the following words appear:-

"Upon this the Speaker's 25 years and what not came under the "attack of the Honourable Premier and the House had to be adjourned "because of disorder. A fifteen minute adjournment was taken."

2. The article, I understand, has been submitted to me to determine whether it constitutes a Breach of Privilege, and what action I deem expedient to be taken in respect of same, 3.10 p.m.

That this article does *prima facie* constitute a breach of privilege of this Honourable House there can be little doubt, in that the report of the Proceedings to which it refers is incomplete and misleading. On the day of the meeting of the Honourable House to which it referred – that of Tuesday, 24th March, 1964, – the sitting of the House was suspended for fifteen minutes, under Standing Order 36 Paragraph 8, not because of any attack made by the Honourable Premier upon the Speaker, but because of the fact that another honourable Member – during a division – was addressing the Chair on his feet instead of remaining seated, and when the Speaker rose to restore order, that hon. member continued to stand and speak, in direct contravention of Standing Order 34 of this House. In misrepresenting the facts as they occurred, the article is offensive and, in my opinion, constitutes a breach of the privileges of this House.

3. The sole remaining question is the determination of what action, if any, may be taken in respect of such breach. Standing Order 68 of the House which deals with Privilege is not very helpful, inasmuch as it merely prescribes procedure to be adopted when a matter of Privilege arises, and calls for a motion to be made with regard thereto. The Legislature (Privileges, Immunities & Powers) Act, 1963 (1963-6), which received His Excellency's assent on 18th February, 1963, and which transfers all such matters and the penalties therefor to a Magistrate's Court upon a prosecution instituted in accordance with the provisions of Section 39(1) of the said Act, has not yet been proclaimed and accordingly is ineffective. Therefore it becomes necessary to extend researches over a wide field to ascertain the true position.

4. The entire question of Privilege and the powers of this Assembly with respect thereto have been fully discussed in this Honourable Chamber on a motion made on the 3rd March, 1955, by Hon. G. H. Adams, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., "That the Editor of the 'Advocate' be summoned to the Bar of this House to show cause why he should not be censured or otherwise dealt with". Several Members of this House were present on that occasion and participated in the division which took place: namely, the Hon. Senior member for St. John, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the hon. junior member for Christ Church (Then Leader of the Opposition) who all voted against the motion: and the Hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. junior member for St. James and the hon. junior member for St. George, who all voted in favour thereof. The remarks of Mr. E. K. Walcott, Q.C., then hon. junior member for St. James, are pertinent and illuminating and are quoted in full:

"Mr. Speaker, I was not here at the beginning of this "Session, so I did not really hear what motion was put; but "I understand it to be a motion of summoning the Editor "of the *Advocate* to the Bar of this House. Well, like the "hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I hesitate to give an "opinion when I have had no chance to refresh my memory "on the things which were dealt with a few years ago; but "to my knowledge we have no power to do that. You will "find that I am right in saying, if you look up law books on "Colonial Legislatures, you will see that the power of summoning to the Bar of the House is *lex et consuetudo parliamenti*, and does not belong to a Colonial Legislature. "It only belongs to Great Britain alone.

" I would naturally like to refresh my memory on that; I "know that nobody has ever been summoned to the Bar of "this House in my time which dates back to 1925. I would "like to look up this matter; if colonial Legislatures want to "add powers such as this, these powers must be included in "their Act, and the only Section which we have is Section "59 of the Representation of the Peoples' Act 1901-1 which "says this:-

" If any person who on any occasion whatsoever may ap"pear before the General Assembly shall misbehave him"self towards the said Assembly or any of the members "thereof, either by uttering any unhandsome language or "otherwise, during the sitting of such Assembly, the "Speaker of the said Assembly shall have and hereby have "full power and authority to commit every such person to "Glendairy Prison....."

" That is the power which we have. We have not got with "us Mr. Caddle who used to act as Librarian of the House, "otherwise he would be able immediately to put his hand on "the case of Allan Croney in which case the House com"plains of some equivalent to libel which was written by "Mr. Croney. I am speaking off the record; but I think "what the House did was to draw the matter to the attention "of the Law Officers of the Crown and the Government, "and asked that they investigate the question as to whether "or not some member or members of the Assembly had "been libelled in some written document; and in that case, "to take the necessary criminal action. I think that the "matter went to the Court of Grand Sessions for Criminal "libel and it was settled, I think, by the necessary apology "made at the necessary time and in the necessary place. "We can pass any motion we like; but we do not want to "pass any motion which would not be effective. There is "no method of summoning the Editor before the Bar of this "House, if I am right; and we will be utter fools if we were "to pass a motion saying that we will summon somebody "before the Bar of the House. I presume the Marshal would "be the person whom you would send; I do not know if we "would send a writ or a letter; and then when the Marshal "got down there at the *Advocate* he would be told to scam"per out, and we would look like fools. Therefore, I say "let us go slowly on this matter; if it can be done, let us "have the discussion after we have looked up the matter "and dealt with it in due course and maintain the dignity of "the House. If we find that something has been done with "which we do not agree, if it has been moved that we go to a "Select Committee with the matter, I think that that would "be the best way to deal with it. If the Committee were ad"vised that they had the right to summon people to the Bar "of the House, instead of our haste and anger doing some"thing which might be wrong, we would be doing things "calmly and deliberately; having given it due consideration, "and having evidence as to whether or not there is any ex"cuse or reason which could be made for any misrepre"sentation which has taken place. I hope that we will do it "in that way, that we will deal with the matter in due "course; that is all I can add at this stage. I do not intend "to enter any dispute; I do not think we should insist on "airing views one way or another which will not do us or the "island any good. I do not think it can do any harm if we "have a Committee appointed to deal with this matter in "due course."

Ridges' Constitutional Law (Eighth Edition), at page 455, states:-

"With regard to the privileges of Parliaments, the *lex et consuetudo parliamenti* have been held to apply exclusively to the Lords and Commons, and not to oversea Parliaments;" and there are many cases, some of which are reported in Volume 36 of the English and Empire Digest (Replacement Volume), which support that view. In other words, Colonial Parliaments have no intrinsic power to apply the usage and customs of the United Kingdom Parliament with regard to the application of Privilege, except such powers are specifically contained in its own Statute law.

As at the present date, there is no law in force, i.e. operative defining the privileges of this Honourable House and, in view of the dicta above expressed, with which I entirely concur, it is my opinion that this House has no power to deal with the article complained of in any other way, al-

though it is within the competence of the House to pass a motion declaring the same to be a Breach of Privilege. 3.20 p.m.

May I just *en passant* and for general information recall that in respect of that Bill, the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities & Powers) Act, 1963, Part VIII provides, in cases which may be brought under that Act if and when it is duly proclaimed, that an offender, if found guilty, is liable to conviction by a magistrate's court to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to both such fine and imprisonment?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour's ruling clearly vindicates the stand taken last Tuesday by the hon. senior member for St. John in respect of an article which appeared in the newspaper under reference, and Your Honour confirms the allegation that the article was offensive and an abuse of the privileges of this House. In view of that, Sir, it seems to me that irrespective of whether or not at this stage the House has the power to impose any penalty upon the publisher for the offending article, the House should still go on record as expressing its strong disapproval of the said publication. I think I am right in saying that a motion for privilege takes precedence over all other motions, and therefore without giving any prior notice, I am going to move at this stage a Resolution indicative of our grave disapproval of the publication of this offensive article in the "Truth" newspaper of 25th March under the caption "HOUSE DEBATE 'UN-ORBIT', U.K., U.S., & U.S.S.R. MAY LOSE SPACE RACE, BARROW TO KICK MAN TO MOON — INJECTION TALK LEADS TO GRAVE DISORDER."

Your Honour has already pointed out the absolute inaccuracy of the offensive statements in the newspaper in a paragraph reading:

"Upon this, the Speaker's twenty-five years and what not came under the attack of the Hon. Premier and the House had to be adjourned because of disorder. A fifteen minute adjournment was taken."

Your Honour has been good enough to refresh hon. members with the precise manner in which the vote for adjournment on account of disorder was taken, and Your Honour also clearly defined the hon. member who offended on that occasion. According to Your Honour's ruling and my own recollection of what took place, the hon. member who offended and who was the principal cause of Your Honour's ruling was not the Hon. Premier, and therefore, Sir, I hope that hon. members will join with me in supporting this Resolution. I think the House would be lacking in its duty if inspite of the allegation by the Hon. and Learned Premier and the decisive ruling by Your Honour, it ignored to take some action against the publication in question. The Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its grave disapproval of the article appearing in the issue of "Truth" newspaper of Wednesday, 25th March, 1964, under the caption "HOUSE DEBATE 'UN-ORBIT' U.K., U.S., & U.S.S.R. MAY LOSE SPACE RACE BARROW TO KICK MAN TO MOON — INJECTION TALK LEADS TO GRAVE DISORDER."

As Your Honour has pointed out at some time, the House of Assembly in Barbados has no legal power in these cases to impose penalties on people who are the perpetrators of offences such as the one under reference, but Your Honour has drawn reference to the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities & Powers) Act which we passed last year, which will, as soon as this Act has been proclaimed, afford appropriate protection to the proceedings in this Chamber. The Act was passed by the House in January, by the Other Place in February, and, as Your Honour recalls, His Excellency the Governor assented to it some time later in February, and it has not yet been proclaimed because I understand that it is proposed to proclaim this simultaneously with another recent piece of legislation which we passed. The penalty, as Your Honour says, will apply to any person who publishes any statement, whether in writing or otherwise, which falsely or scandalously defames either chamber or any committee, or which reflects on the character of the President or the Speaker or the chairman of a committee in the discharge of his duty as such; and also publishes any writing containing a gross, wilful or scandalous misrepresentation of the proceedings of either chamber or of any committee thereof or of the speech of any member in the proceedings of either chamber or any committee thereof. 3.30 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, as soon as this Act is proclaimed, the persons who take it upon themselves to misrepresent the proceedings of this Chamber will do so at their own peril, and this is as it should be.

I may say, Sir, that the Government is even now concerning itself with the possibility of affording further protection not only to members of this House but to members of the public against these wilful misrepresentations and distortions either in the Press or on the platforms. There are special penalties attached to people who make scandalous statements against persons within a specific time during the elections — I think it is from Nomination Day to Election Day; and what is deserving of the utmost consideration is to extend this protection under the Representation of the People Act not only at a specific time of the year, but at all times — in view of the habit which is now becoming popular of most infamously, scandalously and slanderously defaming people on the public platforms, to say nothing of the actions taken by certain members of the Press.

The Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act would provide protection for members in this Chamber when they meet to conduct the public business, and I say that what is under consideration now is the question of affording similar protection for all members of the public.

Your Honour raised an important point in your ruling on this matter in which you recalled the debate in 1955 when it was first imputed that this House had the power to summon to the Bar of the House, and if necessary, to imprison the author of any publication or business who abused the rights and privileges of this House or misrepresented the proceedings. Your Honour will remember the debate on that occasion. I should like with Your Honour's permission to quote a paragraph of my own speech at the time which gave my own conception of what our position was and which indicated the action which I intended to take when the vote in question was called. I said:

"I am strongly entitled to the view expressed by the honourable junior member for St. James; that if the Barbados House of Assembly had any such power, it would have been put in the Representation of the People Act or some such Act. It is well known that both Houses of Parliament (The House of Commons and the House of Lords) have the power to summon people to the Bar, but this House has not that power, and I have been checking on the matter since this debate started. What are the constitutional powers of colonial Legislatures? As the honourable junior member for St. James has said, unless we had made provision for it in a local Act we have not the right to do so. The constitutional powers of colonial Legislatures are laid down in the Colonial Validity Acts; and it specially stated that colonial Legislatures are empowered to make laws in respect of constitutional powers and procedure provided that the laws are based in such a manner and form, and from time to time required by any Act of Parliament. Any law passed by a colonial Legislature with regard to the power of the Legislature must be equivalent to any Act of Parliament. The position is, that any law regulating the laws of our Legislature, would have to be passed by the Legislature itself; and of course, we cannot pass any that would be repugnant to any Act of Parliament."

We have taken the necessary step now to pass a law clearly defining our own rights and privileges in this matter, and regaling ourselves with the legal power to take

certain steps and to place not only in the hands of the House but in a magistrate the right to adjudicate the complaint.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Leader of the House is reading from a copy of the Official Debates of this House for March 1955.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour could not be more correct. I was reading from the Official Report of the House of Assembly Debates for the Session 1954-55, and, if I may say so, I said that I was recalling what I said on that occasion because there was some special reference in Your Honour's speech not only to the law which was recently passed but also to the Parliamentary Acts to which I made reference in 1955 when I referred to the Colonial Validity Act.

I do not think that I should say more on this occasion except to ask hon. members to record their full and unqualified support to this motion because failing to do so, would mean failing to give support not only to Your Honour the Speaker who has in clear and emphatic terms condemned this publication, but also to the statement made by the Hon. Premier.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour will recall.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to second it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of your going to second it; are you seconding it?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to second the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why did you not say so when you rose?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the equivalent to saying that you second the motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to second the motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is absolutely correct. Your Honour will recall that I was not in here on Tuesday when there was some little heat in the Chamber, and therefore, I have relied purely, not on the newspaper report, but on what you enunciated and made clear to us from the Hansard report which you have before you.

It is the duty of the Opposition — and I believe all hon. members of this House, whether a member of the Government or an independent member — that if any statement by any member is misrepresented in the Press, all members should join together in deprecating the attitude adopted by a misrepresentation of a statement of fact, and there are no two ways about it.
3.40 p.m.

There can be no two ways about it. From what you have said, you made it abundantly clear that you did not adjourn this House because of disorder as a result of something which happened by the hon. senior member for St. John. I think that you have made that clear. The newspaper article complained about leads one to believe that you adjourned the House directly as the result of something which happened because of the hon. senior member for St. John in this House. Therefore I am seconding this motion because I feel that if a similar thing happened to one of us over here, we would look forward to hon. members from the Government and the other side supporting us.

Let me make it abundantly clear. I can well remember that when the case arose with the "Advocate" in this House, many of us spoke at the time: and we were all satisfied — even the mover of the motion became satisfied — that we could not bring the Editor of the "Advocate" before the Bar of this House. According to Your Honour' ruling, although His Excellency the Governor has assented to the Bill, it has not been proclaimed and we cannot take such legal steps as may be necessary against the particular newspaper. I do feel, however, that if it comes from you who are the person responsible for adjourning the House — if you make the direct statement to the public that you did not adjourn the House for the reasons given in this newspaper, I feel that the Editor of the newspaper would be less than a man, a man without any honour, not openly to apologise for what he has written, when it comes to the article which appeared in this newspaper on Wednesday, 25th March, 1964. If he had been in here at the time he could not say that he heard it and if it were reported to him, he had a wrong report. I have nothing more to say but that I wholeheartedly support the motion which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

The caption which is carried about "BARROW TO KICK MAN TO MOON" and that sort of thing seems like sensational headlines. That is neither one way or the other. But to misrepresent the fact that a person so misbehaved himself that Your Honour had to adjourn the House because of disorder, is what you have categorically denied and we are bound to support this Resolution as it stands today. It is not a question of bringing the Editor before the Bar of this House, but he should know that as far as this House is concerned, now that Your Honour has made the position quite clear, I hope that the Press will not give any garbled report of the Statement which Your Honour has made today relative to what transpired last Tuesday. To give the facts baldly as they did, the facts as they appeared, they recklessly misrepresented the position and I hope that a proper report will be given to this matter. If the Editor of this newspaper does not see fit to withdraw and apologise against the publication of what is not a statement of fact, although we have no right to bring him before the Bar of this Chamber, we can make a rule that this House has the right to debar the Reporters of this newspaper from coming in here; but for a man who is worth his salt, whether this was reported to him or not, whether he was present or not, whether it is because he wanted to be sensational or not, he is in a very responsible position, and he should withdraw the offending paragraph which is not a statement of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. It is not a Party issue; if an hon. member, be he an Independent, a Government member , and Opposition member of my Party or an Opposition member of the Labour Party, if any of us were to complain that he was misrepresented and Your Honour confirmed it, then it is the duty of every hon. member to support a Resolution of this sort. In the circumstances, I feel that I am bound to support this Resolution and I have much pleasure in supporting it. I do hope that what I have said will not fall on deaf ears, not only from the point of view of this newspaper but also from the point of view of other newspapers. I have seen other newspapers being very offensive and publishing articles which were not facts. Some things apparently, as you are aware, before they went into the actual *Official Gazette* we saw in the Press. That, of course, is a matter for Your Honour to control; but, as I say, Sir, this Newspaper is not the only offending newspaper. However amusing this might be to some people, I think that as long as Your Honour has made it abundantly clear and demonstrated here today in no uncertain terms that this article as has been published here, is very far from the truth and it is not the truth, (A MEMBER: It is the "Truth" but it is not true.) then it the duty of every hon. member to support Your Honour in this matter.
3.50 p.m.

What has been published is very far from the truth although it is in the "Truth", and it is the duty of every member to support Your Honour; it is not merely a question of supporting the hon. senior member for St. John.

Any member can stand up here and say "So-and-so was published about me but I never said so." We cannot always rely on our memory. I was not in here, but now that Your Honour has made this statement so categorically denying what has been published, I am bound to support the motion, and I have much pleasure in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just say this, *apropos* the remark made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about any other paper, that when reference was made to me about this paper on Thursday, reference was also made of another paper. I have subsequently been advised by the First Clerk at the Table that it is not proposed by the hon. senior member for St. John to proceed with the objection which he began to take in respect of that other periodical; hence there is no ruling called for by me in respect of that other paper, "The Advocate".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is extremely interesting to listen to these speeches today, more so that of the last hon. member who spoke. He reminds me of a person who is nowhere around when an accident takes place, but when he arrives he knows more about the accident and talks more about what has happened than a person who was there. I was laughing to myself when he made his speech, and I wonder when we will pass rules about members subjecting the Chair itself to humiliating experiences.

Now I am glad to see that the paper complained about is "The Truth". It is the handmaiden of hon. members who have spoken. It is their own making, and you only have to look in a newspaper of a couple of weeks ago and you will find some of the highest citizens in this community making a public marriage with the same people they are condemning today, and I am going to join in the condemnation too. This, however, is only a convenient statement to make now; this does not go to the core, nor does it say what has happened.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I make no excuse for this newspaper, for the Hon. Premier, for any hon. member myself. I am sorry under these circumstances that you are raising this at this time, because anyone who has been in this Chamber — and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was not here when the House was adjourned on the Tuesday.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member must not say I was here. I said I was not here during the debate, neither on Tuesday nor on Thursday, and the records will show it. I had left the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you heard what I said. I did not say the hon. member was in the House at the time of the debate, but there is enough evidence from a previous debate to prove that the hon. member was here, because when it was said that the hon. junior member for St. George should have been informed, it was stated that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was informed: so I do not want to go into that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must again rise on a point of order to say that I was not in the House, and the records are there. I am not afraid to say that I left to go home for dinner. Why should the hon. member say there is enough evidence to prove that I was here? I was not here when the debate went on.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am neither deaf nor dumb. I never said the hon. member was here when the debate was going on, and that is why I said he was not here but spoke like somebody who was not at the scene of an accident, but knew more about it than some person who was there. I am not accusing the hon. member of being here, because if he were, I would not have said what I did. I said that he was at the House that day and things went on in the House, and I said it was a pity that this has arisen out of of those circumstances. It is a pity the Hon. Premier has brought it, and it is a pity to hear the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition speaking on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, anybody in Barbados would know that I have no leaning towards the "Truth", because I have taken positive action against that newspaper when hon. members were afraid to do so; so you will understand where I stand. I am not one of those hypocrites who is going to say one thing today and something else tomorrow for the sake of convenience, or wait until somebody offends me to say that something is wrong. I am bold enough to say something is wrong even if it is to my biggest enemy. I say, Sir, that this is the handmaiden of some of the members, and I say it is regrettable in these circumstances because I do not think we should try to prolong what has taken place with somebody pretending that it is not accurate or true. The whole circumstances surrounding this thing is something that you should bury. The Hon. Premier asked the hon. member to make an apology, but the first apology should have been made in here to the Speaker, because he was treated by the Premier in the worst possible manner in which I have ever seen a Speaker treated in here for the nineteen years I have been a member of this Chamber, supported by the Hon. Leader of the House. Let us therefore try to bury certain things and not refer to them; it was a bad day, and there is no question about the disgraceful way in which the Speaker was treated, and only a blind hypocrite would now be trying to make any kind of speech. There is no point in resurrecting this kind of discussion and highlighting this thing. There is no question that the Speaker was treated badly on all sides of the House, and if all has been reported, it would have been a very bad thing for the names you can call.

4.00 p.m.

There is no doubt that Mr. Speaker was treated badly based on his own rulings. Therefore, why are we going over these things? I have no axe to grind for the Editor of the Truth or anybody. What happened was this: when the vote was going to be taken, I sat in my seat and began to make a speech and I was shouted over by the Hon. Premier. I replied to the Premier and the Speaker rose.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have just arrived in time to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter defending the indefensible and saying that I shouted at him. I have on no occasion referred to the hon. member's name. The hon. member was making a speech from his Chair and all I said *sotto voce* was to vote "Aye" or "No". If the hon. member is unusually sensitive, it is no business of mine. Every time we are treated to dissertation from him, as if we have no rights at all, as if we have no right to make a simple remark. I have never shouted to the hon. member in all my life. I never referred to him by name. All I said was what you invited the House to do and that was to vote either "Aye" or "No". Let the hon. member be accurate and name one occasion when I shouted at him. He thinks he is something to deal with mankind.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is the example which you get from the Hon. Premier. If I recall this tomorrow, a different story would be given. I was addressing the Chair; but the Hon. Premier can get up and utilise all that time to make an explanation on a point of order, and to say that I am something to deal with mankind. I belong to the kingdom of mankind; therefore, I have a right to deal with the things pertaining to mankind. I was here sitting making a speech. I want the Hon. Premier to understand that all of us have rights. The mistake which the Hon. Premier makes is that he thinks rights are something which is given to some. But all of use have rights. When I was sitting here, nobody knew what I was going to say and I had a right to say to the Speaker how I was going to vote, and the Hon. Premier had no right to be telling me how to vote. It was none of his business what I was prepared to do. I was exercising my rights and that is what I rose to say. I have a right to indicate to the Speaker what was my intention and I regard it as gross impertinence when I was speaking to be interrupted in any sotto voce manner which was so loud that I could hear it over here — and the Speaker could have heard too. I have the right to explain myself. It was then that the Speaker rose. When the whole impasse was taking place, it was a good thing for the Speaker to get a little relief from the situation and it was better for him to get relief from me so that he would not suffer any embarassment from the other side.

Sir, I say that this matter has two sides to it. It has a side which is a good thing that you can bring to the notice of the public or the papers which challenge you, the privileges of this House, and as I have said in here, this particular newspaper in reference is no newspaper at all. It is the handmaiden of a few and a scandal monger. However, it had no right to scandal those who were their cohorts, and now it is starting to work on people in all walks not realising the danger.

I told the hon. junior member for Christ Church that people like him are subscribing to this sort of dirt by giving advertisements to that newspaper: because by doing so, that newspaper can carry on this kind of dirt. If those people did not give advertisements to that newspaper, it would have to close down. Therefore, Sir, you will see that inadvertently they are subscribing to that sort of dirt. With what is taking place, nobody needs to be in any way afraid. The Speaker said that the House was in disorder because I rose to my feet when I was sitting and I was interrupted by the Hon. Premier. I said he had no right to do it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I cannot sit here and allow the hon. member to make such mis-statements of fact. The hon. member knows that it was not a question of my interrupting him on his feet. He was sitting and making his statement and I was entitled to say vote "Aye" or "No". He chose to pick up my statement, and then the hon. member rose to his feet and then the Speaker rose to his feet and told the hon. member that he was on his feet. The hon. member would not sit. The Speaker switched the microphone off which caused the hon. member to raise his voice a little louder and it was at that juncture that the Speaker adjourned the Sitting. I just want to get the facts straight. The hon. member said that it was as a result of the *sotto voce* remark.

Mr. WALCOTT: All of that is true. The difference between us is that I am not afraid to say what I did, but the Hon. Premier is afraid to say that he treated the Speaker badly the whole day.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will have to hear the point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will say that the hon. member is reflecting on the Chair because how somebody addressed the Speaker is of no relevance to this debate at all. When the hon. member said that we treated the Speaker badly the whole day, the Speaker did not protest; therefore, I do not know where he got that from. Let us get down to the relevant matters which we are discussing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me say this now in respect of all that has been said. I expect that hon. members will uphold the traditions and dignity of this Honourable House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, mention was made of what I did and I am not afraid to say it. I am not afraid to recall an accurate description of what took place. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was not in the House and, as I said, I am no defender of the Truth Newspaper. I am not a defender of a person who wrote the article in the *Truth* newspaper, I am a defender of the rights and privileges of the House. However, I am not afraid to say to the Hon. Premier or any other hon. member, if he said anything, what he said.
4.10 p.m.

I am not afraid to say to the Hon. Premier that I sat here and defended the Chairman of Committees against the behaviour which he was getting from this side of the House, and the Hon. Premier said that I am the self-appointed preserver of the rights and privileges of this Chamber. It is good when you can be a self-appointed person for right and not for wrong. If I had made any offending remark to His Honour the Speaker, I would withdraw it; and I would like to say that I have not seen any Speaker treated, in my 19 years in this House, in the way His Honour the Speaker was treated by the Hon. Premier, and I do not ask anybody to agree with me. I am saying that all of this should be buried and not given too much rise of face because it is not good for the community. I was ashamed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I looked back in the gallery, and saw what was going on here for fully fifteen to twenty minutes; I wondered what would happen to this country if a Speaker who is the highest tribunal of the land, could be treated in that manner in public — I wonder what would happen to the other person who is holding a lower position than His Honour the Speaker?

The whole basis of this discussion was that of a previous ruling by the Speaker; that was the background. When the time for the voting came, I sat down in my seat and I wanted to explain something to the Speaker, which I was never allowed to do. I was not opposed to dealing with the motion on the day after, but I wanted to explain why I was not in favour of the method in which it was done. In so far as they were debating this question on Wednesday, Thursday or Friday, that was no concern of mine particularly because I felt that if you told me that you would do it next week, I did not mind. I wanted the Speaker to realise that I was voting differently from other hon. members. I spoke because nobody could ask me why I voted differently from how I spoke. I said since that is the position I will vote in accordance with how I spoke. If the representation of the newspaper did not see that I was on my feet when His Honour the Speaker rose — I must say that I was rather infuriated to find that I was exercising my right to sit and speak and the hon. member was not challenged for interrupting me in the debate because the Standing Orders say that the Chair shall hear an hon. member in silence.

I may say this: His Honour the Speaker was under so much pressure that that was a good way out of it. The Speaker could have adjourned the House before because that is the right of a Speaker: hon. members did not take their seats, but they went on. I cannot read these debates now, but if these things are not expunged from the records of this House there is not going to be any pleasant reading for posterity. That is why I say, no matter how we feel, if the Government feels that way about the Speaker, they should deal with it on a subsequent motion.

The Speaker was put there by the Government and who was challenging the Speaker's ruling? It was the Hon. Premier. I said that it did not sound well and I also said that only a hypocrite of the first-class order would come today to make me believe that he is supporting that behaviour under any guise whatsoever, that it was something good that was said in here.

I would not say that; that will lead to people in lesser positions in this community regarding themselves eligible to treat everybody with disrespect if His Honour the Speaker could be so treated. Everybody can get hot because I do not think that the House of Assembly is any tea meeting room where old gentlemen meet to reminisce over their youthful days; anybody is likely to lose his normal equilibrium in a debate and say something out of the way, but we have to be very careful about this matter. Any community like ours with thousands and thousands of years of tradition will look upon the immediate leadership for guidance; people look upon the immediate leadership for the type of conduct which should be pursued; and when you get a situation where the highest office in Government clashes with the highest office in Parliament in the way in which it took place last Tuesday, then there is not much guidance. There is something lacking and the hon. member's colleague should allow him to know it. They are not helping the Premier when he gets into these fits of passion by patting him on his back and trying to find an excuse for him. They will be doing a good service to the community and to the Hon. Premier himself if they will let him know that these things are not the best. Some people can call what is black white.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is using the occasion of this de-

bate to deliver a deliberate and unwarranted attack on persons, and it is giving currency to the kind of malicious propaganda which is spread by the more irresponsible elements in the community. I have never got into any passion in this House; I said at the last sitting, when I referred to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, that I was speaking in a voice which was almost inaudible. I have never got into any passion. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has delivered indictments all around; he has been delivering them *ex cathedra* and these indictments are deliberate and untruthful.
4.20 p.m.

If this side of the House had attacked His Honour the Speaker, on the other hand, His Honour the Speaker would have drawn it to our attention that we were in some way reflecting on a decision made by the Chair. We certainly did draw certain matters to the Chair's attention on that occasion, but why the hon. member should choose this occasion is something that we are completely at a loss to understand, and it is completely irrelevant to the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order has been made. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is it not fantastic to hear the Hon. Premier asking why I choose this occasion when this occasion is a result of something the Premier is supposed to have said which he did not say, and so the House broke up allegedly in disorder on something he had done? If my name was not called, I would not have risen but I am not making any excuses for myself. If I do something wrong, I am not a person who cannot say I am sorry. The hon. member said he was not in a passion, but that is immaterial to me. All I say is that I am not going into what he said to the hon. member, because I was not here when the remarks were made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if the hon. member had had the privilege of being in here, he would have heard me address the Speaker that this House would never adjourn in disorder because of anything I had to say, and when he talked about passion, I said to the Speaker that if I sounded inaudible, it was because I was getting dead serious. The hon. member was not in his place, and he is standing up making an indictment against the whole Government about passion and criticising the Government, and then any time the facts are drawn to the hon. member's attention, he refuses to listen to anybody else in the House at all.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If he wants my place, he can have it.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member talks about untruths. I have never practised telling untruths, nor do I have to say anything and look around to see who is looking. When he speaks about untruths, I can bring chapter and verse to show where the hon. member has spoken a deliberate untruth on me, but this is not the occasion to bring it; the appropriate occasion will arise. The hon. member made reference to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and I made reference to what was said to the Speaker. If the hon. member feels that nobody in this Chamber has a right to rise after he has spoken to the Speaker, he may feel so; but that is not going to prevent me from doing it. I am not one of those people who is afraid of anyone when he does something wrong. The hon. member said something in here one day, and I told him I did not agree with him; but the Hon. Premier wants somebody to be always saying "Yes, you are right", and when you do not do that, he wants to come down on you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and I are no political comrades, because he walks about the country telling people the worst things about me, but that would not make me walk around the country saying something about him, because he is using his political rights.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have told the hon. member not to bring in any extraneous matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I only drew that as an analogy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but there is no question of supporting or defending something the hon. member is doing based on his attitude towards me, because it is immaterial to me whether the hon. junior member for St. Joseph gets up in the House. If he brings something which in my view is a correct motion, I will support it; but some people have the idea that because a person is your political opponent, anything he brings must be wrong. I can only judge right or wrong for myself; I cannot look to anyone to judge what is right or what is wrong for me to do in a debate. I have passed the age of people doing things for me and I can make that judgment for myself. I make that statement to show that I was opposed to the original notice and also the amended form of the motion made by the hon. junior member for St. George, and I said so publicly and openly. Since I spoke in here, the hon. junior member for St. George has passed me, like Levi, on the other side. So many members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not speak to me that it does not matter, because I work for my living; I do not ask members any favours.

When the hon. member accused me of an untruth, he should be the last member to talk about untruths. I answer a man truthfully on any matter with which I have to deal in this Chamber, because I do not consider there is any matter coming to this Chamber which I have to lie about in a debate. Why should I speak an untruth in a debate when Hansard records are there to show? That is why I say this has arisen out of circumstances that are their own handmaiden. I have not created "The Truth"; I have not been the one aiding and abetting and nursing this newspaper and publisher. Look into the community and see who has been nursing it; but this was bound to come as night follows day. You supported this newspaper; it has been scandalling people up and down this country, but it is only now that it has started on members of the House.

So far as the article complained of is concerned, if you want the records straight, I will say that I rose and I will do it again. If I am speaking, I am not going to be interrupted by anyone — Premier, Leader of the House, or any other member. No Premier has the right when I am speaking to browbeat me into voting "yes" or "no". If the Speaker poses a question, and I am explaining something to the Speaker, he is the only person to tell me if I am going right or wrong. If the Hon. Premier has the idea that the House of Assembly is a rum shop he is running or a proprietor's business where he can tell a man to drink the rum or go outside, put down the glass or you are talking too loud, let him understand that this is not a rum shop. The hon. member also made the stupid remarks about whether I wanted to take his place. When they reach this kind of position that they are so conceited, they begin to take any criticism as a move by somebody to get into their boots. He is now asking if I want to take his place.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me tell the hon. member that I think the reply to what the Hon. Premier has said has been dealt with.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is uncalled for.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And the reply to it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do not think I would make that the substance of my reply? Your Honour can be assured that this Resolution is based on the background of a debate which took place on that matter; so anything I say on the Resolution is based on the debate which took place, and the whole substance of it was that I was the member who rose when the Speaker adjourned the House and I rose in reply to the *sotto voce* remarks made in reply to me. To be quite frank, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not dealing with any malicious statement. In a small community like this, the majority of people do not have much to talk about because they do not feel involved or motivated to speak on world affairs. If you go to a cocktail party, you will find nobody discussing what

happened at Geneva or United Nations; you will hear some lighthearted talk like this: "Have you heard that the Premier is going to kick a man to the moon?" However, you cannot expect when a matter arises in here that I would react like people whom you meet at cocktail parties. What I said was that the time has come when we should try to avoid as much as we possibly can raising these issues and making these intemperate statements that do not sound well in the ears of people, and then when you pick them up, they have an internal reaction which you do not like. All that you have to do is to control yourself and use language which you do not have to be ashamed or afraid of. Therefore, so far as what we say, it does not matter what people say outside. It seems to me, when these statements are picked up outside, that some hon. members get a little bit touchy and you get these reactions.

Sir, I do not like to make reference to it, but sometimes if you look where privilege is granted, you will be amazed to find that reactions to debates which are conducted in here are that sometimes I have to contain the hon. member on my left. You find this reaction taking place, and somebody will be looking for opposition, and then your own rights to express yourself in this Chamber will be jeopardised by this sort of reaction. These things taking place have unfortunate reactions, and if you do not quell them at an early time, it will get to a position where it would become very explosive. Someone remarked to me outside of this Chamber that "You all are soon going to fight inside there." That person feels that passions are rising so high in here that the next thing is that we are going to have a fight. I said to that person that it is not anything unusual because in some Parliaments you get fights taking place. In Parliaments in Latin-America, it is not unusual for parliamentarians to become violent physically. This is an explosion which takes place with the body, but there are some people who only explode with their tongues. Our whole exercise in here is an explosion with the tongue. People can get very warm in a debate and every hon. member has the right to express himself. But I do not think it is right for any hon. member to regard another hon. member as not having the right to express himself.

Sir, I repeat that this matter has arisen because the *Truth* newspaper is a bad newspaper. I do not know to what length this newspaper would go in writing about people and I do not think that in the West Indies there is a newspaper published like this one. It is a scandalmonger. I am not talking about members of the House of Assembly; I am talking about private people living their lives. *(Loud noises from the gallery)* You hear this sort of remark in this Chamber. This is the sort of thing which we are in for and which is encouraged also.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am a different man from many. I do not believe in allowing disorder to take place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I assure the hon. member that no disorder will arise.

Mr. WALCOTT: No stranger has any right raising his voice in any Chamber like this. I have been in the House of Commons and I could not raise my voice above a whisper because if I did so, I would be promptly ejected. You have this idea that hon. members seem to think that they are at the sufferance of the people in the gallery.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me assure the hon. member again that no disorder will arise.

Mr. WALCOTT: None of these drop-outs of society is going to come in this Chamber and make people miserable. Maybe, some of these drop-outs may be better taxpayers than I am. Some people may drink a gill of rum every day, but we know that when they do that, we have to spend a lot of money on them at the General Hospital. This is one of the indications that these issues give rise to all these sort of things, and that is why I am sorry that this debate has taken place; but, on the other hand, I am glad it has happened because this newspaper in my view is one which is fit to be banned. People in private life, people in public departments, people in public institutions are being undermined in a depraved manner week in and week out by this newspaper. You only have to read the columns of it to know. It is a good thing for a newspaper to criticise a department, but it is a different thing when a newspaper is only trying to undermine people in public life. When sometimes you examine the character of the persons who are doing it, you wonder if those people have the face to look upon respectable people and pull them down.

Sir, I am sorry this debate arose in the circumstances which brought it about. I would have been happy if these circumstances were better circumstances so that we would not have any misquoting.

4.40 p.m.

I do not indulge in making any statement, slanderous or otherwise, against any member of this Chamber. If I feel strongly about any matter, I will say what I feel; but no hon. member of this Honourable Chamber could charge me with making any slanderous remarks whether in public or in private. A statement of fact is quite a different thing from a slanderous statement. There are certain things which people feel should not be known; and if things are done and you mention them, that is not slander. If I say that a man is a gambler and he was punished, that is not slander; it is a statement of fact which might not be known, but I avoid that because I do not think it is necessary. However, Sir, I feel that we should be taking cognizance of the facts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can allay anybody's fears as to what is taking place. The argument went on and I rose with the Speaker; and if these circumstances were to take place again, I will do the same thing again.

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I may be forgiven for speaking now, I have been asked by our Chaplain to make an excuse for his absence at the beginning of our proceedings this afternoon, as he was unaware that the meeting of this House would be taking place at that hour. What we did in the Chaplain's absence was to stand for two minutes in silent prayer.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to say anything on this Resolution, but the Hon. Premier called my name and therefore I would have to reply. I am very much surprised to hear this Resolution having been read out and the speech which was made by the Hon. Leader of the House. I am very much surprised about that because the Hon. Premier said that we have a Bill to immune hon. members from these statements and attacks on members, but that Bill has not yet been proclaimed. I would be very glad, if before that Bill is proclaimed, he would bring in one to protect hon. members from the present Premier. Sir, as you know, what happened last Tuesday which is the result.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are two things which I would like to point out. One is that we have to adjourn in a short time, and the next thing is that the matter which is before the House is a Resolution in condemnation of the abuse of the privileges of the House by a misrepresentation of the proceedings in the House to which the Hon. Premier has taken objection. I trust that Your Honour will ask the hon. member to stick to the matter before the House, that is, to debate what is before the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is also something else to which I want to draw Your Honour's attention. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph rose to his feet he said: "I am not going to speak on the Resolution" and therefore I take it that the hon. member has made his speech. When the hon. member serves that notice, I respectfully suggest that he be not allowed to proceed any further.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, somehow the Hon. Premier has different ears from most of us. I never said that I did not want to speak on the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I acknowledge and I sympathise with the hon. member's difficulties, but I have to take English in the normal grammatical sense and the common, ordinary meaning of words. On the last occasion he said that the present Premier is the last Premier and he made a remark about me; when I objected he said he was referring to the present Premier. When the hon. member said that he was not going to speak on the Resolution, I will have to make an excuse for him and I may have to take what he says. If I ask him the difference between the present and the past he will still say that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member confine himself to the terms of the Resolution? We have very little time left now and if he does not confine himself to the Resolution, no other hon. member will be able to get a chance to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that I was not going to speak on the Resolution.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: I said I was not going to speak on the Resolution, but the Hon. Premier called my name, and still the Hon. Leader of the House is going to ask you to ask me to confine myself to the Resolution when he sat there and heard the Premier call my name and mentioned some of what happened last Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us forget what happened last Tuesday.

Mr. SMITH: I cannot forget it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I mean, for the purpose of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Leader of the House can sit there and be ready to spring on other hon. members for the Premier, and he is not man enough to tell the Premier when he is wrong. I will prove that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the Hon. Premier say anything about the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member forget.

Mr. SMITH: I cannot forget.

Mr. SPEAKER: Forgive, then.

Mr. SMITH: I cannot forgive either.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Leader of the House moved the passing of the Resolution, and if he could cut off the head of the Editor of this Newspaper, he would have done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that imputation or suggestion that the Hon. Leader of the House would commit that criminal offence.

Mr. SMITH: I said if he could.

Mr. SPEAKER: He might have the power. If the hon. member would withdraw that aspersion that the Hon. Leader of the House would ever dream of committing a criminal offence.....

Mr. SMITH: I will withdraw it. Whatever you want me to withdraw, I will withdraw. If you ask me to sit down, I will sit down.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I think I will say 'this nice behaviour', and then I do not think I will get any interruptions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am just asking the hon. member to deal strictly with the Resolution. We have only ten more minutes.

Mr. SMITH: If we have ten more minutes and I talk it out, so much the better. I know that nobody can stop me so long as I am not straying. I do not want to encourage anything that is wrong, because at the time when you adjourned the House, the man who was to be kicked had already been kicked; so you did not have to adjourn the House to save kicks or cuffs. We in Parliament and the Leader of the Government must realise that people are looking up to any Leader of the Government or to any Premier of a Government for proper leadership.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: There is nothing at all in the Resolution about the Leader of the Government or of people looking up to the Leader.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to re-read the Resolution so that it will be clear in hon. member's minds what we are now discussing.

Mr. CLERK: The Resolution reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its grave disapproval of the article appearing in the issue of "Truth" newspaper of Wednesday, 25th March, 1964, under the caption "HOUSE DEBATE "UN-ORBIT' U.K., U.S., & U.S.S.R. MAY LOSE SPACE RACE BARROW TO KICK MAN TO MOON – INJECTION TALK LEADS TO GRAVE DISORDER."

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution as given notice of by the Hon. Leader of the House is that the House place on record its grave disapproval of an article appearing in an issue of the "Truth" newspaper. Will hon. members please stick to that Resolution, whether they are speaking in favour of placing on record their disapproval or speaking against placing their disapproval on record?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think this is the same paper which I have in my hands. The Hon. Introducer of the motion read from it and spoke at length. he read as follows:-

"HOUSE DEBATE 'UN-ORBIT' U.K., U.S., & U.S.S.R. MAY LOSE SPACE RACE BARROW TO KICK MAN TO MOON – INJECTION TALKS LEADS TO GRAVE DISORDER."

The Hon. Introducer mentioned this paper which has in the first paragraph "The Barbados House of Assembly had an exhibition yesterday." I know that you could have adjourned the House for disorder long before you did, and I had to put my kerchief over my mouth to make a rebound from the cuff.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is being entirely wicked and malicious. He has said on more than one occasion that he has received kicks and he had to rebound from a cuff. The hon. member is at least 30 feet from where I am, fortunately for him, but I never threatened to kick or cuff the hon. member in here. I told him I would do it outside. No less a person that Dr. Dixon on one occasion 30 or 40 years ago had to bring Mr. Yearwood to his senses the same way, and as a matter of fact, Dr. Dixon did put his threats into execution. If the hon. member is afraid of that, he can have recourse to the Law Courts, but he is not entitled to stand up there and say he had to rebound from cuffs and he had received kicks from me or anyone else or the House could have adjourned in disorder, because it is a reflection on Your Honour's decision as Speaker. Your Honour will remember that when I spoke I said that I regretted that I was almost inaudible but that this House was not going to adjourn as a result of disorder, and that is why I was speaking very quietly. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that he had to cover his face with a handkerchief to rebound from any cuff. There was no cuff in his direction or kicks, unfortunately for him.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, did I say I got my kicks? I wonder if the hon. member thinks that if he gave me a kick he would get off so easily.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am now going to speak because I am serious. I cannot have the proceedings of this House turned into buffoonery even if we may have some buffoons present. The hon. member told some deliberate falsehoods in here today — he had to cover his mouth to rebound from a cuff. I think the hon. member should withdraw that statement as being completely untrue and misleading.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not say I received some kicks. You were listening to me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph ever received any kicks or cuffs in this House?
5.00 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: That could not happen; that would be impossible. As I have said already, the Premier is always getting up and using insulting remarks and he must respect hon. members; if not I will have to bring in a Bill to protect myself. Every time the Hon. Premier gets up, he cannot say anything unless he insults hon. members. At no time can he get up and say something as he should. I will not say that he does not know what to say.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member cannot understand the Queen's English, it is no fault of mine. It is the fault of the people who had to send him to school. If he does not know what an insult is, I am sorry for him.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, at no time have I used any unparliamentary remark to him. I have never referred to him or his family insultingly. I have never got on a platform and insulted his family.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that we do not want the proceedings of this House relegated to buffoonery. He thinks it is something of a baboon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: You must not allow hon. members to get up on a point of order like that. When you get up on a point of order, it should be a case where an hon. member misquoted another. When you make a statement, that is not a point of order and the Hon. Premier knows that. He is going to be like that all the time because he is the Premier of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, this is getting tiresome. I am the hon. senior member for St. John, just as he is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I am a member of this House and I am entitled to the same courtesies as any other hon. member. They seem to think that courtesy is something to be extended to people other than members of the Government.

Mr. SMITH: Is that a point of order?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: When I say, on a point of order, I do not want the hon. member getting up and issuing a dissertation as to whether it is a point of order or not.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, as soon as I get up, the Hon. Premier will be getting up again.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will soon all be up.

Mr. SMITH: Let the hon. member be quiet when I get up. If he does not like to hear when I am speaking, he can absent himself. The Hon. Premier cannot stop me from talking because I am elected to this Chamber as he is. I am elected by the people and he is also elected by the people. The people voted for him and they can stop voting for him also. The Hon. Premier must realise that we are all here for a time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That time is getting very short now.

Mr. SMITH: As far as defeat is concerned, I never tasted it yet, but the Hon. Premier knows it. It will come as a surprise to me because I have never tasted it. I never drank it yet; so I do not know if it is bitter or sweet.

Sir, I am getting on now with the Resolution and with the motion which the Hon. Leader of the House has just moved and has asked us to support. I will have to disapprove of it because it is the 'truth' from the Truth newspaper. It was at that particular time that the newspaper said that the House had to adjourn. I said that it should have been adjourned long ago and I am sorry that it happened at that particular time. I do not think, as far as I can remember, that I saw the editor in here; I doubt if the Editor of the Truth was in here at the time. He might have got the news from someone or from his reporter. However, as the hon. senior member for the City has said, the Editor should have made an apology.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What I did say was that having heard what the hon. member has now said, if he was a man, he should be honest enough to apologise. You cannot make him apologise; but if he has any decency, hearing what you have said — and that is that he was wrong in his information, his article is not true — he should apologise.

Mr. SMITH: If you are big enough to make a mistake, you should be big enough to apologise. I am one of those people, if I see him, to tell him that he was really wrong.

The behaviour of the Hon. Premier last Tuesday merited it too. I do not feel pleased over how the Hon. Leader of the House got on with you, but you always find it like that. There are a lot of people who live in glass houses, but who believe in throwing stones, and that will happen all through the ages. That newspaper publishes things which I do not know if the Editor himself writes them. In this case, the Hon. Leader of the House is right; and when you are right, you are right, but when you are wrong, you are wrong. I will not be so foolish as to say that the Editor was right. I was in the House at the time. Supporters of the Government or no supporters of the Government, I am sure they did not feel good at what took place, Sir, you will be surprised. I am not so good at quoting from the Bible but I read it. There was a prophet who would not chastise his son and it caused his death. That is what is going to happen to members on the other side. They would not chastise the Big Shot. You must chastise a child when it is wrong so that you will get it going right. We are big men today; we are not children; therefore, one knows when one is doing wrong and we should not condone or encourage one when one is going wrong. So long as you keep your mouth shut, I will work with you all the time, I will keep going wrong. If you keep on smiling while I am going wrong, one day I will go too far. You must show me that you are vexed sometimes and in this case, we should at all times try to set a good example so that other unfortunate people may not slip into the trap.
5.10 p.m.

We are responsible citizens: we are the representatives of the people, and it is a fact that the people look up to us. There are some people who will want even to bring their private affairs to you as one of their representatives because they want your guidance; there are things which they will ask you rather than ask their neighbours. They have that confidence in you and they are not ashamed to put their inside business before you. We must make them realise that we are worth while and we should not display what I would describe as stupid actions on the floor of the Honourable Chamber. That has not been happening before. We must always look forward and turn over a new leaf. We can pull our brakes up, have them re-lined and pull off again.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the time is getting up and I do not want it to be said that I did not want this Resolution to be passed. My colleague, the hon. junior member for St. George, is here now, however, and I do not know what he will say. If I did not want this Resolution to be passed, I

could talk it out. We want hon. members on the other side to realise that we must not use our authority and power in the wrong direction; we must use it in the right direction.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for ten minutes. I should like to admonish hon. members to be in their places before 5.30 p.m. o'clock.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended for ten minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On the House assembling,

HOUSE SUMMONED TO THE OTHER PLACE

At 5.25 p.m. of the clock, the Acting Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber and informed Mr. SPEAKER that His Excellency the Governor was ready to receive the Members of the Assembly in the Council Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER and other Honourable members in procession according to seniority preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace, proceeded to the Council Chamber, where His Excellency the Governor delivered an Address and presented Mr. SPEAKER with a copy thereof.

5.30 p.m.

PROROGATION OF THE ASSEMBLY

At the close of His Excellency's Address, Mr. SPEAKER and other honourable members preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace Cradlewise returned to the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: (Sitting in the Clerk's Chair): Gentlemen, pray be seated.

On the last occasion when it was His Excellency's pleasure to meet the members of this House in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver the following Address on the Prorogation of the Legislature:-

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

The Houses of the Legislature have been in Session since the 19th of December, 1961, and it is now appropriate that there should be a break in the Session.

In accordance with customary practice I do not propose to review the developments that have taken place during the past Session but it is fitting to state the main reason for the prorogation of the Legislature at this stage.

In my Messages Nos. 9/1963 and 2/1964 to His Honour the President of the Legislative Council and His Honour the Speaker of the House of Assembly, intimation was given of certain amendments to the constitutional provisions of Barbados which my Government, with the concurrence of Her Majesty's Government, proposed to introduce as soon as possible.

These constitutional changes have proved acceptable to all the main political parties in the Island and on 26th March Her Majesty the Queen made an Order in Council consolidating all the new and existing provisions of the Leters Patent. This Order in Council will be laid before the United Kingdom Parliament on 3rd April.

When, therefore, the next Session of the Legislature opens the Upper Chamber will be reconstituted as a Senate. This afternoon the Legislative Council, as a wholly nominated branch of the Legislature, held its last meeting and my Government now wishes to pay public tribute to the Generations of citizens of this country who have over the past three hundred years given such devoted and outstanding public service as members of this Honourable Board.

I thank you for the careful attention you have given to the various matters that have been submitted to you for your consideration during the past Session.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

I thank you for the supplies which you have voted from time to time to meet the needs of the public services.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legistive Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

By virtue and in exercise of the powers in me vested by the Letters Patent 1914 to 1961, I now prorogue the Legislature and I order that it stand prorogued until the 5th day of May, 1964.

5.55 p.m.