

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 7th, 1965

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); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FER-GUSSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Min-ister of Communications and Works) and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings which were held on the 2nd 16th and 23rd November, 1965, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and con-firmed (After a pause). There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of those Meetings to be duly confirmed,

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$50,088 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part I -- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1965-66 No. 33, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Again, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

I also beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

REPLY LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 63/1964 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip is now ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is a Question which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City. (After a pause), I understand that the Question is now in the process of being typed, but it was handed in at the proper time.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, 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.

LETTER FROM AUDITOR GENERAL re EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNTS

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Auditor General dated 1st December, 1965, which reads as follows-

Auditor General's Office, Barbados.

1st December, 1965. Sir,

Section 26 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, 1964, provides that the Auditor General shall report annually as soon as possible and not later than the last day of December following the close of each financial year the results of his examination of the accounts. Such report shall be addressed to the Speaker of the General Assembly and a copy transmitted to the Senate for information.

2. With respect to the financial year 1964-65 I should

like to inform you that it will not be possible to examine the relevant accounts and report thereon by the 31st December, next, the latest date allowable by law, for the following reasons:-

By section 10(2) of the above mentioned Act the Accountant General is required to submit certain statements to the Auditor General within a period of four months after the close of the financial year, i.e. by the 31st July. The statements for 1964-65 were only received on the 25th November, 1965.

By Section 10(3) of the Act Accounting Officers and Collectors of Revenue are required to submit accounts to the Auditor General within a period of three months after the close of the financial year, i.e. by the 30th June. Out of sixty-eight Appropriation Accounts only four were submitted by the

30th June, 1965; five in July, thirteen in August; twelve in October and eight in November, 1965. Reminders were sent on the 19th October, 1965, requesting Accounting Officers who had not submitted accounts to do so without further delay, but twenty-seven accounts are still outstanding as follows:-

Ministry of Communications, Works

and Housing¹²

Ministry of Social Services¹¹

Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour¹

Current Estimates, Part I, Head 47, Subsidies and Grants¹

Capital Estimates, Part II, Head 9, Miscellaneous Projects¹

26

3. It is considered that you should be informed of the

position for the information of the General Assembly.

I am, Sir, Your obedient servant,

C. D. Gittens Auditor General.

His Honour The Speaker General Assembly Public Buildings Bridgetown.

2.55 p.m.

The question to which I made reference, which is in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, is now ready if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown desires now to ask it.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows -

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Will the Minister state the name of the firm, person or persons awarded the contract for building the Hilton Hotel, and the price at which the contract was originally awarded?

2.

3. If such a contract has been so awarded, will the Minister state whether there has been any revision in the terms and conditions of the said contract since the date of the original award, and the details of such revision (if any)?

4.

5. Will the Minister also state, if any such contract has been awarded, whether such contract has been awarded to a firm, person or persons other than a firm, person or persons who tendered for same in accordance with the public advertisement in this behalf?

6.

7. If the answer to (3) is in the affirmative, will the Minister give the reasons why?

8.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time, and I am advised that the Reply to Question No. 63 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip has been laid.

That hon. member is not in his place.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 1 under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider a grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No. 31 Head 5 - Home Affairs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Head 5, --Home Affairs -- of the Capital Estimates, provision was made under Item 10 -- Police Stations --of \$94,000. Supplementary provision of \$29,400 is now required for this reason \$19,323 of this amount is a revote of funds which lapsed at the end of the last financial year, and

the remainder is to replace funds which have been spent on constructing a specially designed foundation due to the soil characteristics of the southern wing. This special foundation was not envisaged or estimated for when the estimates for the construction work were prepared. So altogether the re-vote of \$19,323 and \$10,000 which is a new provision to supplement the original vote make a total of \$29,400.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I notice from the Addendum that the remainder is to replace funds spent on constructing a specially designed foundation. I understand this to mean that this money has already been spent and we are now asked to vote the amount that is needed.

Now Sir, when we are spending public funds and a certain amount is voted to do a particular job, if the money is exhausted and more is required, permission should be sought in some way to spend money from some other Head, or else the Government should come here and ask for money to carry on as we are doing now. In other Departments you are not allowed to spend money like this. If the money becomes exhausted, you have to ask permission to spend from somewhere else, because if the building is finished, the money must have come from somewhere else. If this had been done by a private contractor he would have been asked to submit estimates for finishing the building. I do not feel it is fair that the Government should spend money as they like, and others have to go with hat in hand asking if they can spend money from another Head. There are certain places where jobs are being held up until they can go through the proper channel, but we are told today

that these funds have already been spent and we are now asked to vote this money.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not know where the hon. member got what he says from. Nobody told him that funds has been spent and now you are asking for more. The Addendum says quite clearly this amount is required to complete the work on the extension of the Central Police Station. It goes on to say that a portion is a re-vote of funds which lapsed at the end of the last financial year, and the remainder is to replace funds spent on constructing a specially designed foundation due to the soil characteristics of the southern wing.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, we have it herein front of us. The Addendum says that this amount is required to complete the work on the extension of the Central Police Station. \$19,323 of the amount is a re-vote of funds which lapsed at the end of the last financial year, and the remainder is to replace funds spent on constructing a specially designed foundation.

What is the meaning of that? It is as plain as a,b,c. I do not know what the Hon. Minister would like me to understand. It says \"to replace funds spent.\" If it were not spent, why put it here? The suggestion is that you put it here because you are going to pay it back. The Hon. Minister may know much better than I, He is an Oxford Scholar. I do not know if I went to school I am a little a,b,c, fellow, but, in my little way, I am sure that I am right this time.

I am saying that when you are spending public funds on a job which you have estimated for and you come back and say that you have spent more money, you will have to seek permission from somewhere. You will have to ask the House to vote more money.

I know that whenever money is overspent on a building -and it has happened many times before - the blame is always put on the foundations. I can tell you the names of quite a few buildings which have been constructed, and from the supplementary votes for more money to be spent on them, you would see that the foundations always carry the excuse for more money to be spent on them.

I do not think that you are going to pin down one Department on a matter like this. Take, for instance, the Local Government Councils. The Officers of Local Government who are responsible for buildings could not go and do this, that is to say, they could not go and take up money from elsewhere and spend it on buildings, and then come and ask the Government to let them spend it from somewhere else. For that matter, you would get the letter which you wrote asking about it, pitched back in your face. They cannot do as they like; but now here it is in Government, the Government can do as they like. The Government has taken money from wherever it likes and then ask us to replace the money which has been spent. It is not fair. The Addendum tells you plainly \"to replace funds spent.\" If you did not come today to ask for it, we would not know anything about it at all. Tell us where the money came from? They must have got it from some other Head. I hope the Hon. Minister would be able to tell me something now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, when I was in the Opposition, I never thought it necessary to distort the Government's point of view or indeed the plain facts of the English Language in order to support a cheap debating point against the Government. If you want to criticise the Government, you should do it on a matter of principle and show that you can do it thoroughly. Show that you understand what is put before you and at least that you understand something when you read it.

In this Resolution, a certain amount of money is set down for the construction. The end of the financial year comes and all the money has not been spent; so some funds have lapsed. You have not completed the extension; so you have to ask for a revote of the funds which lapsed. In addition to that, you found in your construction that you had to

spend more on foundations than you estimated for, because of certain soil characteristics in a certain part of the area. Therefore, in asking for your supplementary you included that sum which has lapsed and you also took into account that the total vote is likely to be exhausted or has been exhausted because you had to spend more on foundations and, therefore, you add both sums together, the revote and what is spent more on foundations, and you come and ask the House to supplement it. There is no question of your voting money for one purpose and it is being spent on another purpose. All that happened was that it was not accurately estimated. There is no need for the hon. member to turn and distort plain issues and his trying to make out that the Government is indulging in wrong spending. The Addendum means what it says and I do not think any other hon. member would have the same point of view as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. That is all I want to say. I will only ask the hon. member to let it be something which he can show that there is a real cleavage between one side of the House and the other before he gets up and criticises the Government about it.

Mr. SMITH:

I am not trying to distort anything. I am not voting for the sake of voting. I see in the Addendum that the money is to replace that which was spent. I take it that the Hon. Minister would tell you, Mr. Chairman, or the Committee if the building is finished or not. I do not know. The Addendum only says \"to replace funds spent.\" I take it that if the people are still working on the building, you are spending money and you expect to run out of funds and you are asking for money to supplement that. You found out that you have to spend more on the foundations than you anticipated. So long as you know that, you have a chance to ask for the money. I am saying that it is not fair to be spending money and then to come back to the House and ask us to replace it before you have spent it, that is to say, you spent it on foundations and you expect that you would need more.

I am not opposing the Resolution; I am just acting like a sound business man who is in charge of something that is being erected, and when the foreman or contractor asks him to make out a cheque for work being done, before he makes out and signs the cheque, he asks certain questions about the building. You have to ask a question. You have to ask why the money was overspent before you sign the cheque. You do not vote for anything just because it comes here; you have to say something on it. It does not mean that I am against the Resolution, but it is my right to ask questions.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to join in this debate; but when I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph speak about democratic rights, that remark has caused me to rise to my feet. I agree that it is a man's democratic right to possess a vicious mind and an ignorant mind; but it is a different thing when you try to inflict people with them. Nobody is vexed with anybody asking questions but what must be viewed with seriousness about the matter is the hon. member's innuendoes. 3.15 p.m.

The hon. member does not seem to understand and he continues with his innuendoes which produce charges of impropriety. He believes that this cleverness and method of denigrating the Government will throw into the public mind the broad charge that something shady is being done. The mere fact that he can see what is written in the Resolution in unequivocal terms and language, and what is stated there is enough evidence to him that if there was anything shady, it would not have been written in these terms. The unfortunate thing about it is that in the hon. member's anxiety to accuse the Government of something, he does not pay any attention to the elementary things which any member of Parliament should do, and that is to read. If you do not understand what you read, then you should consult others because it is the worst thing to be a fool who is not made known, and it is another thing to justify what is read when you reread what you have read. The English Language is a difficult language. There are some of us who have spent some time with the English Language and still find it difficult to get through with it. Some of us who do not understand the English Language find it more difficult when it comes to the question of passing legislation.

The Addendum to this Resolution states that this amount is required to complete the work on the extension of the Central Police Station. The particular Head of the Estimates was the Capital Head dealing with Home Affairs and the Item was Item 10 -- Police Station. Only a convulsed idiot as a businessman would start to erect a building, and if he finds that in the foundation there is something on which he had to spend more money, would calculate that and start to calculate again at the foundation. You should not be so stupid as to start re-estimating at the foundation; you would have to give yourself some time in the matter. If the Government had come back to the House at the point of the foundation and said that they had calculated that the foundation would be \$1,000 but now the amount is \$5,000 -- if

they had come back and asked for \$4,000 what fool would he be to come and ask for \$4,000? Be-cause you estimate that the amount would be \$4,000? The hon. member does not understand the intricacies of Government. They could not come back to the House of Assembly before the building reached a stage where they are given the final estimate for the completion of the building. You cannot wait until all the workmen go home and say that all the money has gone; what has happened is that in re-estimating the cost of the building they have found that they have spent more money. It really means that in the whole estimate you have spent more money on the foundation than you anticipated. It does not mean that you took money from somewhere else. You will take this money from a Capital vote. In the Estimates we voted the sum of \$94,000 and as to this Head in respect of which we have voted this money, they could have used some money from another Head. I am not saying that that is so. (ASIDES) I do not want to talk about Local Government because that is the last thing which the hon. member should refer to in making an analogy. Some of the people who are running Local Gov-ernment do not know how to spell Ada backwards or for-wards. In some of the districts in which they are running Local Government, they are making fun. I know that in a Local Government area.... (ASIDES) I have a right to talk about this, but I will wait until the proper time to talk about it.

You get these improprieties in Local Government, and if you do not put a screw on some of these people who run Local Government, I do not know what will happen. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is asking a question, you cannot say anything about the hon. member asking a question; but to say that it is unfair, what is unfair about this Addendum? Is the Government trying to hide something in the Addendum to this Resolution? They have told you that these things were estimated. The foundation of the building carried the blame, but lots of other things carry the blame too. We know that where if comes to construction work a lot of improprieties take place, and they take place with some of our close friends whom we do not want to expose. If everybody was willing to expose his friends, it might be that a lot of these improprieties would never take place where these constructions are concerned. It is not that we share in what they are doing, but they regard it in the light that everything is to be kept quiet in certain circles. 3.25 p.m.

The hon. member should not pretend that there is something wrong in Government asking for this additional amount, and he is going to be this grand watch-dog, because as I have said already, this Government has put up buildings and has spent money not of the same character as the last Government had done; therefore this is nothing new. All the Government is asking for is a re-vote. But what amazes me is that the hon. member believes that he can bring down the Government with this kind of cheap exercise books that he tries to use without any covers, which are like tissue paper when you touch them and your thumb can go through them. It is time that he realises that apart from the time being spent, this house is different from a platform where people cannot answer the nonsense he trots out, and you can see quite easily that it is only an attempt to misread something and try to read into it something else; and when he is spotted, he does not have the dignity

to say he is sorry, but tried to press it through by finding another area of comfort to hide his head, under the guise that he is exercising his democratic right to ask questions. Who would query a person exercising his democratic right? In Parliament we do not have to plead bur democratic rights, because we are elected on a democratic basis; but we do not have to use Parliament as a means of illustrating our democratic ignorance.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1965-66 No. 32

Head 7 - Registration - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution re-requests supplementary provision under three Heads. Under Head 7 - Registration -- there are two items- Item 19 --Travelling, and Item 23 -- Execution Expenses.

With respect to the Supplementary for travelling in the Registration Department, it is explained that the monthly rate of travelling payable to the five Deputy Marshals was increased by \$10 on the 1st April, 1965, effective from the 1st July, 1964, and this amount is to supplement the pro-vision in the current Estimates in order to meet the ar-rears which are due to these five Deputy Marshals and to pay the allowance to the Deputy Marshals at the increased rate.

In the Current Estimates \$300 had been provided for the execution of sentences for capital murder, and there have been some executions already in the current financial year and this vote is exhausted. It is therefore required that another \$300 be put in to meet the cost of any further executions that may take place during the remainder of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 7 -Registration -- stand part. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 1 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, Head 10, Item 24, deals with the Accountant General, and is a supplementary of \$2,812 for office equipment. These items were ordered during the previous financial year and supplementary pro-vision had of course been made in that financial year. They did not arrive during the last financial year, but only in this one; therefore this sum is a revote. Of this amount \$2,687 represents a revote, because \$125 had been already pro-vided in the current Estimates.

I beg to move that Head 10 --Accountant General -stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Hon. Leader of the House will take the remarks I make now to the Minister of Finance. I have criticised previous Governments for the lack of support they give to their own service by not having it equipped properly, and in a way that is not be-fitting a Government or an office in 1965. The offices of the Public Services in Barbados are badly equipped, and I hope the Minister of Communications and Works will call in the Public Auctioneer and sell out all the old rubbish that the

Government possesses as furniture and equipment in these offices, and give the staff something fitting to work with in order that you will get higher efficiency. We are fooling ourselves if we believe we are going to put people in a badly lit office, or on something akin to a kitchen table to work on, or on bad seats and uncomfortable chairs and expect to get maximum efficiency. You are going to get slop-piness, people are going to get tired more quickly, and the

general esprit de corp: will be lost because people take pride in what they see around them.

If you put people in decent surroundings with proper equipment, you are going to get higher efficiency, and I plead with the Government to improve on this situation. I went to the Customs not many days ago, and I saw that the Customs House was the same and looked the same way as when I had to do business there some twenty-one or twenty-two years ago, and I feel that it is not good enough with these rusty desks. I saw an important officer sitting out in the openair, so that whosoever will may approach him. That may be all right in an ordinary office, but it is not all right where the officers have to do certain jobs. They should be removed from the glare of the public.

I hope the Minister will understand that equipping an office is a capital expenditure which you are not going to get every year, because if you give people good mahogany desks, the desks will out-last them unless you have a fire, and I do not see why we should go on with these badly equipped offices and not give people the furniture and equipment and the surroundings that are conducive to high office efficiency and high office spirits where people would work in an office and take pride in it. As soon as an office is outmoded you get rubbish thrown on the floor and things are packed up anywhere, because nobody feels it is any-thing to take pride in. I hope the Minister will feel this is something that should be done, and I should like to see more of the Ministers going through the offices that come under their portfolios and seeing if they are satisfied with the office equipment that prevails in such places, and make a request that a capital expenditure be made in order that these offices be given better equipment. It is all right to have a nice building, but it is not good enough to have these people still working with this mediaeval equipment which in my opinion is some of the equipment which Noah rejected when he was going into the Ark. 3.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I would just like to say that the point raised by the hon. member is very favourable and it will receive full consideration by the Government. It is important, of course, and we try to do it whenever and wherever we can. But while we would like to have all Government Officers and Departments well furnished and well equipped, at the same time, we have to pay attention to the equally necessary problem of holding down expenditure, and particularly expenditure which is not of great priority.

In Government, of course, there is the continual policy of resorting to Board of Surveys for the purpose of discarding equipment and furniture which have become useless and, generally, When the case is important to have replacements, such replacements are made. The Government has become very alarmed over the tremendous demands made in many Departments for furniture and equipment. Some are necessary and it springs from the fact that the work of Government is increasing and more offices are set up and these call for extra furniture.

There is also this question. When the question for furniture and equipment is justified and they are given the green light, in all cases we like to examine these things on their merits. The Hon. member's point is well taken and needs consideration.

So far as schools are concerned, and as far as my Ministry is concerned, It is most involved in the continual and ceaseless provision of furniture. However, we have stopped for some time now in importing furniture. Almost every-thing which we need, such as desks, chairs, cupboards, and presses are produced locally, and this Ministry gives a considerable amount of employment to artisans in all the parishes., This is a practice which all Government Departments should follow. Of course, some furniture -- particu-larly safes and other security furniture - would have to be imported from time to time; but where the actual furniture and equipment can be produced locally, we always see to it that local craftsmanship is called into play, and that should be done in the other Departments.

If we can get this policy of encouraging local craftsmanship to supply our needs wherever and whenever it is possible, we would not only be able to re-equip all the Department well, but cheaply when you compare what it costs to import furniture as against what it costs locally. It would not only be cheaper in comparison in that respect but better in quality as well.

The question that Head 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 26 - CIVIL - AVIATION Head 26 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Head 26, --Civil Aviation - there is Item 37, (New) V.O.R. Equipment for which supplementary provision was made already under Supplementary Estimates for \$1. Provision is now asked for \$11,300.

I think that hon. members would remember that we came to the House in June this year for the supplementary vote of \$1 and we could only at that stage ask for that token provision because we wanted to enter into an agreement with Computing Devices of Canada Limited for the installation of a Visual Omni-directional Range System --that is to say, Meteorological equipment - at Seawell Airport and to make plans for the preparation of the site for the equipment.

The cost of the preparation of the site at Seawell for this equipment is estimated at the sum of \$3,710 and the cost of rental and maintenance of the equipment which falls to be met during the current financial year is estimated to be \$7,581. Therefore, the supplementary provision of \$11,300 arises out of the decision taken by the House when in Committee of Supply earlier this year authorising the Government to enter into an agreement to have that equipment installed by the provision of the token vote of \$1.

I beg to move that Head 26 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution for \$15,462 was passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE LARCENY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER- The next Order of the Day is Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier; Second reading of a Bill to amend the Larceny Act, 1868.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to take charge of this order in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Premier.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the House at its last meeting passed a Bill to amend the Offences against the Person Act, 1868, and by that amendment permission was given to enable a Court to order whipping in certain cases. This Bill, which is a sequel to that, seeks to amend the Larceny Act, 1868, so as to enable Courts to order whipping

in cases where a person enters a dwelling-house in order to commit certain offences under the Offences against the Person Act, 1868. The offences are mainly those for which permission is now sought to enable a Court to order whipping under the Offences against the Person (Amendment) Bill. 3.45 p.m.

The whole purpose of this Bill is to amend the principal Act by inserting immediately after Section 41 the following new Sections to be numbered "41 A" and "41 B" respectively, The new Section 41 A sets out the offences against the Person Act to which this Section shall apply, and the new Section 41B says that whipping may be ordered in addition to the punishment which is awarded under Section 41 A. As I have already said, no new offences are being created and this Amendment is just to bring the law into line as far as the Larceny Act is concerned in order to provide that the Courts can prescribe whipping in case where a person enters a dwelling-house in order to commit an indictable offence under the Act, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that this Bill.....

Mr.. WALCOTT:

Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in connection with this Bill. I think that somebody should speak on this matter because this is one of the issues about which some members of the public are beginning to get a little nervous, and they are wondering if we are retrogressing or progressing, They are wondering like that because the punishment of whipping has been imposed for people who commit certain offences, I think that people in any community should be realistic, and they should not regard civilization as some entity like a cup or a stone; they should rather regard it as a question of human beings evolving towards the stage of living, or that they can say that the stage has been reached where human beings are living as they ought to live, There are people who are ready to jump to the defence of the wrong-doers and who use a lot of abstract theories and arguments in such defence, but they are always a bit hesitant to come out boldly and say what should be done in the defence of the law-abiding citizen who has the right to his savings. You will find that all the excuses are made for the wrong-doers and none is made for the lawful persons. There are some people who think that it is barbaric to re-introduce whipping for persons who commit certain of-fences, but we have to ask ourselves how civilised or bar-baric are we that we should not use methods which are in keeping with the civilization to which we belong, Some people like to sit in an ivory door and speak about civilization; but when we come face to face with the human element, that is something else.

In Barbados we have seen that there is no point in having people living in perpetual fear, because there are one or two persons who create fear and havoc in the minds of people. Fortunately for us, these persons are not many; but it is incumbent upon us in the Legislature to set at rest the minds of the majority of the people who live in the community and to give them the mental security to which they are entitled. If I am deemed to be barbaric, well, I do not deem that I am not barbaric in some respects; but I believe that some people should be completely liquidated from this part of the earth because they are serving no useful purpose or performing no useful task, and the ashes and the gases of their bodies would be more useful to mankind than the breath which they are breathing or the food they are eating is to them. I believe that the biological processes which produce all of us sometimes produce some of us who are lunatics, and I do not see why a lunatic should be allowed to run amuck and frighten people all the day long, In that sense I believe that killing is something divine. You could loose all the animals out of the forest and say that they belong to the same society as we, but nobody would live in a society and tell you that you should have bad lions and dogs and you should loose them, One would not be so stupid as to say that you should loose these animals and set them free.

Mr. Speaker, when we have people who possess more of the animal in them than the human element, we have to introduce methods of dealing with them. The psychiatrists have not yet evolved a means of dealing with these people, and therefore we have to save the community from these villains. I do not go in for this soft pedalling where people sit in some ivory door until something happens to their families, and then they want everything pulled down so that you can go to their rescue. I say that we should treat villains as they should be treated; we have to be as barbaric with some people as they are barbaric in a community such as ours; otherwise we are just leaving the Prison doors open. Selassie believed in prayer, but he was crushed. I do not know that the reading of the Bible could stop a tank from killing people. All the countries which have read the Bible and which are very religious today are not as

prosperous as the countries which have not been so religious. The European countries are those in which the affluent explosion is taking place. I do not believe that you can pray for somebody who is villainous and that will redeem him. 3.55 p.m.

I do not believe that the basis of public worship is use-ful to the man who is on the eve going to be penitent, and therefore you do not know what he does at the end. It is just like the boy who was taking an examination and said that just as he was going to pass, he was stopped. Everybody can give his heart to God the day before he dies, because he has no more days to live and it is a very convenient time; so I do not subscribe to these things. I do not believe that the community should perpetuate softness in people's minds with the mystic idea that people can do as they please and then suddenly one night call on the Almighty to redeem and absolve them of these things, add then everything is right with their souls forever after, no matter what they have done in the past. If you continue to perpetuate that sort of belief, people will carry on under the guise that they can do as they please and then call on the Almighty to absolve them from all these things.

The villains in this community have to be dealt with harshly and leave it to the lawyers and the law courts to vindicate their cause; but when their cause is vindicated and they are found guilty, we feel that the price they pay should be a price in keeping with saving the community from such villainous acts. It is time that we let the community know that if all the priests in the community and all the well meaning; people want to revert to the Middle Ages and go out and preach on the battle fields when the guns are raging, they may do so; but none of us is going to face a man with a gun, and we know that all an innocent woman may pray on her knees to a man in her house who wants to take her pocket book, he will not only take her pocket book, but will take her life. It is all right for some of us to talk on the other side, but I would challenge any man to go home and find his wife, daughter or child mutilated like that and see if he is going to look for the Bible as the first thing, because then I would say he is the new Christ. He is going to look for representation because he feels his family is hurt and it is going to be vindicated. If I went home and found my wife or child being mutilated by anyone, the last thing I was going to look for is the Bible, and the first thing I would look for is a gun

(Cheers).

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any intelligent person would be against this Bill, because it is not that you want to use the "car", but you want to let people know that if they do wrong, they will be whipped, and knowing that whipping is no candy to suck, they would not do wrong. No decent person ever does such a crime as to cause whipping. No honest citizen or decent and respectable person would have to go into one's home at night to commit a felony; it is only those persons whom we would like to have converted and think like other people think and not do wrong things.

This Bill seeks to amend the Larceny Act, and it also says "to enable a Court to order whipping in cases where a person enters a dwelling house in order to commit certain offences under the Offences against the Person Act."

It is a very serious thing for one to go to bed at night in fear hoping that everything will go well until

the next day. You cannot sleep happily when you have these prowlers coming into your home. This Bill also goes on to say that "where any person is convicted of an offence under section 41 A of this Act, the Court before whom he is convicted may, in addition to the punishment awarded under that section, direct that the offender, if a male, be once, twice or

thrice privately whipped" Am I to understand that if a

female does the same thing, she will not be whipped? (Mr. WALCOTT: Can a female come and rape me?) I am talking about committing an offence. Do you mean that the only offence under this is raping? If it is so, I will sit down, because sometimes a man may be sleeping in a dwelling house and if a man is caught going in there you ought not to whip him, if a male is inside there. This Bill seeks to amend the Larceny Act and says that "in cases where a person enters a dwelling-house in order to commit certain offences" - - and rape would only be one of the offences; but the hon. senior member for St. Peter is so much out for Water Hall yard that he would not even allow me to say anything, because I know there are some females who can be as barbarous as some males. I do not know if the hon. member had anything to do with females at all, but the quickest thing some females can do is to use a knife or resort to the drugstore for the other thing. When you say that only males should be flogged, then a female can do as she likes. We are going forward and trying to protect people in their homes. That is the reason for this, and not so much that we want to do whipping. Whenever a person thinks of entering one's home to commit a felony and remembers the treatment that is likely to be meted out if he is caught, this would act as a prevention. If you get a barbarous woman who hates another female for some reason or another, she can say that she is not going to be whipped and can do as she likes.

I do not feel that we should omit females. I know that whoever is responsible for drafting this section does not know some women yet. There are very few men as well as women you have to beware of, but a bad thing is a bad thing whether it is done by a man or a woman. I am appealing to the Minister to delete "if a male" so that it would apply to everybody. 4.05 p.m.

Why should she not be whipped if she commits an offence of this sort? If she committed murder and you can hang her, I do not see any reason why if she did wrong along this line you cannot whip her the same as a man.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member who has just spoken have caused me to rise to my feet. Long, long have gone the days when we think of inflicting such brutal punishments on women. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that you should whip women if they commit offences of this sort; but, as a matter of fact, it is a very rare thing to find women doing such things as breaking and entering into a dwelling-house with intent to commit a felony or committing a felony. That is a different thing from a woman having an altercation with her lover, and going and bullying something from a drug store to get rid of him.

According to this Bill: "Whosoever shall enter any dwelling-house with intent to commit any of the offences specified in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 41, 42, 46, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 or 65 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1868, shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a term of imprisonment not exceeding seven years."

Then in 41 B, it is stated:

"Where any person is convicted of an offence under section 41 A. of this Act, the court before whom he is convicted may, in addition to the punishment awarded under that section, direct that the offender if a male, be once, twice or thrice privately whipped, but subject to the provisions with regards to whipping contained in section 30 of this Act."

Now, Sir, there is one thing which no one has actually seen. There is still a proviso where, after the judge or-

dered a flogging for some one, if the doctor feels that the prisoner cannot stand the flogging after he has been examined, he will order that the person must not be flogged.

I, myself, feel that you should not go back to what was the practice before, but I do know that there are times when you have got to face facts. I do not think the hon. member made reference to this, but certain members of the Cloth think that this is a reprehensible step and that we should not re-institute the "Cat". However, in the light of what is happening today, with these types of offences becoming more prevalent today and more people becoming more brutal, you have to do something about it.

However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the suggestion made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that a woman should be included under this Act. Let the hon. member look back as far as he can remember, and see if he can remember the time when you found a female breaking into a dwelling-house and committing any of these offences. It is very rare that you find a person of the fairer sex before a Court for breaking into a house to commit an offence such as stealing. Certainly, you will not find them going out in gangs of two or three at night for the purpose of breaking into a house and stealing. Therefore, I do not agree that it is necessary to include a female under this Bill.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have to say something on this Bill before us. It seeks to amend the Larceny Act, 1868, so as to enable a Court to order whipping in cases where a person enters a dwelling-house in order to commit certain offences under the Offences against the Person Act, 1868. The offences are mainly those for which permission is now sought to enable a Court to order whipping under the Offences against the Person (Amendment) Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen today that these evil crimes are becoming prevalent in this Island of Barbados, and I think that it is high time for the Government to do whatever it can to stop such crimes because it seems to me that putting a man in prison does not scare him. Therefore, you should resort to whipping, and if whipping does not check him, we know that he cannot be checked. We have learnt from our boyhood days that if you spare the rod, you spoil the child. Therefore, you must use the whip so as to save the child.

Now, Sir, do you think that it is right that we go home tonight and hear our sister, our mother or our children are stabbed to death through someone entering the house to steal and she goes out to protect her belongings? That wrongdoer should receive greater punishment than imprisonment. If whipping according to this Act does not scare him, then I see no other alternative.

In St. Lucia which is an Island just 96 miles away from here, if a man stole one water coconut, they put him in prison and flog him too. You have to see things belonging to people where they are without stealing them. I have been to St. Lucia for fourteen months; so I know of it. 4.15 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been speak-ing about whipping women. Well, Sir, that punishment is not prescribed anywhere in the world, as far as I know. The hon. senior member for the City says that you will not see a woman breaking into anybody\'s home for the purpose of stealing. I say, Sir, that if a woman commits an offence we have other punishments for her than whipping. I do not think that a woman would break into anybody\'s home for the pur-pose of stealing. I do not think she would make up her mind to join with others in doing that. I would not like to see a woman flogged; I cannot agree with that. I am saying that for a man who takes it upon himself to go into anybody\'s home for the purpose of committing an offence, flogging is one of the only means of punishment to impose upon him. Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is any other hon. member who wants to speak in this debate, he may do so now. (After a pause). It does not appear as if any other hon. Member wants to speak in this debate and therefore the Hon. Minister of Education may exercise his right of final reply, Hon. J. C. TUDOR Mr. Speaker, I really did not in-tend to trouble the House again with my own contribution to this debate, because I thought that the views from this side of the House had been adequately expressed in my own short introductory remarks, and also in the speech which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. However, Sir, I rise really to do something which I think has to be done on this occasion; I want to dissociate the members of this House who are members of the Government Party, members of this Party who offer general support to this party, members of this Party outside of this House and the overwhelming majority of the people of Barbados -- I dissociate all of them from the dreadful suggestion which has been offered to this House by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in respect of the flogging of women. I want to say. Sir, that this Party will not even contemplate flogging as a form of punishment for women. In the next place, the flogging of women, is in any case, forbidden by laws of this country, and since we do not intend to create any new of-fences under this Act, it stands to reason that we are not agreeing to any punishment such as would be imposed against the minds of the overwhelming majority of the people of this island. I wish to dissociate the overwhelming majority of the population from what it would appear is expected to be the new policy of the Barbados Labour Party, that is, the introduction of the flogging of women. Com-plaints have been drawn to the attention of this Government that protection should be given to the women of this country against rape and against being held up and robbed of their money and their goods; that is what the Government is dealing with. It is because of this that we have introduced this amendment to the Offences against the Person Act and the Larceny Act which will give protection to women particularly. How fantastic then, having regard to the statistics of crime in this island, it would be for us to suggest that in giving protection, to women they should be whipped! I therefore repeat that I dissociate the overwhelming majority of the people of this country from such a disgraceful suggestion.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this

Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. 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. The principal Act is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 41 thereof the following new sections to be numbered \"41A\" and \"41B\" respectively -

41 A. Whosoever shall enter any dwelling-house with intent to commit any of the offences specified in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 or 65 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1868, shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a term of imprisonment not exceeding seven years.

41 B. Where any person is convicted of an offence under section 41 A of this Act, the court before whom he is convicted may, in addition to the punishment awarded under that section, direct that the offender if a male, be once, twice or thrice privately whipped, but subject to the pro-

visions with regard to whipping contained in section 30 of this Act.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALGOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I think I will take this opportunity now we are dealing with Clause 2 of this Bill, to say that I support the views which have been expressed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for the City, when he spoke on this matter. I did not feel it necessary to talk on the question relating to women. When we were talking about civilisation we believed that we were so civilised that, in respect of these offences, we would not be passing a Bill of this nature relative to women as we would be passing it in relation to men; If you had women going into dwelling houses and committing these offences, we would not be passing a Bill of this nature. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked why should we not give the same punishment to a female as to a male, I humorously remarked that I would be willing for a woman to break in and come at me. I would say, Sir, that I do not understand the hon. member's Water Hall logic. Because you are dealing with a male, the punishment you impose on a male must if so factu turn out to be the same as if it is a female. The degree

of punishment and the particular punishment for a male is not the same as that for a female. According to the hon. member's logic, you would say that if a man does something, if he commits an offence, you would treat him in the same way as if a child does it. 4.25 p.m.

The hon. member's logic makes me believe that he is one of those people who thinks that if Jesus was born in a Manger, therefore he is a cow, because cows are born in mangers. That is where I say you cannot have this Water Hall logic. I do not believe he was trying to be logical, but was trying to find an area. I believe he works his mind over-time to find an area for argument, because we are passing a Bill to protect women, not meri, because Women are not the ones that are taken up on this, but in recent months this Island has been inflicted with this danger against our women folk, and no matter what we say, we be-come more incensed when our daughters, wives and sisters are attacked more so than our brothers or male members, because we feel that our male members can stand up and fight. If a man entered the home of any of my friends and interfered with their wives or daughters, I would feel the same way as if it were at my home.

I believe that this was another wild excursion of the hon. member's illogical way of looking at these things and saying that if you put in a male, you should also include a female; but he is forgetting that we are dealing with punishment, and punishment is a question of degree in every-thing surrounding it, and I must say that the lawyers and jurists many years ago gave a lot of study to the degree of punishment, and it is nothing you can improve on easily. I know the hon. member would have to defend that statement, because with such an army of women in this country, there is no point in getting them incensed with these nonsensical illogical statements that the hon. member makes, because it would do more damage than good to try to explain. The hon. member wants to include women if they do the same thing. If a woman comes and rapes me, are you going to try her the same way as if I rape a woman?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I have always said on the floor of this House that an honest servant has no need to be afraid of his master, and I will always say that. I am one of those men who are not afraid to speak how I feel regard-less of who it offends. There are some people who share the same view as I do, but I dare them to say it, because they want to catch a vote. In this case I am not dealing with an individual; I am dealing with the offender. According to this Bill, anyone who comes into my home and commits an offence will be whipped, but as I have said, you will find very few people doing that. Before the re-introduction of whipping, we had very few of these offences, but it is now

on the upsurge, and in order to keep it down you have re-introduced whipping. We have not re-introduced whipping to see someone whipped, but we have done it to deter these offences. This clause starts off by saying "Where any per-son" and further on it says "if a male". What does "any person" mean? The good Book says "the soul that sinneth, it shall surely die"; so any offender must be punished. Now if a man breaks into a home, he has sinned, and you whip him; but if a woman does the same thing, she has not sinned; so you cannot whip her! I know that you will never tear of a woman breaking into a home to carry away any-thing, and you will hear it about a few men. If you are sure that a woman will never do it, why put "any person"?

The Hon. Introducer with his cheap talk and cheap politics said that the Barbados Labour Party's policy is to whip women. When you listen to him on the radio and then hear this cheap talk, you would not know how to believe it is the same person. He should leave that for somebody else. Why does he not

say that the policy of the D.L.P. is to crucify men when they do not support their children? If you are thinking about justice, you cannot think about foolish-ness and cheapness. Does he think that going anywhere in Barbados and saying that the policy of the Barbados Labour Party is to whip women would save him? No decent, respectable woman would ever find herself in a position where she would be whipped, and knowing women as I do, I know that they would say that any woman who commits such an offence should be whipped, I can say that the policy of the D.L.P. is to hang women, because if one commits murder the law at the moment is that she should be hanged. Which is worse, hanging or whipping? 4.35 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The D.L.P. did not introduce the Bill which says that you have to hang mankind. As a matter of fact, the majority of members of this Government are against capital punishment.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, that is not really a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair has to decide that. Mr. SMITH Pardon me; I have to be very careful, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, I hear some noise coming from the other side of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have not heard anything.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, as I was saying, I would like you to go anywhere through the country and say that that is the policy of the B.L.P. I would like to hear the Hon. Minister on that.

Sir, I am saying that no decent, respectable woman would ever find herself in the position where she would be whipped. If it ever happens that you are called upon to whip the first woman, I would say, whip me for her. That is a challenge which I am throwing out.

I started out by saying that any person who contravened this Act, whether the person was male or female, he or she should be whipped. I have to defend a man because I am a man too. If the Hon. Minister does not want to defend a man, I cannot make him. If he wants to defend women, all well and good. This is a time when I can defend a man. All the burden is thrown on the man. Do you mean to say that I must not get up and say something in support of him? I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Education not to go down there with this little cheap talk. (A VOICE: Where?) You know where.

Sir, when it comes to 41 A, as I was saying, if a wo-man commits murder and she would be liable to the rope, I would get up and say that under this Act you should not shield her from this punishment. Hanging is worse punish-ment than whipping. I never was whipped nor was I hanged; but in my opinion if one committed a murder and was to be hanged and you ask him which punishment would he prefer, whether to be whipped or hanged, I feel the offender would

say that he would prefer to be whipped, because never mind how severe the lashes would be, they would only burn for a time; but hanging means that you would be gone for ever.

I am not so barbarous as you may think if I say that you should include women under this Bill. I said that you should include them, but I did not say to whip them. However, the soul that sinneth must die. If she never commits the offence, she would never get that punishment. If a man never commits such an offence, he will never get that punishment. We would like to see this little Island of ours go on and on. We want to attract tourists and, even now, if we carry on whipping and they know about it, they would say that we are very barbarous and they will not want to come here.

However, Sir, I do not see the reason why we should be making a big fuss about this matter. Wherever you go, you will find one breaking and entering your house. As far as I can see, I do not think whipping is going to stop it. My reason for saying so is because when one is out for committing a bad deed, one does not remember the punishment. When one leaves his home, one does not think of breaking and entering a house to kill somebody; one is breaking and entering for the purpose of getting money. I remember some time ago some one broke into my place and took away the paper money and left the silver.

This Bill says \"break and enter with intent to commit a felony\". It does not mean if you go inside a house without the intention of stealing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading this Honourable House when he says that the Bill provides that you can be whipped if you break and enter a house, not necessarily if you commit a felony. Whipping is ordered for a person who enters a dwelling-house with intent to commit a felony, not necessarily for entering, but entering with intent to commit a felony.

Mr. SMITH:

I said that your intentions may not be to commit a felony, but you entered. The Hon. Minister knows as well as I do that sometimes you enter a house without the intention of committing a felony. I believe the Hon. Minister has done it too. There are occasions when we have found ourselves in the position of going to a certain place not to commit a felony, and we find ourselves entering the premises illegally. If the owner had caught him or myself, we would be charged with entering with intent to commit a felony. The Hon. Minister knows as well as I do that there may be someone of the family in the home who is waiting to let you in, but the owner of the place never expected you; therefore, if the person was myself, I would be charged with entering with the intention of committing a felony. If the police caught up with me inside there, I would be charged with the intention of committing a felony, but I would not call that breaking and entering with the intention of committing a felony, because I was waiting to be let in. The Hon. Minister knows that too, and I am going to warn him now that if he does not stop going where he goes, he is going to be caught.

That is the point I want to make. As I have said, because of this Bill, I am not entering any man's place without his knowledge and consent, because I know now that if ever I found myself in that man's place without his consent, I would have to bear whatever happens. 4.45 p.m.

If the Police comes I can stand by for a flogging. If I know that I will be whipped, I will not go there

because what I am going for cannot pay for the whipping, and no intelligent, decent person would be going there either. None of us either inside or outside of this House will want to see one woman whipped, but you only put it in that way so as to pre-vent the crime from being committed. This new Section 41 B starts off like this :-

"Where any person is convicted of an offence under Section 41 A of this Act"

And it ends up "if a male...." The hon. senior member for St. Peter says that there are a lot more women in this

place than men. If a woman gets up against me, what will happen to me? It is only a certain type of woman who will get up against me; it is not the decent class of woman who will do that. You will get some people who will say: "Smith is not saying anything wrong." If a woman will let down herself and myself as well, of course, she should be whipped. When the Hon. Leader of the House says that it is the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to be whipping women for committing these offences, I will only say that that is sheer wish-wash. I think that the Hon. Minister should be ashamed of mentioning that. Anyhow, Sir, there is a true saying The berry does not drop far from the tree."

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to those of hon. members who have already spoken in defence of flogging women. I compliment the Government in not including in this amendment any flogging for women. I think that the members of the Government, and indeed all of us, know that we were all born from women, and none of us in this Chamber would like to see our mother get flogged regardless of what she may have done. I would not agree to impose any whipping on women.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C.E. TALMA in each case, the Bill WAS read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 14th December, 1965, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before I put that motion, I have the honour to inform hon. members that I have just received on behalf of myself and other hon. members of this Chamber, every good wish for Christmas and the New Year from all ranks of the Barbados Regiment. The question is that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 14th December, 1965, at 2.30 o'clock p.m. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "AYE", hon. members against will please say "No", I think the "NOES" have it.

A division was taken as follows :-

Ayes: Mr. BATSON; Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA; G. G. FERGUSON; A. DaC. EDWARDS, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, CORBIN, COWARD; HOLDER and SMITH - 11

Notes: Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven hon. members voting "AYE", and no hon. member voting "NO", despite what appeared to have been a voice answering "No." 4.55 p.m.

I would remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 37 (7) which reads as follows: -

"When a Member's name is called by the Clerk at a division, the Member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes". A Member shall not answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which he may have expressed when the voices were taken collectively."

However I regard this incident as closed.

The question that this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, 14th December, 1965, at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.57 p.m.

