

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 — 71

Thursday, 15th December, 1966

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., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH J.P.; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform hon. members that there are no Minutes yet available for confirmation.

I have the honour to inform hon. members that I have received for myself and other hon. members a Greetings Card of best wishes for Christmas and the New Year, from the Commanding Officer, Officers and other Ranks of the Barbados Regiment.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$40,458 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67 Part I -- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67 No. 40 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of certain parcels of land situate at My Lord's Hill in the parish of St. Michael for the purpose of protecting the water resources of the Island.

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

I should also like to say that I shall be asking leave of the House later in today's Sitting to give notice of other Bills and Resolutions at the appropriate time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to amend the designation "Visual and Dental Treatment" of item 92 Head 38 -- Ministry of Health and Community Development of the approved Estimates 1966-67 to "Special Services" and to amend the note thereto.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Public Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

A Bill to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

A Bill to amend the Industrial Development (Export Industries) Act, 1963.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to repeal the Victoria Emigration Society Act, 1897.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950.

QUESTIONS

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware of the dilapidated condition of the West St. Joseph Secondary School especially of its driveway?

If the answer is in the affirmative, when does the Minister propose to begin repairs and reconditioning?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that in the parish of Saint Peter there is an obvious lack of recreational and social facilities and rural amenities: to wit -- no community centres, playingfields and playgrounds for young children?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government see to it that such provision be made available at such central areas with priority being given in respect of the more highly populated centres?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the difficulties encountered by residents in and near Speightstown when seeking homes to rent?

2. Will Government see to it that a Housing Scheme is provided for such persons in or near Speightstown in the parish of Saint Peter?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware of the deplorable state of affairs existing in the Indian Ground area at St. Peter, and of the inconvenience and distress occasioned inhabitants there through the lack of a proper water supply to the area?

2. Is Government aware of the fact that approximately 300 pupils attending the Indian Ground Primary School for Girls suffer much hardship and are exposed to dangers to health occasioned through an insufficient daily supply of pipe-borne water to meet the hygienic and lavatory requirements of the said School?

3. Does Government agree that water is one of the prime essentials of community life?

4. Will Government investigate the above and seek to remedy the deplorable situation without delay?

Mr. SPEAKER: The next set of questions stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who instantly does not seem to be in his place. Has the hon. junior member for St. Peter got the authority, expressed or implied, to put this series of questions on behalf of his colleague?

Mr. HINDS: No, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House for the Hon. Minister of Communications to give notice of some matters which were not available at the time when Government Notices were being given.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave for the Hon. Minister of Communications to give notice of certain matters, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted for that now to be done.

There being no objection, leave is granted. Let the hon. member proceed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

1. "RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the air mail postage on parcels to the destinations set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be at the rates set out immediately opposite such destinations in column 2 thereof, and that the Schedule to Resolution No. 72/1960 be amended by the insertion of the said destination and rates and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

2. RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the Schedule to Resolution No. 35/1965 be amended in the manner set out in the Schedule hereto, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

3. "RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967 the postage on any postage packet set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto when transmitted from this Island to a place abroad otherwise than by air mail shall be at the rate set out immediately opposite such packet in column 2 thereof, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

2.55 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice of a Resolution that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the postage of parcels to the destinations set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be at the rates set out immediately opposite such destinations according to poundage in columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 thereof, and that the Schedule to Resolution No. 56/1965 be varied accordingly, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

Sir, with your permission and with the indulgence of the House, I am asking leave to deal with these Resolutions in all their stages at today's session of the House. Copies of these Resolutions will, of course, be circulated.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO CONSIDER AND REVISE SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Committee which was appointed last Tuesday to consider and revise the salaries and conditions of service of the Officers and Members of the House has met and its Report will be presented by me to be laid on the Table of this House. Later in the day I expect that Report to be available. I apologise for the delay.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Public Employees Pensions Act, 1916.

A Bill to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

A Bill to amend the Industrial Development (Export Industries) Act, 1963.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to repeal the Victoria Emigration Society Act, 1897, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, a Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders, 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. LYNCH entered the House and took his seat.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister:- To move the Second Reading of a Bill to make provision in respect of the jurisdiction, powers and authority of the Supreme Court of Judicature established by the Constitution and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, when hon. members have all received their copies of the Barbados Independence Order, 1966, which contains the Constitution of Barbados as it now is, they will see that Chapter 7 of the Constitution sets out the provisions for the Judicature, 3.05 p.m.

Part one deals with the rules of the Supreme Court and Part two Appeals. The purpose of this Bill which is now before us is that provision should be made for the jurisdiction, powers and authority of the Supreme Court of Judicature established by the Constitution and for related matters.

We do not regard this Bill as being controversial because it is mainly concerned with the objects and reasons whereby we are making provision in respect of these matters. Hon. members would recall after the dissolution of the Federal Supreme Court, provision was made for a Caribbean Supreme Court of Appeal coming into existence, and since then both Barbados and the other territories in the area have made use of this Court. From time to time various Acts were made to prolong the life of the Caribbean Court of Appeal, and by the last Act this Court would cease to exist at the end of this year unless another Act was provided to extend it.

At the Barbados Constitutional Conference which was held in London this year, it was thought at one time that by the provisions as were then set out in the Draft Constitution, this Supreme Court be brought into being by proclamation; but since the British Caribbean Court of Appeal was to be abolished at the end of this year and since Barbados was entering into Independence before the end of the year, it was finally decided that it would be better for Barbados to establish its own Supreme Court of Appeal -- the period of one month, from November 30 to the end of this year, would not make any difference.

It now becomes necessary that this Bill be introduced to establish Courts of proper administration and justice in accordance with the Independent Constitution of Barbados. Hon. members will have every opportunity when we go into Committee of dealing with this Bill clause by clause. However, they can be assured that all the rights of appeal are preserved and this Bill does not interfere with appeals which are pending before the Courts.

Under the provisions of this Bill, Clause 4 seeks to establish a division of the High Court styled the Divisional Court for the purpose of hearing appeals from decisions of magistrates. The decision of the Divisional Court on any such appeal would be final, but clause 4 (4) would enable appeals to be referred to the Court of Appeal for decision in certain circumstances.

As a result of this Bill, it will be only necessary to appoint one Puisne Judge, and we think this will be a saving to the country; but it is the intention of the Government, if there is an increase in the number of litigations and it is found necessary, to make subsequent provision for another Puisne Judge. I would like hon. members to know that we shall introduce the necessary amendments to the Laws of the Supreme Court so as to have that law brought up to date.

Clause 3 provides for the jurisdiction, powers and authority of the High Court. Provision is made for the High Court to have all jurisdiction vested in the Supreme Court immediately before 30th November, 1966.

Attention is also drawn to section 5 which provides for the Court of Appeal to have (a) such jurisdiction, powers and authority in relation to appeals from the High Court as were vested in the British Caribbean Court of Appeal immediately before 30th November, 1966 in relation to appeals from the Supreme Court and (b) the jurisdiction, and powers and authority vested in the Full Court of the Supreme Court immediately before 30th November, 1966 other than jurisdiction, powers and authority in relation to appeals from decisions of magistrates.

Clauses 6 and 7 provides for the application to the new judicial structure of the laws which applied immediately before 30th November, 1966, to the structure then existing and for them to be construed with the necessary modifications.

Clause 8 provides for the repeal of certain sections of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956-58 relating to the Full Court, and clause 9 for the Act to be deemed to have come into operation on 30th November, 1966.

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

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

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill arises as a result of the fact that the British Caribbean Court of Appeal is shortly to go out of existence, and the territories in the Leeward and Windward Islands and Barbados are making provision to have a Court of Appeal for themselves.

I want to say at the outset that in the Constitution which we had the opportunity of seeing, the provisions made in respect of this matter are likely to differ slightly from what was agreed to at the Conference. As regards the provision for the setting up of a Court of Appeal, as far as I can remember, it was not the intention of all sides at the Conference that Barbados would have a separate Court of Appeal. It was felt that we should follow the practice as was done of having a Caribbean Court of Appeal sharing place with the other territories. What has happened is that we have made provision for our own Court of Appeal to come into operation immediately by proclamation. This can be suspended so as to allow sharing of appeals to take place. 3.15 p.m.

We view this Bill as a temporary expedient, because it is the view of our Party that a Court of Appeal constituted in the manner as envisaged by these provisions today is not the ideal set up at all for Barbados. I want to draw the attention of members of this House in particular to the position as I understand it. It is not the intention to have the Court of Appeal staffed by Judges who did not do the original work. The position will, therefore, be that in the Court of Appeal one will have the situation whereby Judges will be called upon to sit and pronounce upon the judgments of each other. It will be that today I am sitting on top of you, and tomorrow you are sitting on top of me. That will be the position in every case that will arise.

Now in a small community like ours, in my opinion the impression that the public will get from that is not going to be as good an impression as they would get if we had a Court of Appeal where they knew that in an appeal they

would be dealing with Judges whose permanent job was purely to sit on appeal cases. I know the argument is going to be put forward that this would be unduly expensive, that this would cost a great deal of money, but there are two answers to that. The first answer, in my opinion, is that when one is dealing with the question of justice, the question of money should not be the predominant factor; and the second point is that in view of the importance of this matter, that should move the Government faster towards trying to make an arrangement with the other territories in the Commonwealth whereby we can share a Court of Appeal which would be staffed by full-time Appeal Court Judges whereby we can have a Court which would be satisfactory to all concerned.

Lest it be said that they are unduly restricted in their sphere of operations in, say, the Leeward and Windward Islands, under Chapter 86(1) of this Constitution this sharing arrangement could operate with people not only in the Windward and Leeward Islands, but in any territory in the whole of the Commonwealth, particularly the Caribbean Commonwealth.

Now, Sir, when the Hon. Minister said that at the present moment it was the intention only to create one additional Puisne Judge, I wonder if he would tell us whether the intention is to give that Puisne Judge the same status as the other Puisne Judges or whether the establishment would be changed, and whether he would not be a Puisne Judge who would get additional remuneration, and who primarily would be involved in doing appeal work. The proposal which the Barbados Labour Party put forward at the London Conference was that there should at least be one Justice of Appeal in addition to the Chief Justice, so that one would get at least two Judges where there would be a distinction between them and the Puisne Judges on all original work. I wonder if the Hon. Minister would be able to tell us whether it is the intention to interfere with the Civil Establishment Order dealing with Judges and elevate one of the Judges to this position.

Now I am not in agreement also with the statement made that this Bill does not take away any rights of appeal that were in existence before, because if one looks at Clause 4 of the Bill which establishes a Divisional Court, the object of this Divisional Court is to take the place of the previous Full Court which was established under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act in Barbados where appeals from Magistrates went to the Full Court which was presided over by two or three Judges. Under this Bill that decision is final unless it comes within Clause 4 (4) namely, that the two Judges differ in opinion, or one of the Judges is of the opinion that the question involved in the appeal is one which by reason of its importance should be referred to the Court of Appeal for decision. The point I want to make is that you have restricted the right of a person to appeal from the Full Court to the Caribbean Court of Appeal; you have restricted in this Bill a person's right to go from the Divisional Court — which takes the place of the old Full Court — to our Court of Appeal — which takes the place of the old Caribbean Court of Appeal, because you have introduced now a condition to this Bill on a point of law. It may be -- and my understanding of the position is -- that in 99 percent of these cases the matter would be referred to the Court of Appeal. The only distinction between the Court of Appeal and the Divisional Court would be that another Judge comes and sits, and where you have three Judges sitting it is automatically a Court of Appeal. So this is in my opinion a restriction of the rights which hitherto the citizen had.

All in all, the view of our Party is that we recognise that since the Caribbean Court of Appeal is going out of existence in December, this Bill is necessary at the present moment to provide for the transitional stage, but we do not regard that this is a perfect and ideal Court of Appeal for Barbados, and our view is that this is only a temporary measure pending negotiations with other territories so that we can have a Court of Appeal which is composed of Judges whose prime work is to do appeal work, and whom the public will feel are Judges who would not believe in scratching one another's backs.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now ...

Mr. J. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I really had the impression that the hon. Learned member for St. Philip was at the point of rising, and I did not at this stage want to interrupt him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a question of which hon. member should rise last?

Mr. ADAMS: It is not important on this side. This Bill is clearly a Bill which has been produced in a hurry where perhaps no real need for hurry was there. In the first place, after it is passed, the entire course of appeal will still be shrouded in mystery. At the present time, as the Hon. Learned senior member for Christ Church set out, we have a Caribbean Full Court and a Magisterial Court. There are many practitioners, I think I can safely say, who, if they wanted to prepare an appeal to go from one Court to another, would perhaps have to spend as much time looking up aspects of the law as I would have to spend in a month in ordinary practice, because as things at present are, the only Rules providing for appeals from the Court of Appeal of Barbados to the British Caribbean Court are Rules which were passed by the Federal Court of the West Indies, the Federal Supreme Court. It is not outside the experience of some hon. members of this House that the only persons who in fact knew the Rules of the Court of Appeal were the President of the British Caribbean Court of Appeal, 3.25 p.m.

Counsel and the Registry of the territory from which the Appeal came, other people being unable to obtain the precise rules under which the appeal was filed. We were therefore hoping that any Bill to provide for an appeal, or on the occasion of any presentation of a Bill like this, we would have heard something about revising the Appeal Rules and bringing them up to date, consolidating the procedure as a whole and making it clear both to the public and legal practitioners how they could go about effecting appeals in different directions. When I first read this Bill, I observed the provisions dealing with the transfer of the powers of the British Caribbean Court of Appeal to the new Court of Appeal only in respect of appeals coming to the Court of Appeal. In respect of appeals going past the Court of Appeal, this Bill is totally silent.

In order to discover whether it is still possible to appeal to the Privy Council from the Caribbean Court of Appeal without using the Rules of the Privy Council we have to refer to the provisions in the Independence Order, and not the Constitution itself. That is one of the matters on which hon. members should be satisfied before they are called upon to make this Bill law. The Hon. Leader of the House referred to the transitional provisions which will be brought into force by an Order submitted to the Governor-General. I take that to be under section 10 of the Independence Order, but how can we approach this Bill without knowing what the terms of the Order will be or what the exact transitional provisions will be? What happens with those cases which have already been heard by the present Full Court, those cases which have been argued by Counsel, and litigants may have been waiting on for a year, to get a decision from the Court? We have to presume that all the work which has already gone into these cases would collapse in the absence of these provisions not having been placed before the House and to which cases only an allusion has been made.

The Hon. Leader of the House has said that no right of appeal has been infringed, but the present situation with regard to appeals from Magistrates' Courts going up is this. For an appeal to get past the Full Court, there are the statutory conditions depending on the nature of the case. If cases have started with the Magistrate, they may go to the Privy Council; but this Bill in so far as any bridging of the right of appeal is concerned, makes the right fundamentally dependent on the discretion of the Court of Appeal itself. This is something which we do not have to contend with in the present state of appeal laws in Barbados. This Bill

shows itself to be highly restrictive of the rights of appeal. Magisterial cases are not treated with the same importance as cases from a Judge, but since the possibility of error in the Magistrates' Court is considered to be greater, the need for further appeal should be considered greater than an appeal from a Judge. With regard to hire purchase matters, magisterial jurisdiction is \$3,500 and I think hon. members can envisage themselves in a position where they might have agreed to purchase an expensive motor car and they would be distressed at the fact that they have no further appeal as of right in the event of a dispute. The Privy Council's jurisdiction is only £300 and you may be able to appeal to that Court; but you cannot get that in Barbados unless one of the Judges sees fit to agree to it.

In plantation matters, there is one plantation in the constituency of the Prime Minister which is held in tenancy. If you can conceive of that tenancy coming to an end without agreement for payment for compensation, a Magistrate would have to consider and arbitrate on 700 acres of agricultural land and what compensation should be paid to the lessees. Whether or not either party would have the right of appeal to the highest Court would depend upon the Judges differing in opinion. This question of the Judges differing in opinion is very seldom seen in the Courts of this Island. What the hon. senior member for Christ Church has referred to as "back-scratching", not an expression which I would use before the tribunals concerned -- Mr. Speaker, the word is "backslapping", I am corrected. I think we all appreciate what it means; Peter sits on Paul today, and tomorrow Paul sits on Peter. Perhaps what I have said would not be of such significance in England where you have several Judges; but where you have only four Judges, of necessity they will be sitting on each other's appeal constantly. To find an individual who happened to have Judges differing and therefore have the right of appeal, you who would have to wait for years and years.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Bill which could suggest who has the duty to bring a matter to the attention of the Judge when the matter is of such importance that it would be referred to the Court of Appeal. The question of expense may arise, for instead of arguing the appeal, Counsel may have to spend a whole morning arguing that the matter is so important that it should be referred to the Court of Appeal.
3.35 p.m.

Therefore, instead of saving additional time, you may waste time, not so much as by asking for their decision, but through their sending it to another tribunal. There may be some things which may be referred to the higher tribunal; but, Sir, it is my view that the question on which Judges may more often exercise their powers appears under Section 4 subsection (1), and it is here that more often than not, the need to have further appeal is felt.

Those are the two suggestions which no doubt hon. members will determine in Committee, but the principle at stake is that while at the present there is some provision for the right of appeal, nothing in this Bill is being said which indicates that it intends to assist the Court and barristers. Subject to that, we agree with the submissions of this Bill.

Mr. SARGEANT: Mr. Speaker, the legal history of the Appellate Courts in the West Indies has been very interesting. I think it was in 1859 that the first Court of Appeal of Barbados -- the Court of Appeal of the Windward Islands and Barbados as it was called -- was formed. That Court of Appeal functioned until 1920 when the West Indian Court of Appeal was formed. That Court included Trinidad and Tobago and British Guiana.

Then in 1957, the Federal Court of the West Indies was formed. That Court lasted until 1962 when we saw the British Caribbean Court of Appeal formed.

I make these references because after the dissolution of the Federation, Jamaica set up its own Court of Appeal and some years later Trinidad and Tobago thought it neces-

sary to establish its own Court of Appeal. Afterwards, it became incumbent that we too should establish our own Court of Appeal. I refer to this owing to remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. He said that no provision was made for an appeal to Her Majesty's Privy Council. I must refer to section 87 (2) of the Constitution and it says: "An appeal shall lie as of right to Her Majesty-in-Council from any decisions made by the Court of Appeal in any such case." So the fundamental rights of the citizen still remain. That is as to making a last minute appeal to Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Much fuss has been placed on Section 4 subsection (4) (b). In fact, I think my learned friend, the senior member for St. Thomas said that paragraph (b) is not sufficiently wide enough as regard the powers and the freedom of the subject to appeal. Looking at (4) you read: "If on the hearing of an appeal from the decision of a magistrate --

- (a) the judges sitting in the Divisional Court differ in opinion; or
- (b) in the opinion of either of the Judges so sitting, the question involved in the appeal is one which by reason of its importance should be referred to the Court of Appeal for decision.

then the Divisional Court shall order that the appeal shall be heard and determined by the Court of Appeal."

The wording here is slightly different from Halsbury's Laws. One looks at the right of appeal to the Privy Council and the other says: "the right of appeal on general and public improprieties." The hon. member cannot say that the omission of these two words in paragraph (b) can create this great difference which we referred to just now.

When you go on to subsection (5) it says;

"on the hearing of an appeal by the Court of Appeal pursuant to subsection (4) a Judge who sat on the appeal in the Divisional Court shall be competent to sit on the appeal."

I do not agree with the Hon. and Learned senior member for Christ Church when he said that justice should be met not in terms of money or expense.
3.45 p.m.

If you were to look at, say, the records of our appeals here, you would find that there are about 80 to 90 appeal cases from the Magistrates Courts to the Supreme Court annually. We get between 13 and 15 from the Supreme Court to what used to be the British Caribbean Court annually. As I said before, I agree that when we are talking about justice, we cannot weight justice in terms of money, but we have got to be realistic about this point. We have got to ask ourselves whether the economy of this Island can afford to pay an additional Judge just to sit there and do nothing but just to say that he is a Judge of the Divisional Court.

I was somewhat surprised when the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church referred to Judges back-scratching. We have always had implicit faith and confidence in our Judges, and I certainly do not take him seriously on that point. I am sure he was not serious, and I am sure that nobody in this Chamber would accuse anyone sitting on the Bench as a Trial Judge of being so biased as to be unable when sitting in a Court of Appellate Jurisdiction to say he was wrong to come to the particular conclusion he came to on the particular occasion. I do believe the hon. member came to that conclusion mainly by way of trying to buttress his argument.

Now reference was also made to the Rules. As the hon. member knows, provisions of the Act and Rules are not made here in the House; therefore he certainly was not serious when he mentioned about Rules in the House here today. The hon. senior member for Christ Church referred to this Bill as not being perfect; but if we look at this Bill and look at the Constitution, we will find that this document which is before us today covers every material detail that is required in the Constitution.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will say that not only are the rights of the citizens of this country preserved, but as far as I can see, the architect of this document went out of his way to more or less put in material which was unnecessary, because there is material which we find already referred to in the Constitution.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is very little I wish to add. The House has heard the views of the two hon. members on my left in as much as they were at the London Conference, and they more thoroughly than anybody else in this Island have gone carefully into this legal position; but I would like only to correct one of two things which the hon. member who has just sat down said. I have practised for a number of years in the Courts of this Island, and it is notorious, and you know it very well yourself, Mr. Speaker, that the two Judges in the Assistant Court of Appeal never differed. The late Mr. Justice Thorne when he came down to act in the Court of Appeal for some time used to say this after a decision with which he did not agree, but we all knew what that meant; and when another Judge who is still alive went to the Court of Appeal, on one occasion he told members of the Bar that he could not understand until he went to the Bench how it was that year after year over, then, fifteen or twenty years two Judges always agreed; but he discovered when he went to the Bench that they did their utmost when the occasion arose to persuade him to go along with them, because it would not look good for them to seem to differ.

It is completely wrong in a small island like Barbados where two Judges were, the night before or the early morning before, playing bridge to ask one to say to the other that in fact he is ignorant of this point of law. As regards to the Judge admitting on the Bench that he was wrong in a decision which he made, it would surprise the world that the other day a Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States admitted that he was wrong in a previous decision, because he realised it was wrong and it was a fundamental point and the Supreme Court wanted to over-rule. In raising the question that although money is less important than the administration of justice, and then following it up with the argument that only twenty cases go from the Supreme Court, I would say in reply that two cases are enough if there is a danger of injustice being done. Those are the only two points I wanted to make. Mind you, the hon. member made a good speech and he ought to be congratulated on his maiden speech as he has looked up the history of these Courts; but I would appeal to the House to see that both because of local conditions and because of the necessity for justice to seem to be done, if there is only one case to go to that extra Judge, we should have that extra Judge instead of asking two Barbadians who are very friendly to really differ strongly on the Bench. It is far better to spend money and have the additional Judge. That is all I wish to say.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I may be considered rude in entering into a debate in which I am probably incompetent. Anyhow, this is not a Court of Law; this is the Legislature, and I have listened with great enthusiasm to the speeches made, some of which were very good; but on closer scrutiny I am afraid that many of the legal luminaries in here have missed the point and by-passed the issue. I would like hon. members to listen carefully, and if they do, they may appreciate the points.

If you were to examine sub-clause 4 of Clause 4 carefully, you will see in the first instance that it is an appeal from the decision of Magistrates, and in an appeal from a decision of the Magistrates, provided the two Judges sitting in the Divisional Court differ in opinion, that is one ground whereby the matter is referred and not finally adjudicated upon. The second point is that if in the opinion of either of the Judges so sitting, the question involved in the appeal is one which by reason of its importance should be referred to the Court of Appeal for a decision, then the Divisional Court shall order that the appeal shall be heard and determined by the Court of Appeal.

3.55 p.m.

In both of these cases where the two Judges sitting in the original Court cannot agree and no decision is made in that particular Court, the matter is referred for the decision to the Court of Appeal. Again, any Court matter on which the Judges are sitting in the original Court and the matter is not adjudicated there and then, may be referred to the Court of Appeal. Speeches were made to the effect that the same Judge will be sitting in his own appeal, but that does not arise. There is an appeal from the Magistrate to the Judges, the Judges differ in their opinion, no decision is made and the matter is not adjudicated upon. The matter is referred for final decision and adjudication to be made by the Court of Appeal.

If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had said that he would have liked to see the Court of Appeal duly constituted with three Judges sitting and not two, I would have gone along with the hon. senior member for Christ Church and all the other legal luminaries and would say that money is no object and therefore let us have a duly constituted Court with three Judges, whereas four Judges would be the proper Court and not three whose minds might not be made up; but to say what the hon. member has said is not placing a proper interpretation on the matter which is before us. I would not worry to press the case because this is not the platform. I hope the Reporters have taken down what I have said and will not have my speech misinterpreted.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to sub-clause (4) (b). It is this: Before the word "in" the following words be inserted: "The question involved in the appeal is one of law alone or is one which", and the words "the question involved in the appeal is one which" be deleted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I accept that amendment. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that we accept that amendment because, in fact, it is one which we ourselves intended making and one which was suggested to us by the hon. junior member for St. Philip. The other point at issue was a different one, but in respect of this one we accept it because it is one which we intended to make.

The question that Clause 4 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.05 p.m.

Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 were called and passed.

Clause 9 was called. It reads as follows:-

"This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on 30th November, 1966".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 9 stand part.

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

Mr. J. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on the question of Clause 9, it says that this Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 30th November, 1966. Hon. members would recall that during the second reading of the Bill, the point was made that when this Act comes into force, certain pending appeals -- speaking of my own experience -- will of course fall to the ground because if this Bill is passed, Clause 8 will come into operation which says that sections 9, 35, 36 and 37 of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, are hereby repealed. Because of that, it will, therefore, be impossible for Judges to hear an appeal to give their decision because there will be no Full Court being able to sit.

The point was made that we should know what the transitional period is before we bring this Act into being. We should know what matters are pending before these Courts and what is going to happen to them, whether they will have to be heard all over again. Of course, the only persons who would suffer would be those unfortunate litigants. It is only reasonable that the nature of this transitional period be known before we fix the date for the coming into operation of this Bill. Would the Hon. Leader of this House say here and now when the Order would be submitted to the Governor-General? We do not know what that Order would be. We do not know what this House would do until we know exactly what the transitional provisions would be -- the transitional period between Colonial Barbados and Independent Barbados.

The Governor-General will have powers to make rules. Presumably the Order would be made on those grounds. I can think of one case. An Order was not made in that case.

Section 10 of the Constitution says:-

(1) The Governor-General may by order make such provision as may appear to him to be necessary or expedient for --

- (a) the continuance on or after the appointed day before the High Court or the Court of Appeal established by the Constitution of any proceedings pending immediately before that day before the Supreme Court of Barbados;
- (b) the continuance on or after the appointed day before the said Court of Appeal or the British Caribbean Court of Appeal or the abatement of any appeal pending immediately before that day before the British Caribbean Court of Appeal from the Supreme Court of Barbados;
- (c) the enforcement of any judgment of the Supreme Court of Barbados or the British Caribbean Court of Appeal given but not satisfied before the appointed day; and
- (d) the enforcement of any judgment of the British Caribbean Court of Appeal given on or after that day by virtue of provision made in pursuance of paragraph (b).

We hope that this Order given to the Governor-General will not be forgotten.

The question of the Privy Council is referred to. By section 88 of the Constitution, Parliament has power to make law providing for appeals to the Privy Council. Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the House would like to say something about that, but so far we have heard nothing relating to appeals pending. I do not know, unless we are given some assurance that they will be heard without delay and that they will make it possible for this Act to come into operation without any break.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I just intervene to allay the fears -- if there are fears -- of the hon. member.

The legal provisions are already being made and they will appear in the "Official Gazette" in due course.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will they cover the whole Act?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: At least they would cover the point made by the Hon. member.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am taking that answer very seriously.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

4.15 p.m.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the next items would be Resolutions given notice of by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. There are, I think, four of them, and we will take them *seriatim*.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO REVISE SALARIES

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister proceeds to deal with the first of these, I promised earlier that as soon as the Report of the Select Committee which sat yesterday was available and copies had been printed, I would instruct that the Report be laid, after which copies would be circulated among hon. members. In order, perhaps, to facilitate hon. members in thinking about this Report which is signed by the Chairman, and to which there is attached a Minority Report, I will proceed to read it.

REPORT

The Select Committee appointed to consider and revise the salaries and conditions of service of the Officers of the House and the salaries of Members of the House, have the honour to submit the following Report:-

The Committee met on Wednesday, 14th December, 1966, when the following Honourable Members were present:

His Honour the Speaker (Chairman)
His Honour the Deputy Speaker
Hon. J. C. Tudor
Hon. C. E. Talma
Sir Grantley Adams
Mr. K. N. R. Husbands
Mr. L. A. Lynch
Mr. E. St. A. Holder

With respect to the Officers of the House, the Committee recommends the salaries, salary scales and conversion points set out in the First Schedule hereto, to take effect from 1st April, 1966. In addition, the Committee recommends that a Uniform Allowance be given to all Officers of the House (Other than the Clerk, Deputy Clerk and Chaplain), and that a distinctive badge be provided for such Officers showing the post that each holds in the Service of the House, such badge to be worn on all occasions when the Officers concerned are engaged in the business of the House. The Committee further recommends that the Marshal of the House be provided a "Court Suit" to be worn on Ceremonial Occasions.

3. The Committee recommends that the nomenclature of the post of "Deputy Marshal and Assembly Orderly", and that a female "Messenger and Cleaner" be attached to the Office of the Clerk.

4. With respect to the salaries of Members of the House, the Committee recommends the salaries and allow-

ances set out in the Second Schedule hereto, such salaries and allowances to be effective as from 1st April, 1966. All salaries and allowances mentioned therein are payable monthly, except the Duty Allowance payable to the Leader of the Opposition which should be payable to him at any time at his discretion during the financial year. The Committee is of the opinion that the Entertainment Allowance granted to His Honour the Speaker under Head 3 -- Legislature -- Item 17 -- Speaker's Hospitality, is inadequate and should be increased and should be payable to His Honour at his discretion, and in such instalments as he shall deem fit, during the financial year.

5. The Committee, after careful consideration, decided to make no recommendation with regard to the salaries of the Prime Minister, other Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, as it feels that such recommendations are more properly within the scope and province of the Cabinet. The Committee feels however that a special Duty Allowance of \$960.00 per annum -- payable monthly, -- be given to the Minister performing the duties of Leader of the House, in addition to any increased salary payable to him as Minister, in compensation for extra duties placed upon him by virtue of his office as Leader of the House.

6. The Committee is of the opinion that a Member who has served for at least ten years as a floor Member of the House or at least five years as a Minister should be entitled to a pension, and recommends that a Committee be set up as soon as possible to consider a pension scheme for Members. The Committee, without attempting in any way to fetter the discretion of such Committee, would like to express the view that such a scheme should commence from 1949, the year when salaries first became payable to Members of the House as such. The Committee fully realises that this recommendation is somewhat beyond the scope and extent of its terms of reference, but consider the matter important enough to be mentioned in its Report inasmuch as it is so closely connected with the emoluments of Members.

J. E. T. BRANCKER,
CHARMAN,

MINORITY REPORT

There is a Minority Report which reads as follows:-

"Generally speaking, I do not agree, at a time when it is said that the Treasury is bare, to increases of salaries for members of the House. But if this proposal is defended on the ground that there are anomalies in the fixing of salaries for some of its Officers and staff and that an increase in salaries and wages for other Government employees warrants an increase in salaries for Members of the House, then I am of the opinion that great care must be exercised in fixing new rates of pay for House Members, and the times from which these payments should begin.

2. I profoundly differ from the recommendation that the salaries of the Prime Minister, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries should be considered by the Cabinet alone. It is unnecessary to stress that this is an invidious position in which to place the Cabinet, but in addition it is clear that under the terms of reference, in the absence of an appointment by the House of another Committee, the Cabinet, to consider its emoluments, the salaries of all members were to be considered. It is surely relevant to the fixing of any salary that comparisons should be made between the respective status and responsibilities of a Minister and of an ordinary Member and the Speaker and other officials.

In this connection, I am of the opinion that the proposed special increase in the salary of the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House is too great.

3. With paragraphs 2, 3, 4 (subject to para. 1 above ad fin) and (subject etc.) I agree.

G. H. ADAMS,
15th December, 1966.

I lay that Report of the Committee as Chairman. I direct that copies of the Report be now circulated to hon. members.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the figure (6) has been mistaken for the symbol for "and". I think Your Honour read "and" but the figure "6" should be there.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask that that correction be made. Let the Hon. Minister of Communications proceed with the Resolutions.

RESOLUTION re SURFACE MAIL POSTAGE ON POSTAL PACKETS

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, there are four Resolutions which were tabled today all relative to the Post Office, but there is a slight difference between them. The First Resolution reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the postage on any postal packet set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto when transmitted from this Island to a place abroad otherwise than by air mail shall be at the rate set out immediately opposite such packet in column 2 thereof, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

All of these Resolutions have been circulated to hon. members. The Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:-

"It is proposed to revise the surface mail postage on postal packets to Commonwealth Countries and to destinations outside the Commonwealth. It is the policy of all Postal Administrations of the Commonwealth to apply a reduced rate." I stress the words "reduced rate", to postal packets despatched to Commonwealth Countries and to any of the territories of the British Empire. This is made possible under Article 8 of the Constitution of the U.P.U., which provides for the establishment of restricted Unions. Information has been received from the British Postal Administration that increased postal rates for surface packets to Commonwealth Countries have been introduced since the Ottawa Convention 1957, on which the present rates are based. It is therefore necessary to revise the rates accordingly. As a consequence, a corresponding decision is proposed in respect of postal packets to destinations outside the Commonwealth".

This Resolution has a Schedule attached to it and without being too tedious in my approach, I say that all hon. members can go through the Schedule. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION re AIR MAIL POSTAGE ON PARCELS

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the next Resolution reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the air mail postage on parcels to the destinations set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be at the rates set out immediately opposite such destinations in column 2 thereof, and that the Schedule to Resolution No. 72/1960 be amended by the insertion of the said destination and rates and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

BE IT RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

The Schedule to this Resolution will be seen at the bottom of the Resolution. The Addendum reads as follows:-

"The Air Parcel Post Service is at present limited to the West Indies, Canada and U.S.A. It is proposed to extend this service to include all destinations to which (a) there is no closed mail service; and (b) mail can be sent via the United Kingdom. Such destinations include Europe, Asia and Australia. The proposed rate is \$1.50 for each half pound or part thereof and in addition thereto the credits applicable to the Post Office of Great Britain for onward transmission to the country of destination."

In view of this, Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION re SECOND CLASS AIR MAIL

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

"RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the Schedule to Resolution No. 35/1965 be amended in the manner set out in the Schedule hereto, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein."

The Schedule is as follows:-

1. The Words "Printed Matter" appearing immediately beneath "Column 5" shall be deleted and replaced by the words "Other Articles".
2. The figures appearing opposite the countries of destination listed below shall be deleted and replaced by the figures as set out below --

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
Country of Destination	Letters per 1/2 oz.	Postcards each	Air Letter Forms (Aerogrammes)	Other Articles per 1/2 oz.
	¢	¢	¢	¢
Antigua	10	8	8	6
Cayman	12	8	10	8
Dominica	10	8	8	6
Grenada	10	8	8	6
Guyana	10	8	8	6
Jamaica	12	8	10	8
Montserrat	10	8	8	6
St. Kitts	10	8	8	6
St. Lucia	10	8	8	6
St. Vincent	10	8	8	6
Trinidad	10	8	8	6
Turks and Caicos Islands	12	8	10	8

3. The figures "25" shall be inserted under Column 5 - Other Articles -- opposite each of the following countries of Destination, namely, Australia, India and Hong Kong.

At present, second class air mail is confined to Printed Matter. It is proposed to extend second class air mail to include samples of merchandise and small packets. This is in keeping with the practice of other Postal Administrations and will be of considerable benefit to the public.

In addition members of the local mercantile community have from time to time made representations for the extension of the 2nd class air mail service to Australia, Hong Kong and India. Accordingly, it is proposed to make provision for delivering of 2nd class air mail to these Countries.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION re POSTAGE OF PARCELS

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this is the final of the four Resolutions and it reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that with effect from the first day of January, 1967, the postage of parcels to the destinations set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be at the rates set out immediately opposite such destinations according to the poundage in columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 thereof, and that the Schedule to Resolution No. 56/1965 be varied accordingly and that the Senate be invited to concur herein."

The Schedule is as follows:-

Surface Parcel Post						
Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	
Destination	Postage rate on Parcels of Weight not exceeding					
	2 lbs.	3 lbs.	7 lbs.	11 lbs.	22 lbs.	Remarks
United Kingdom	1.85	1.85	2.50	3.00	4.15	
Canada (Direct)	.75	.75	1.65	2.50	5.00	Max 20 lbs.
Canada (Via T'dad)	1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.50	-- do --
U. S. A. (Direct)	1.00	1.00	2.50	4.50	8.85	
U. S. A. (Via T'dad)	1.35	1.35	3.15	5.35	10.35	
Canal Zone	1.00	1.00	2.50	4.50	8.85	
Puerto Rico & U. S. Virgin Is.	1.00	1.00	2.50	4.50	8.85	
Other places via U. K. add the following amounts to postage from U. K. to destination.	.65	.65	1.00	1.25	2.00	

The Addendum reads as follows:-

"The current Parcel Post rates are based on the terminal charges notified to this Administration at the time of the Ottawa Convention 1957. In order to conform with the principles laid down in the Parcel Post Agreement, 1964, it is necessary to revise the rates to the following destinations and to other places via U.K. due to increases in terminal charges.

United Kingdom, Canada, U.S.A., Canal Zone, Puerto Rico & U.S. Virgin Is."

In view of what is set out here, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) Act, 1958.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this Bill has not been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that is a fact, and I accept it as so from the hon. member, it might not now be proceeded with.

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to give supplementary notice of a Resolution as well as two Bills. I would give notice of these two Bills afterwards.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of lands at My Lords Hill.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON SALARIES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if we are in order now, I ask that the House deal with the Select Committee's report on Salaries.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am seriously suggesting to the hon. member to postpone consideration of that Report now. A Report of such significance and importance should not be dealt with today with the exception of that matter as relating to the Staff. There are certain things, rather unavoidable, to deal with, like the Minority Report and that sort of thing. Nobody would agree that we should proceed with a matter of this nature in haste. Some hon. members would have to be told what the Report is about. Some have read it, and some have seen the Minority Report; but on the whole some have only seen it a few minutes ago.

A matter of this sort where members are giving themselves money and where Government is rushing this matter through the House is of too great importance to be dealt with now. Do not let people say that hon. members are only seeing after themselves. We face the world today, not only this island, with the fact, at the beginning of Independence, of the possibility of it being thrown at us that we are thinking only of our own pockets.
4.45 p.m.

We are asking the taxpayers to pay more money, and we will have to pay through the nose for Independence and whatever it brings in the future; and the first lot of people, with all the unemployment in this Island, we are asking to put money in their pockets is ourselves. It is true that Christmas is around the corner, if that is the reason for

rushing this through; but this was to be done before elections, until the Dissolution scotched it. If we are to tell the public and the world that we rushed through a Resolution to give ourselves more money when we are faced with stark poverty and unemployment in this Island, let us say so, and let us be condemned by the rest of the world. If we have any regard for the good name of Barbados, let us postpone this matter. We could settle the salaries of the Staff, not because it is the Staff, but because they are part of the Government's employees who are already drawing increased salaries. The Staff is a different matter, but I appeal again to the Leader of the House to postpone consideration of the rest of that Report which in plain English is "Let us put some money in our pockets so that our Christmas shopping will be higher and better!"

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next Item be consideration of the Report of the Select Committee set up under Your Honour's Chairmanship.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in seconding that motion, I certainly would like to express my sentiments in so far as these proposals are concerned. I would like to draw to the attention of this House that the question of the remuneration of Members and the increase in salaries and conditions of service of the Staff of the House of Assembly has been engaging the attention of a Select Committee as recently as October; and to say that we have come down here rushing through anything is really a mistake, in that this matter has been carefully considered by a Select Committee duly constituted, and which was at the verge of reporting when the House was prorogued. There are new members who have just come in and who will be getting \$300 a month and a travelling allowance of \$50; and if they do not want it, I certainly as a member of this House for about 20 years would not sit around here and fool the public or anybody that I do not want some form of remuneration for my services in here whether as a Backbencher, Minister, Parliamentary Secretary or otherwise.

Now this question of remuneration of members started down in 1949 when the now Hon. Leader of the Opposition was Premier of Barbados. He first instituted the system of paying members a salary, and he as Head of his Cabinet then in 1954 under the Ministerial system -- and I had the honour of serving under him as Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries -- fixed the salary at \$600 a month for Ministers. That went on until 1958 when just before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition went off as Federal Prime Minister the Cabinet revised their own salaries and they saw fit to increase them from \$600 to \$720 per month. It was not done by a Committee of the House. It was the Governor-in-Executive Committee, afterwards called the Cabinet, sitting in their own Chamber which fixed their own salaries, as the Cabinet today will do.

The Prime Minister is the Leader of the country and has a most onerous and delicate job to perform, and if he gets a bigger salary than the Chief Justice, no one should quibble or feel annoyed with that. If a Minister is not properly compensated for the sacrifice, I certainly do not care to be a Minister at all. I am not going to sit here and allow the hon. member to get away with this sort of thing. I have represented the parish of Christ Church for many long years, and I will be here for quite some time; so whether or not the people of Christ Church know I am talking for money, they would be glad to know that I get money to give them a bigger drink at election time. All the satellites and political candidates can run around and tell the Christ Church people that I came in here for money; but I came in in the dark days of 1937 when you were afraid to show your head in politics. If the members of the Opposition feel they have only been in here a few days and should not get any money, let the money remain in the Treasury. You are under no obligation to draw it. You belong to the Barbados Labour Party which happens to need certain facilities; I am referring to the Barbados Labour Party Opposition in contra-distinction to the other splinter Opposition which is fast disappearing from the scene. The Hon. Leader of the

Opposition himself instituted this system of paying Members \$100 a month in 1949, and after having gone to the Federal Assembly and seen what fat salaries were paid out for doing nothing down there, and is himself the recipient of a huge fanciful salary, how can he come here and postulate in that way? If there is nobody with guts to get up and talk about salaries, your humble servant will speak freely on salaries and let him realise that I cannot be punished all these years for nothing. I hope many of you sitting idly by will not be misled and found doing things which are improper and which in your own conscience you feel diffident about. I do not care to lecture to you any longer; that is enough for the converted.

The question that the Report of the Select Committee be the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADOPTION OF SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in moving that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted, I have certain observations to make. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is often the case in political life, particularly if you are in Opposition and you wish to justify your position, to make the other side always appear to be wrong on most matters; so this is all part of the small change of politics. In order on some occasions to obviate this, Parliaments resort to a device of seeking the highest measure of agreement on matters which concern themselves as Parliaments. Therefore when a Select Committee is appointed by Parliament to exercise its mind on matters affecting the status or the remuneration of members of Parliament, nobody should go into that Select Committee determined to make political capital if such could be made out of its proceedings.

4.55 p.m.

If nine hon. members of this House sit in Select Committee, it is possible for you to have not only one Minority Report but several Minority Reports, and the reason why other hon. members of the Select Committee might not want to put in Minority Reports is that they realize what is the purpose of Minority Reports. No Select Committee reaches a conclusion which is entirely acceptable to all of its participants, but you try to find the highest measure of agreement and not the lowest standard of discord. This matter has been engaging the attention of the last House and this present House and Members of both Houses for some time. Your Honour will remember that in 1961 we went very near to reaching certain conclusions with regard to the Staff and Members. The General Election of 1961 intervened and altered those proceedings.

The former Deputy Speaker in September appointed a Select Committee with the same terms of reference as the Select Committee appointed on Tuesday by Your Honour. That Select Committee put in a unanimous Report, a part of which is embodied in the Select Committee's Reports which I have in my hand today. Obviously, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition agreed to be a member of the Select Committee, he understood the terms of reference of the Committee. I do no violence either to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or to the Committee itself when I say that while it is true that some of the arguments which he has raised on the floor of this House, he did, in fact, raise in Select Committee yesterday, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not give the Committee the impression that he was going to make a political issue out of such arguments as he enunciated there and then. Since the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has put in a Minority Report and since he has attempted to make political capital out of this issue by the speech which he made, the House will have to be divided on this Report because he has taken the matter out of the hands of the Select Committee which, we thought, had reached unanimity on most of these problems; and he has brought disagreement on the floor of the House. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition alone signed the Minority Report but he is not just an ordinary member of this House. He is not a back-bencher; he is the Leader of Her Majesty's

Opposition in this House; and if he signs a Minority Report disagreeing with the Majority Report, one has to assume that he gives the impression to his Party to support him and that they will support him; an indication will have to come from them that they do not feel as he does. We have to assume that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is making a political issue out of this matter, and he wishes to bind his supporters to what he has put in the Minority Report. If this House has to be divided, it has to know what it is dividing on. We are prepared to reject the Minority Report as not being worth the paper on which it is written. We cannot acknowledge the Minority Report because we accept the Majority Report.

The Cabinet has substantially approved the Majority Report with one exception, and that has to do with the First Schedule and the post of Clerk. I wish to move at the appropriate time that the salary scale instead of being as it is set out here should be changed to X-2 -- X-1. There is just a change of scale, but there is no change in the conversion point. With that amendment I propose to move. (A MEMBER: What is the amendment?) The amendment is that the salary scale of the Clerk should be X-2 to X-1 instead of being X-1, but the conversion point remains the same. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

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

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking as one who saw the Minority Report for the first time at five minutes to five o'clock and became aware of its terms only then. It is only then that I saw the signature on the Minority Report and it is very obscurely paragraphed as far as numbering is concerned. I did not have the opportunity of hearing the speech of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, except some words about Christmas shopping. I heard the speech of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, a parish in which I myself live. I must say that I do not think that being only a member of this House for a few days in any way disqualifies me from having an opinion of a member or of the attitude of the hon. junior member for Christ Church which he has set out at great length.

5.05 p.m.

As I see it, this matter specifically deals with members of the Opposition and with the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for St. George. -- Mr. Speaker, I ask to excuse me for speaking so softly now because I was using my voice recently. -- As I see it, this matter concerns those members of the House who are not members of the Government and the other Officers. The Government has fourteen members in this Honourable House and only two of them are in any way affected by the positive recommendations of the Report. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is one and the hon. junior member for St. George is the other.

I see nothing in the Minority Report with which I disagree. It says: "Generally speaking, I do not agree, at a time when it is said that the Treasury is bare, in increases of salaries for Members of the House. But if this proposal is defended on the ground that there are anomalies in the fixing of salaries for some of its Officers and staff and that an increase in salaries and wages for other Government employees warrants an increase in salaries for Members of the House, then I am of the opinion that great care must be exercised in fixing new rates of pay for House Members, and the times from which these payments should begin.

"2. I profoundly differ from the recommendation that the salaries of the Prime Minister, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries should be considered by the Cabinet alone. It is unnecessary to stress that this is an invidious position in which to place the Cabinet, but in addition it is clear that under the terms of reference, in the absence of an appointment by the House of another Committee, the Cabinet, to consider its emoluments, the salaries of all members were to be considered. It is surely relevant to the fixing of any salary that comparisons should be made between the respective status and responsi-

bilities of a Minister and of an ordinary Member and the Speaker and other officials."

This is what I see as the principal point of the Minority Report.

If the hon. junior member for Christ Church who is also a Minister supports the full part of the Report, and not the Minority Report, I can well understand him because he may be well aware of things of interest. A Ministerial Report may be forthcoming, but we do not know.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On the question of the Ministers' Report, that will be dealt with by the Cabinet and then sent to the House; so hon. members will have every opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Sir, the fact that Ministers' salaries are not put before the House is a sore point and one on which the Minority Report is founded. I fail to see why the question of salaries for the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries should not be put before the House. This is what this Report deals with and I do not agree that it is not in order for us to deal with that.

I agree with paragraph 2 of the Minority Report where it says: "I profoundly differ from the recommendation that the salaries of the Prime Minister, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries should be considered by the Cabinet alone. It is unnecessary to stress that this is an invidious position in which to place the Cabinet, but in addition it is clear that under the terms of reference, in the absence of an appointment by the House of another Committee, the Cabinet, to consider its emoluments the salaries of all members were to be considered. It is surely relevant to the fixing of any salary that comparisons should be made between the respective status and responsibilities of a Minister and of an ordinary Member and the Speaker and other officials."

We are all members of the House. It is certainly clear to me that salaries of members should mean the salaries of all members of this House, and we are in a very invidious position because we are the only people who have the power to put our hands in the taxpayers' pockets and transfer money to our own.

I hope hon. members would bear in mind that this is a matter which concerns mainly the Opposition. When we speak on this issue, I submit to the House that our views deserve greater respect. One of the things about public opinion is that we like to know how our money is spent. When things are railroaded in this House, it cannot be said that the greatest care is being taken. I would always like the greatest care to be taken with all Resolutions and matters which come before us as regards the public. The people are not going to pay any attention to what the hon. junior member for Christ Church is saying about what took place in 1961 and 1966. The public is not going to pay any attention to that. They are going to say that we are now elected to the House and we are going into the matter of our salaries. The Minority Report deserves greater consideration. Do not let us give the public the impression that we have come here for money. I appeal to all hon. members -- and I profoundly appeal to those hon. members who are not affected by this -- to see that point.

Mr. Speaker, you are included in these proposals as well as Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees along with the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for St. George. I appeal to the Hon. Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries to let us postpone this matter for more mature consideration; and since we have the assurance that the Cabinet will discuss their own salaries, let the Cabinet have the opportunity of discussing this Report of the Select Committee also.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise on a point of order. I never said that this matter which went to Select Committee was not discussed. I said that Ministers' salaries were not discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made. 5.15 p.m.

I alone decide what is a point of order, so long as I am in the Chair. Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas proceed.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: My impression was that Your Honour had to determine a point of order before Members could continue to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I so rule.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: We have the assurance of the hon. junior member for Christ Church in the terms in which he has just expressed it; but whatever the assurance meant, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we postpone consideration of this Report until the next meeting of the House. Personally speaking, I would be in deep agreement with paragraph 5 of the main Report that "a special Duty Allowance of \$960 per annum payable monthly be given to the Minister performing the duties of Leader of the House as compensation for extra duties in his office as Leader of the House;" but in that very paragraph we have a reference of "in addition to any increased salary payable to him as a Minister." Is this not in itself an argument for postponement? Since there is to be an increase in salaries, and the Leader of the House should get a sum in addition to that, what is the point of putting that into the Report if it is not contemplated that some of the increases to which this Report refers is a reference to Ministerial increases, and if any of the increases are being related to any of the Ministerial increases, why not all? Why can't we have them all before us so that the public will have an opportunity to judge as one complete whole, and so that hon. members can have an opportunity to judge in one complete document or set of documents exactly what proposals are being put forward for the increases payable from Head 3 and Head 5 of the Estimates?

I think I heard the Hon. Leader of the House give his reason for not considering the two together -- that Head 3 of the Estimates deals with one and Head 5 deals with the other. Head 3 may deal with one and Head 5 with another, but this Honourable House should deal with all, in my view. I see the Minority Report says "with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 (subject to paragraph 1 above)", but there is some ambiguity here. I dare say the Minority Report is only to do with the printing of the main Report. I take it is meant to agree with paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, and in this I am in complete agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly not suggest the postponement of increases in salary for employees of this House if this is possible, and these include the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk, the Librarian, the Marshal, the Chaplain and the Deputy Marshal, Messenger and Library Attendant, and I hope that any action the House takes by way of postponement would subsequently be adjusted in their favour if it is our desire to backdate any of the increases. We would share the view that the Officers get their increases at a suitable time, Mr. Speaker, and I would not like to think, on behalf of my Party, that anything we might succeed in persuading the Leader of the House and members of his Party to do by way of postponement was going to hurt the Officers of the House; but as far as I am concerned, although the larder may be as bare as the Treasury was announced bare, I can wait.

Speaking as an ordinary member of the House who sees these emoluments suggested, who sees the Ministers and the Government Party anxious to force these increases down my pocket, I do not think we will see for the remainder of this session hon. members opposite quite so anxious to confer benefits, do good and promote the general goodwill of members on this side. I would suggest that consideration of this part of the Report which deals with Members' salaries, the salary of the Leader of the Opposition, the salary of the Chairman of Committees, the salary of the Deputy Speaker and Your Honour's salary be postponed for consideration at another meeting of this Honourable House.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, only last night I was reading a journal of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in which there was an article on M.P.s, pay, and that article set out how this matter was dealt with in England, Tasmania and New Zealand. Apparently it is the custom of Parliaments periodically to have a squabble over the increase of pay of Members on both sides which all members generally want. The point which we are making, Sir, is a simple and basic point. Today the Report of the Committee is being brought before the House. This Committee met yesterday, and we are being asked today to adopt the Report of the Committee in full. The point we are making is that this matter should be postponed, with the exception of the provisions dealing with the Staff of the House, until the next meeting. That is a simple point and that is the only point; so for the hon. junior member for Christ Church to get up on the floor of the House and attempt to convey the impression that the Opposition on this side is seeking to give the public the impression that they do not really care about the payment of salaries, and that we are hypocrites because we introduced salary increases ourselves, and that he wants money in politics is absurd.

It would be stupid for anybody at this stage to attempt to make political capital out of this matter when it is known that in all parts of the Commonwealth of Nations periodically salary increases are given to Members of Parliament. It is well known that the cost of living rises and that the value of money paid at the particular time when it is fixed no longer bears the same value. This idea of conveying the impression that we on this side want money, but do not want to vote it is an attempt to play at a type of politics which is not tolerated in Christ Church or the greater part of this Island.

The second point is that we say it is unreasonable to be expected to deal with Members' salaries without dealing with Ministers' salaries, because there is a definite relationship between Members' salaries and Ministers' salaries. The reason why I quoted that article in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Journal is that because of these undignified squabbles that used to take place in the House of Commons, on the last occasion they had a salary increase they appointed an independent Committee outside the House headed by no less a person than Sir Geoffrey Lawrence, especially well known to Your Honour, and the terms of reference of the Committee was to consider the salaries and remuneration of both the Ministers and all the Members of the House, and that same Journal set out the material points that were made about this relationship between the Ministers' salaries and the salaries of the Members of the House.
5.25 p.m.

The terms of reference of the Committee were to consider the salaries and remuneration of both Ministers and Members of the House. That same gentleman pointed out the main points of difference as to the relationship between the salaries of the Ministers and those of the Members of the House, and how can it be unreasonable if we say that that is the point which we have taken? That is the point taken in the Mother of Parliaments, in New Zealand and Tasmania; all of them deal with the salaries of Members of the Government and the salaries of Members of Parliament as a whole. That is the basic point. Between now and Tuesday as the Minister has said — I know that he will be the leading exponent in this matter which is going to be discussed by the Cabinet in the near future, and why not let us have one exercise of the whole thing? Why not let us deal with the matter as a whole?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have never said that I was the leading advocate of increasing the Ministerial salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but a point of explanation. Standing Order 26 (16) says:

"A Member who has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but he shall not introduce new matter."

Mr. St. JOHN: I said I know that the Minister will be the leading exponent of it. This is not a matter out of which to make political capital. The Election is five years away from here and we would not be making political capital so far away from the Election. This is not the normal method of dealing with the matter; the method of dealing with it in the past was wrong and it should be corrected now. We should be dealing with the salaries of the Ministers and Members as a whole, so that we can get a general picture as to the total cost of the expenditure of the Legislature. With the exception of the Staff who are the Servants of the House — they must have their increases in salary; but as far as the Members of the House are concerned, the position should be dealt with as a whole. That is how it is dealt with in other countries and that is how we feel it should be dealt with here.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that as long as we are the Government we will find the Opposition as happy to be in the Opposition as they have been this afternoon. A peculiar thing about the whole Minority Report — and it is not surprising — that it could have been the Report of the Select Committee because, constituted as it was with Your Honour in the Chair, four members were drawn from the other side. It was possible in these circumstances that the Minority Report could have come from this side. Besides, Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has seen the Report at five minutes to five o'clock. It is a part of the antics of the Leader of that Party to inform the members of the said Party as late as possible of things as important as this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I object strongly to those offensive remarks. Even a junior member of this House ought to know that those remarks are not parliamentary. The hon. member speaks about antics and my habitual antics. I am asking Your Honour to call upon the hon. member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: To what is the hon. member referring?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The reference to the word "antics".

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not agree that the word "antics", or the use of it, is unparliamentary.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In connection with the last sentence of the hon. member's remarks, perhaps the Official Reporter will give you the exact words he has taken down. That has been done in the past.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection to asking the Clerk to get from the Official Reporter the Official Report of the last sentence used by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, and I so direct the Clerk.

The Official Reporter supplied the words he had taken down.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the Official Reporter his note of that which was said and it reads as follows:-

"It is a part of the antics of the Leader of that Party to inform the members of the said Party as late as possible of things as important as this."

I rule that those words on that sentence are not offensive and insulting or in any way a contravention of Standing Order 26 (5).

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation...

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, you have given your ruling and it cannot be retracted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has risen on a point of explanation. Under Standing Order 26 (16) it says:-

"A Member who has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but he shall not introduce new matter."

May I point out to the Hon. and learned member for St. Thomas who has risen on a point of explanation that an explanation must be to some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood. I must hear the point of explanation by the hon. member.

Mr. J.M.G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on a point of explanation and I said so, when the Hon. Leader of the House interrupted. I am merely trying to obey the rules of this House. Immediately after the words on which Your Honour ruled were uttered, the hon. member went on to say that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for St. Michael proceed.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I would finish that sentence which seems to be unfinished. "As late as possible."

Mr. J.M.G. ADAMS: I rise on a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that according to the rule an hon. member may offer explanation on some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood. Is the hon. member implying now that he rose to speak on some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood?

Mr. J.M.G. ADAMS: The hon. senior member for St. Michael said that I received the Report as late as possible. I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Michael what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not wish to give way -- but I gather that the hon. senior member for St. Michael is giving way.

Mr. SPRINGER: Now, Sir, it is unfortunate that some members leave the Chamber at a time when they should be in here. I said that it is not surprising that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas received a copy as late as 5.05 p.m.

Anyhow as the Leader of the Opposition has objected to the use of the word "antics", I will accommodate his age.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I object to that. It is unparliamentary. I have here two references, one from May's and the other from another authority. That remark is unparliamentary. That is meant to be personal. It is a personal reference to another hon. member. What is my age to do with it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition objecting to the use of the word "age" in respect of himself or of other hon. members?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It was used in a sarcastic way. He is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made the point of order. The hon. member made his point of order and then appeared, or so it appeared to me, to make a speech. The point of order was made and I was about to rule on it.

In so far as to the age, wilful or otherwise, of any hon. member even if such was a tribute to the Chair, so far as the present occupant is concerned, age is honour.

The only Standing Order in this Chamber which deals with anything like that is Standing Order 26 (5). It says:

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

It is not offensive to say that he is aged or that he is inexperienced.

Standing Order 26 (6) says:

"No Member shall refer to any other Member by name".

And Standing Order 26 (7) says:

"No Member shall impute improper motives to another Member."

I do not regard that reference or remark as offensive under the rules of this Chamber.

Let the hon. senior member for St. Michael proceed, and I am sure he will deal with the subject matter which is before the Chamber.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted at the point at which I was going to say "the age of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition" and I am very sorry that the hon. member has read in my unfinished statement sentiments of sarcasm.
5.45 p.m.

When it comes to fixing the salaries of Members of the House we should get opinions varying as widely as expressed on that side. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has been quite honest in remarking that he is quite satisfied that the present salaries of members are too low.

Mr. J.M.G. ADAMS: On a point of order, is it in order for the hon. senior member for St. Michael to suggest that I could ever be dishonest on the floor of this House? That is implicit in the statement made.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order cannot be made by prefacing a query.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be somewhat worried as to whether we will vote for this increase or otherwise. I for one can assure him that I am going to vote for the increases; so their fears are allayed in so far as my support is concerned.

When last I spoke in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I had to draw reference to the behaviour of the Ministers in the Federal Government when they were fixing salaries, pensions and other remuneration for themselves at the death of the last Federation in 1962 -- not only "last", but "only". What is surprising, Mr. Speaker, is that even then the Secretary of State for the Colonies, so generously had they intended to treat themselves -- had to slam the door in the face and on the fingers of the then Minister of Finance and the others. It is surprising that at this time these men did not realise that they should not have fixed salaries, pensions and what not for themselves, but they were going to tax an organisation that was dying.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those people who feel that as a member of this House my service is worth more than the service of anybody in the defunct Federation, and that is my attitude in this. If whoever was responsible for the payment of whatever remuneration the Leader of the Opposition is getting now is of the opinion that he can draw \$800 a month from a dead organisation, I feel I am equivalent in a living Assembly in Barbados, especially in its first year of Independence.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an issue in which politics should play so important a part. There is no hon. member on that side who will have the guts to say he disagrees with this, and if the Government passes this today he will give his extra to the Party to which he belongs because their Party needs money. Not one of them would be good enough to do that. If I were opposed to this I would ask my Party to withdraw it; so if hon. members think they can make political capital of this, they are mistaken. If they are trying to console themselves with the fact that it is going to pass apparently against their mouthings but with their own wills, they are mistaken.

We have a responsibility to lead this country, Mr. Speaker, and if people leading a country cannot set a stand-

ard, whether it is in salaries or behaviour for themselves, this country cannot go on properly. They talk about what they represent, but I represent under this system 100,000 people living in St. Michael; and if a man my age cannot honestly represent 100,000 souls to the tune of \$300 a month, then I am in the wrong place. I remember very well the now Leader of the Opposition when he first introduced salaries in this House looking across the table at the late V. B. Vaughan who was then in the Opposition when he got up to speak and saying: "Quite frankly I thought you were going to move that it be tax free!" So when it comes to this type of thing I do not fool myself. They want this and they are either going to abstain or vote for it; not one of them will vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition is getting a little upset and anticipating remarks and reading into my speeches sarcasm and what not. I did not intend to say anything that would embarrass him. It is unfortunate, and I regret terribly that he seems offended by reference to his age, and I can assure the hon. member that since he is offended at the word "age", I will probably talk about his youth. This is my contribution, Mr. Speaker, and I expect hon. members on the other side who are not in favour of supporting this Resolution to vote against it.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the Hon. Minister and to the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and I have listened also with much frustration to the hon. senior member for St. Michael in his contribution. First I would like to deal with the hon. junior member for Christ Church and his need for money like all of us in this world; but what captured my imagination most was that he had the audacity to stand on that side of the Table and remark that he would be contesting the elections five years from now hoping to come back in this Honourable House. I think the hon. member has seen the writing on the wall. He has made it very clear that our Party might be wealthy...

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member is casting aspersions on my election campaign or attempting to do so, but unless more double-crossing goes on between the Conservatives and the Barbados Labour Party, your humble servant will always be in this House of Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is not a point of order. I do not yet understand what the hon. senior member for St. James is attempting to do, but let the hon. member proceed with the substance of the Resolution.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge the hon. junior member for Christ Church made it very plain who came in here three weeks ago. I am very fortunate to be here as the senior member for St. James. Those who might have been here for twenty or twenty-five years and who might have been members of this honourable Party to which I belong, would know about the double-crossing between the Conservatives and my Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not concerned with any double-crossing; I am concerned with whether or not the Report of this Select Committee should be adopted, which has no reference to any double-crossing. I deem it that the hon. junior member for Christ Church has made no point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am going to keep very close to the straight and narrow path, and to apply to the Chair for guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is freely available to the hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I heard about the dissolution of the West Indies Federation, about those persons who drew \$800 per month, about age and about youth. This is what I would like to say: I feel deep within myself that in the first three weeks since we have come into this Hon. House, the first thing or the important thing which the Gov-

ernment seems to believe should be handled should be the salary scales, not for the Staff of the House, but for members of Parliament and the Cabinet. You have fourteen members of which a few of them hold office as backbenchers; you have hon. members on the other side carrying that extra strain on the Treasury and now they are asking this House to increase the salary of the M.P.'s and then allow the Cabinet to decide what the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries will have. This is the thing which strikes me forcibly. There is a Select Committee to determine what the backbenchers should be paid, but the Cabinet is to decide only what the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries should be paid. Whatever the Cabinet decides these persons should be paid, we must accept. You have these fantastic salaries of \$2,000 a month and \$1,000 a month with the fancy things which are tax free. I like to deal with priorities; I do not feel that any hon. member of this Chamber should consider receiving his salary to be a priority in this country today. I believe in dealing with first things first. You will hear sooner or later that we sat by here and voted for something in which we do not believe. The Minority Report submitted by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has made the position very plain and the hon. member has asked the other side to postpone this matter until the next sitting of this House so that we can go into the matter in greater detail.

Mr. Speaker, what is this big rush? I welcome the rush to pay the Civil Servants and the Staff of this Honourable House, but hon. members on the other side are trying to force this matter down the throats of people for the purpose of their own pockets, and then you will hear who is going to vote for it and who is going to pay. As I have already said, Sir, I believe in priorities first; I believe in dealing firstly with people who are in an unfortunate position and then you can consider the salaries of members of the House. I beg to move that the consideration of the Second Schedule of this Resolution be postponed until the next meeting of this House. I speak frankly, forcibly and seriously on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that he should make a motion to the effect that this Report of the Select Committee be rejected or postponed? I gather that the hon. member is not supporting the adoption of this Report. The hon. member may either move the rejection or the postponement of this Report; he may vote against the adoption of the Report or move the postponement.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the motion before the House be read again.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the Report of the Select Committee be now adopted.

Mr. CRAIG: Well, Sir, I beg to move that the consideration of this Report be postponed, with the exception of the part dealing with the salaries of the Officers and Staff of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot accept a division of the Schedule. The hon. member should either move that the Report of the Select Committee be rejected or its consideration postponed.

Mr. CRAIG: Can I move that consideration of this Report be postponed?

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, yes.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be now postponed.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What motion is before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very sorry to say that that is not a point of order; anyhow, what is before the House is a motion that the Report of the Select Committee be now adopted.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was of the opinion that the hon. member was about to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk of the Table whether there is any motion before the House other than that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

(The Clerk answered in the negative.)

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion that further consideration be now postponed. In seconding the motion, I want to say this. We have before us a Minority Report signed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and paragraph two of that Report draws to the attention of this Honourable Chamber something which is of much importance, and it is that the Treasury is bare. On the other hand, this House is being asked to carry out in indecent haste what appears to my mind to be a raid on the same Treasury.

We want to make it clear from this side of the House that we would like to do absolutely nothing today which would delay the increased salaries to be granted to the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, and other officers who are entitled to increased salaries or remuneration to which we know they were entitled for some time; but what we want to concern ourselves with is that a comprehensive report should be given to us to deal with salaries — and whatever else may be put to us — of all hon. members of this Chamber, from the Prime Minister back down to the lowest back-bencher.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church told us that there is no haste in this matter. Evidently then, there is no reason to ask us to pass this matter this afternoon. I am willing to see this matter postponed until a later date, possibly next Tuesday when we would have a better opportunity to deal with it and when we hope to make comparison with what the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries would be receiving. Let us have everything before us and let us see that an attempt is not being made to fool somebody. We have not seen enough; we have not been given enough on which to go. As to the indecent haste for all of this, we believe that too much is being taken for granted, and I want to tell this Honourable Chamber that we should not remain here and allow the Ministers of the Government to do something which we may have to regret by not postponing this matter this afternoon.

In seconding the motion, I am appealing to all hon. members, unless there is something else which has not been brought to light, to let us all wait and see what every member of the House is going to get and let us all discuss it.
6.15 p.m.

We would not like it to appear as if we are trying to prevent the Officers of the House from getting as soon as possible any salary increases to which they are entitled.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the motion of the hon. senior member for St. James which was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, that further consideration of this matter be postponed. We on this side of the House are quite willing to postpone consideration of this matter with the proviso that all four Opposition members who sat on the Select Committee sign the Minority Report, and we are even prepared to offer a short recess to allow them to do so. Now the reason given by the Second of the motion for postponement is that they would like to discuss the question of Ministers' salaries. I am wondering whether it is the opinion of the Opposition that the recommendations of the Committee for remuneration of Members of the House are exorbitant. Hon. Members on the other side are getting on in such a manner as if the proposals which are made for increases in salary for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries will not be decided on by the House. Hon. members know that the House has the final word. If they do not want to stop the Officers of this House from having similar rights to those enjoyed by Civil Servants of getting half their monthly salary at the increased rate to assist them at Christmas time, and get their back pay in January when payments are being made, they would

agree to doing this today. Who says the House will meet next Tuesday or the Tuesday after? The reason why we have had two meetings this week is because everybody knows there will be a recess over the Christmas season. Why is it that Civil Servants should enjoy certain benefits which the Officers of the House should not enjoy?

The terms of reference of the Select Committee, Mr. Speaker, were to consider the revision of salaries for Members and Officers simultaneously, and this is what we are discussing. The Committee made a joint recommendation on the revision of salaries for Officers and Members alike, and what we are discussing is the adoption of the Report. When the hon. senior member for St. James moves that further consideration of this Report be postponed, he is in truth and in fact saying that the Officers of this House should be denied the privileges which we on the Government side would like to give them over the Christmas season. The hon. member is in fact saying that the Officers of the House should go and borrow a half month's salary from somebody to shop, unlike the average Civil Servant.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the Officers of the House are to be denied this right. I made it very clear that the Officers should have the right, but let us deal with Members at a future date; but the hon. member has just distorted the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not proceed after having made his point. He made no point of order, but he made what I deem to be a point of elucidation. The point was made; he should not go on after that. He will never do that again, I am sure.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee submitted a Report recommending a general revision of salaries for Members of the House and Officers of the House. There were not two separate and distinct Reports. If the hon. senior member for St. James is saying that consideration of the Report should be postponed, he is saying that the Officers of the House should be denied the privileges and concessions which are offered to Civil Servants. The Opposition had four members on the Committee, and if this is not an after-thought, why is it that the Committee could not have made two Reports — one for the Officers and one for Members of the House? We have asked that this matter be dealt with as an urgent matter, not because the Ministers are getting anything out of it, but because the average clerk downstairs in the Post Office is going to get two weeks' advance in pay at the increased rate so that he can shop and buy something for his children for Christmas, and the Officers of the House are not in that position tonight.
6.25 p.m.

The position is that he can get his, but not at the increased rate of pay; so that the spending power of the Civil Servant or the clerk salary-wise will necessarily be greater than that of the Officers of the House, and we are trying to bring them into line so that their spending power can be commensurate with officers in the Civil Service of similar rank. The Cabinet itself is not getting anything out of this. I would just like to make one point and it is this: if the Opposition is not satisfied and feels that the recommendation made on their behalf is taking money out of the Treasury and the Treasury cannot bear it, being a bare Treasury right now, I am asking the Opposition whenever this Resolution is passed that they do not receive the increased salaries. I would like to see them refusing the increased salary when this Resolution is passed.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church is not going to refuse his salary, and I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will refuse his either, because he has worked for it. In the same way that we say that Civil Servants are to be remunerated commensurately with the production which they give, what is wrong with the House of Assembly seeing to it that its Officers and Members are properly remunerated? I see absolutely nothing wrong with that. As to the question of the postponement of this Resolution, I just want to make a final point. If all of the Members of the Opposition who were members of the Select

Committee are willing to give, and will give, an undertaking now even at this late stage, because it was obvious from the speeches made on the other side that the Official Opposition knew nothing of the Minority Report: otherwise they would have signed it; but they have all agreed to the proposals and they are now singing a different tune. There was no political capitalising in the Select Committee, but now there is this type of atmosphere in the House. That is why there was no opposition to the proposals. There was agreement in the Select Committee, but now there is opposition. If they agree to sign the Minority Report, then we will postpone the matter.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Speaking on the new motion for the postponement, when I hear from hon. members who have been in this House for a long time that there is no difference between these two Schedules, between the salaries of the Officers of the House and the Members, I do not seem to be able to read. I have a back of my mind that the salaries of the Officers of the House can be increased by Resolution, but salaries for Members of the House can only be increased by substantive Statute when the previous motion is carried. We have not yet heard from the Hon. Leader of the House that he intends to have the Bill passed in all its stages today. When I have these things a back of my mind, I wonder if I am hearing accurately when I hear things said to the contrary.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: I will give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is no option.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has completely misunderstood what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Minister forthwith proceed to elucidate.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When I referred to the question of there being no differentiation between the recommendations made for Members and Officers of the House in the Report, the hon. member seems to have been asleep when I was speaking. What I said was.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of the elucidation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What I said was that there was one Report of the Committee on the question of the revision of salaries for the Members and Officers of the House, and that there were not two separate and distinct Reports. We are now discussing the adoption of the Report of the Committee, and if that were to be postponed nothing can be done for the Officers of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made. Let the hon. senior member for St. Thomas resume his speech.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it may be that I have mistaken the necessity for the adoption of the Report before the passing of the Resolution. It may be that I am mistaken there, but Your Honour will correct me. Is it not possible to pass a Resolution dealing with the Officers of the House and not at the same time deal with members of the House? Speaking as one who has recently been in this House, I cannot see that the matter of the Officers of the House being dealt with can affect the postponement of the other part of the Resolution. It was remarked and repeated that members of the Opposition have not seen the Minority Report. I want to say, Sir, that I saw the Minority Report too late and that was entirely due to my fault. I am not suggesting that the Minority Report was written unknown to members of the Opposition. I am suggesting that it is my misfortune to have come into this House and seen the Minority Report at this time. It was perhaps unfortunate that I did not see this Report earlier. A Bill would have to be introduced to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.
6.35 p.m.

I make one final plea to the Government and members on the other side. Let us report progress and ask leave to sit again. The only thing which we should do now is to consider the Resolution to provide salaries for the Officers of the House and I have no hesitation to say that all members would support it. There are certain assumptions which I would hesitate to make. I would hesitate to assume now what is the hush-hush on matters as regards members of the Government. I hope the Hon. Leader of the House would not get up and assume that the Opposition would do this and do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he cannot speak after the Hon. Leader of the House, and if he wishes to speak he may now speak on the motion for the postponement. We are now discussing the postponement.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The point I want to make is that this is a motion which comes from the Opposition; so I should be able to speak last, not the Leader of the House. The motion which I would be supporting came from this side of the House.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Leader of the House rises to reply to the motion for the postponement, he may now reply.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: To all the speeches?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes he may reply to all the speeches. Standing Order 27 which deals with the right of reply is as follows:-

"1. The mover of a motion may reply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other Member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order.

2. A Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or any Government Officer."

Therefore, it is the rule and practice of this Chamber that all hon. members should speak before the Leader of the House because he has the right to reply after all hon. members have spoken.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is just Your Honour's interpretation. Anyhow, something was said before and I wish to avail myself now of the opportunity to speak.

I listened to the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and I could not help thinking that the whole spirit of his speech reminded me of someone who did not speak but gained the reputation of being a wise man. I suggest the hon. member made the sort of speech he made failing to see the distinction between the two Schedules of this Report and failing to see the difference in making recommendations for the Staff and making recommendations for members of the House.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew seemed in his speech really to have been tripping himself up as he went on.
6.45 p.m.

I would like to see a postponement for much longer, but what could be more absurd than for the hon. member to say that to postpone this until next Tuesday is something to deprive the Staff of getting more money in their pockets to spend at Christmas, as if Tuesday comes after Christmas? That is the first point the hon. member made which reminded me of the member for Peterborough. The hon. member then talked about Civil Servants and sneered at our suggestion that the Government side should find the

words "Civil Servant" like poison. If you have not got a bare Treasury, why pay the Civil Servants in instalments? You have money to pay yourselves and the Civil Servants must wait for instalments! Everybody outside knows that the Treasury is bare, but the Government knows from inside, and all this Minority Report asks is to postpone this matter.

I will pass over for the moment the utter absurdity of appealing to other members to sign this Minority Report. If this thing passes, the members of the Government would be showing a profound contempt for public opinion. If the Government has not, go now and telephone Rediffusion, and put an advertisement in the *News* and *Advocate* tomorrow that you will go in the villages tomorrow and tell the people what you are doing. I challenge you to do that. You know very well that the Civil Servants have to wait month by month to get what they will get, while you will get it through the Treasury if this thing passes. There are hungry unemployed people who have children at home and who cannot buy an extra rum at Christmas, but we are voting money for ourselves. Would the hon. member know what we are going to do with the increase? Does he know how we spend our present salaries or what we propose to do with any increases?

What I got up to say -- and I tried to do it as I have done from the time I entered this House, in the most amicable way, inspired chiefly by one thing -- is that everybody who knows or read of the Independence celebrations of other Caribbean Territories and other ex-Colonies, knows that Washington, Whitehall, France, and the Soviet Republic are waiting and watching; but hon. members do not know because they shut their ears. They ask -- "How do you think these boys are getting on? Do you think they are really getting something out of politics?" We are accused of making political capital out of this; but when we consider the effect of our asking the House to do this and think of the future prosperity of Barbados, hon. members sneer and have hilarious laughter at some so-called witticism of some colleague over there. I solemnly warn this House that this is not just that a member should get more money or not; this is an exhibition by Barbados before the face of the world when everything is fresh and new, when people are asking how the Government is going to fare; how the Government is going to behave; what sort of politicians can they rely on. Of course we believe that some of these pioneer industrialists ask whether money counts more than honour with the Government of Barbados. Some of them are going to ask whether these are fellows who love money, and tonight we will give them the answer. We are thinking of more money rather than what the public would say.

Suppose any hon. member goes tomorrow night or Sunday and holds a meeting in one of the villages in his parish, he would get questions thrown at him such as: "Is it true that the Civil Servants cannot get their increases straight away?" You would answer "Yes". "Is it true that the Public Treasury is bare?" You will answer "No". "Is it true that you forgot to help the poor people and even school children with a meal at Independence time, but invited some of your friends who have no connection whatsoever to Barbados officially and paid their fare?" I would like to hear you answer. "Is it true, going down the list of invitees, that you could find money for people who were your friends?"

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is apparently straying from the subject matter of the Resolution when he goes into details of persons who were invited to celebrations, whose friends they were and so on.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minority Report which I made and which Your Honour read out, points out that the Treasury is bare. If the Treasury is bare, it is because we spent money unnecessarily in other directions. If the Treasury was over-flowing do you think you would see that Minority Report? I am saying that if you had the courage to hold meetings and explain this to your constituents, you would have questions thrown at you; so what answer would you give? Barbados is on trial. I am not dealing now with the aspect of the particular members and

what reflection is made on them as minor as Mr. A or Mr. B., but what would the outside world say? We have had the boast in Barbados of saying you do not get corruption in Barbados; you get it in such-and-such a place. Are we now anxious to throw away our past reputation? Anybody can make mistakes, but I see this afternoon from the remarks of the members on the opposite side that they cannot conceive of hon. members of the Opposition taking a high point of view when they say they do not agree with something the Government is doing. Instead of that, they say we are making political capital of an issue.

Mr. Speaker, salaries are low in comparison with the cost of living; but if salaries are low for us, you have to think what they are when you apply it to people in the lower income bracket, let alone the unemployed. Salaries are low and therefore income is low. All that is true, but what we have said is that this is not the time to help ourselves before helping the others.

You have ruled that the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael were not out of order, but I dare say that what was really said the Reporter did not take down. I am not going any further, but the member for St. Michael admitted he said more than that. I do not think I should deal anymore with what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said, but I would like to add that when he spoke of the Minority Report not being signed by the others, and made some reference to the possibility of members in the Labour Party not knowing about the Minority Report, you know, Mr. Speaker, that as Chairman of that Committee Meeting I said it was with regret that you would have my Minority Report. Throwing out insulting language like that to members of the Opposition does not get anybody anywhere. If hon. members refer to my age, it should be remembered that it has brought vast experience. 6.55 p.m.

When it is suggested that the procedure has been changed and I do not know what has happened since my time in this House, I suppose that after what I am going to say now, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy will not repeat the sneers. When reference is made to my age and my absence from this House, I wonder if hon. members reflect that since I have left this House in 1958 I was not spending my time in selling rice or corned beef or cooking and distributing chicken backs. I was in Parliament continuing my knowledge and gaining the experience of being in a Parliament which was less intriguing in their views than this Parliament is. All that is by the way. I again say that I came into this House this afternoon and I am thinking that I am hoping for too much. I was hoping that the bitterness and the slime in some places in the last election campaign would have been over. I think we should appeal to the public to accept us as the people will have it, and we should be as ready and willing to show to the world that we are capable of running our own affairs just as the ex-African colonies, or some of them, have done. We want to show that we, in Barbados, have a reputation for setting an example to the Caribbean and other colonies throughout the world. The growth of our Constitution was faster than theirs and our education was higher.

Sir, I came into this House hoping that I would not have to raise my voice or to make any reference to any sneers. I appealed to the Acting Prime Minister and Leader of the House almost in my first utterance in here, for peace, to be willing to be big, and he will get nothing different from that from the Opposition; but if this sort of thing is going on because we have adopted a lofty attitude and they are saying that we are making political capital out of it, then God help us! It is true that tempers will sometimes flare up and differences of opinion will come; but I will no longer, after this debate, appeal to the good sense or the high sense of responsibility of the Government. I shall take them for what they are and remember that in an impoverished Barbados it is possible for a Minister to say: "I have been in here for a long time, but I am entitled to an increase of salary for my work." It is possible not to answer what the minority is saying. The minority is saying: "Not at this time; postpone this and on Tuesday you can easily make the

necessary change, in order to bring in only the Staff and we will not open our mouths". All of us want the Staff to get their salaries. We are now going to give the Government a challenge as they were prepared to attack. Let them go and ask public opinion if they are satisfied with the stand which we took when we said that we will not put money into our pockets when there are other things to be done. Why has no member of the Government attempted to deny the basis on which this Minority Report is written? The Treasury is bare, and whatever money you can scrape up, scrape it up and give the deserving before you give yourself. That has always been our view. I appeal for the good name of Barbados not to show this profound contempt for public opinion that you are showing. For the good name of Barbados we say that they are wrong, so to speak, in that they are putting their own pockets before the poor masses of the people, and we are saying that we should not consider ourselves first. I appeal to them to do something for the reputation of Barbados instead of rising no higher than throwing bricks. Little children do that, and that does not take us anywhere.

We will take this debate as probably the most serious debate that any of us in the past or in the future will have, because outsiders are looking at us. Reference has been made to the fact that I introduced this matter of payment for members of this House. I want to say this; that the kind of people who used to come in here before the Barbados Labour Party changed the whole attitude of this country, did not need any money. People like ourselves — non-merchants, non-planters — as soon as people like ourselves, people like most hon. members began to come in here, it was unreasonable to ask them to give their time and labours without payment. On that basis, I brought in that Bill. Of course, the hon. junior member for Christ Church can be excused.

7.05 p.m.

There was no salary increase for members in 1958 during my time. That was obviously intended as a smear. That is just intended to say, "You did it!"

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I said I did not know whether it was during his term of office or whether it was after. I know that an increase was made around that time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. It is not even a point of explanation.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If I misquoted the Hon. Minister, I apologise to him. If he says that he does not remember if it was in my time or after, then I apologise.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has lasted longer than I thought. I do seriously suggest to the hon. members on that side to let this be postponed until next Tuesday and that a motion be made to deal with the salaries of the Staff, so that the Staff will get their money on Wednesday or Thursday or whatever time it is. This matter can be adjourned until further.

I thank the House for listening to me; but I ask the House not just to listen to me, but to examine their consciences. Go and tell the people what we are doing and ask them the answer.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Leader of the House exercises his right to speak in reply, I want to satisfy myself that no other hon. member desires to speak. (A pause). I am now sure no hon. member desires to speak. The Hon. Leader of this House may exercise his right to reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Ordinarily, I would not wish to have made the sort of speech I have to make now, and to deal expeditiously with the matter before us. However, certain remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition imputing hon. members of this Government impels me to say something now in reply, because I would not like those re-

marks to go unanswered. I myself belong to a political Party, and any member of a political Party can say anything of the Democratic Labour Party, and I, on my part, would not worry to reply; but I would not allow the hon. member -- the Leader of the Opposition -- to make all sorts of denigrating remarks against this Party and slander this Government and let him get away with it.

It is not now that the hon. member is saying all sorts of things about this Party. Even before we took the oath of allegiance in 1961, the hon. member put it on record that the people who succeeded the Barbados Labour Party was a crowd of wild people and rascals.

I want to ask him this. First of all, Your Honour knows that nothing he is saying now is worse than what he has said before. He is now talking about patriotism. All that is rank hypocrisy.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I object to that. A former Minister of that Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition proceeds, I will ask whether the Hon. Leader of the House is disposed to withdraw the words "rank hypocrisy", the last words of that sentence, and to which I gather, exception is being taken.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you.

7.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am giving this matter very careful consideration in consultation, as I normally do, with my colleague the Hon. and Learned Deputy Speaker. I apologise to hon. members for the hiatus.

7.25 p.m.

I have had the advantage of referring to all available authorities and have considered the exact words as taken down by the Official Report. I have also had the advantage of consulting with my learned brother, the Deputy Speaker. The words, as taken down by the Official Reporter, are: I quote: "He is now talking about patriotism. All that to me is rank hypocrisy". It is clear that the word "hypocrite" may be regarded as being unparliamentary. There was a debate in 1902 in which that word used in the House of Commons caused the Chair to intervene when, apparently, it was spoken by one hon. member of another hon. member; but I have not got that Report now.

The expression which was used by the Hon. Leader of the House has been reported to me as follows: "He is now talking about patriotism. All that to me is rank hypocrisy". As we understand, on careful consideration of the text, the words "all that" refer to "talking about patriotism," and "the talk about patriotism" or even "patriotism" itself which is said to constitute rank hypocrisy. My ruling is that although this phrase may be perilously close to the borderline -- and I trust it is the closest that any hon. member could ever get to in this Session -- it is my ruling that inasmuch as the words "all that" are clearly referable to patriotism and contain no specific reference to the hon. member, I do not deem that there is any Standing Order contravened. That is my ruling; but let me repeat that the word "hypocrite" being used in regard to any hon. member is unparliamentary and is a contravention of Standing Order 26 (5) and can be ordered by the Chair to be withdrawn or certain consequences will follow. The word "hypocrisy" according to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on page 945, Third Edition, is derived from a Greek word meaning to answer, play a part, pretend. "The assuming of a false appearance of virtue or goodness, 'with dissimulation of real character or inclinations, especially in respect of religious life or belief; hence 'dissimulation, pretence, sham.'" But note in Parliamentary Debates, Commons 1962-63, Volume 672 page 115 where one member, in the Commons, said of another "he is such a hypocrite in these matters" that Mr. Deputy Speaker (Sir Robert Crimston) observed: "It would be better if the hon. Gentleman did not use that phrase".

At this stage, the Members of the Opposition left the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a substantive motion that further consideration of the Report of the Select Committee be now postponed. Hon. members who are in favour of that will please say "Aye", but hon. members who are of a contrary opinion will please say "No". (MEMBERS: No.) I think the "Noes" have it. The question now is that the Report of the Select Committee be now adopted. Hon. members who are of that opinion will please say "Aye", but hon. members who are of a contrary opinion will please say "No". Methinks the "Ayes" have it. I now declare the Report of the Select Committee duly to be adopted.

NOTICE OF BILLS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Bills:-

A Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

A Bill to amend the Chaplains and Printing Committee, Act, 1891.

I also beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"RESOLVED that with effect from 1st April, 1966, the salary scales and salary points payable to the Officers of the House of Assembly mentioned in the Schedule hereto be as shown in the said Schedule."

I also give notice of my intention to deal with these three Measures immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave to proceed with three matters of which he has just given notice, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. (After a pause). There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.
7.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act, 1891, 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with the Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I call the attention of hon. members to the form in which this Bill is granting powers. It reads:-

"BE IT ENACTED by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Assembly of Barbados, and by the authority of the same as follows:-

1. This Act may be cited as the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Act, 1966.

2. Section 2 of the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is hereby amended by the repeal of subsection (1) and the substitution therefor of the following subsection --"

To hear some people talk, you would not think that their own affairs were being attended to.

The section goes on to read:

"(1) Subject to the provisions of section 3 of this Act, members of the House of Assembly shall be remunerated as follows:-

- (a) the member for the time being holding the office of Speaker shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of seven thousand, two hundred dollars per annum and a travelling allowance of one thousand and eighty dollars per annum;

And there is a proviso attached.

- (b) the member for the time being holding the office of Deputy Speaker shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of four thousand four hundred and forty dollars per annum and a travelling allowance of six hundred dollars per annum;

Then there is a proviso as to when the Deputy Speaker carries out the duties of the Speaker.

- "(c) the member for the time being holding the office of Chairman of Committees shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of four thousand two hundred dollars per annum and a travelling allowance of six hundred dollars per annum;

- (d) the member who is for the time being the Leader of the Opposition shall be entitled to receive salary at the rate of four thousand eight hundred dollars per annum, a travelling allowance of seven hundred and twenty dollars per annum and a duty allowance of nine hundred and sixty dollars per annum;

If we were as spiteful as some people say, we would not have dealt with this in the way we have done. Despite that the hon. member is so bitterly opposed to this Government, we have dealt with everybody. The hon. member sat in at the meeting of the Select Committee and he knew of everything that was done.

- "(e) every member other than the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, the Leader of the Opposition and any member while in receipt of remuneration as a Minister or Parliamentary Secretary shall be entitled to receive salary at the rate of thirty-six hundred dollars per annum and a travelling allowance of six hundred dollars per annum."

Sir, those are the amended provisions for the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, the Chairman of Committees and members of the House other than the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and the Leader of the Opposition. All have been taken care of and I now beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw this to the attention of hon. members. The provisions of this Bill will be effective from 1st April, 1966.

I now beg to move that Your Honour leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the 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. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

7.45 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

CHAPLAINS AND PRINTING COMMITTEE ACT, 1966

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the Bill to amend the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act, 1891, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members that this provides for increase in the remuneration of the Chaplains both of this House and the Other Place with effect from 1st April, 1966. The amending Clause is of course Section 2 in which the words "three hundred and sixty" are taken out and the words "six hundred" substituted therefor. In other words, the salaries of the Chaplains of this House and the Other Place will be \$50 a month instead of \$30.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

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

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

RESOLUTION re/SALARIES OF OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the third matter is the Resolution with respect to the salary scales and salary points in respect of salaries payable to officers of the House. The Schedule is hereto attached, and hon. members have seen that there is general agreement with its provisions.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business. I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter, whom I am very glad to see in his place, wants leave of the House to give notice of Questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually I did give the assurance to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that I would be asking the House to grant leave to put these questions which he was unable to do earlier this afternoon.

I take there is no objection. Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter proceed.

QUESTIONS

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that recent heavy rains which fell in November and December this year have caused many of the residents of New Road and Gill's Terrace aback of Church Street, Speightstown, to suffer much anxiety and inconvenience due to the overflowing of the Salt Pond which surrounded their homes and temporarily confined the occupants in-doors?

2. Is Government aware that such overflowing of the Salt Pond was a great threat to life and property, and to animals belonging to residents of the said New Road and Gill's Terrace at Church Street, Speightstown?

3. Will Government make an investigation or cause one to be made into the need for canalizing the Salt Pond in Speightstown?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that a tenantry road running through the district of Gay's in the parish of Saint Peter is in a bad state of disrepair?

2. Will Government give early consideration in effecting the necessary repairs to the tenantry road?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the sad plight of hawkers of green vegetables and fruit and other perishable commodities who ply their goods for sale in Speightstown on week-days?

2. Is Government aware that such hawkers have to squat on sidewalks, on private properties, and even outside the Public Library at Queen Street, Speightstown?

3. Is Government aware that certain properties situated at Sand Street and Major's Walk were compulsorily acquired for the purpose of erecting a public market in Speightstown?

4. Does Government intend to use these acquired lands for the purpose of erecting a public market and slaughter-house?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that the results of a survey conducted by the Highways and Transport Department relating to the need for providing access roads to facilitate peasants in getting their agricultural produce from field to factory have not been implemented?

2. Will Government redouble its efforts in this direction with a view to providing such access roads as the survey entailed?

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with the appointment of Committees and Boards.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with the appointment of the Committees and Boards, and if there is no objection, leave will

46
be granted *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the members of the Printing Committee for the last session be the members of the Printing Committee for this Session. They are:- His Honour the Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Hon. G. G. Fergusson); the Hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Hon. J. C. Tudor); the Hon. junior member for St. James (Mr. Holder), the hon. junior member for St. George (Mr. Hoppin), the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown (Mr. Lynch) and the hon. senior member for St. Peter (Mr. Husbands).

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

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

SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the members of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the last Session be the members of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for this Session. They are:- The hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. Yearwood), the hon. junior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Corbin), the hon. senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Weekes) and Mr. R. C. Chapman.

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

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

SUGAR PRODUCTION AND EXPORT CONTROL BOARD

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the members of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board for the last Session be the members of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board for this Session. They are:-

The hon. senior member for St. George (Mr. Lowe), the hon. junior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Corbin), Mr. R. L. Greene and Mr. E. L. Bannister.

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

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

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the members of the Public Accounts Committee for the last Session be the members of the Public Accounts Committee for this Session.

They are:- The hon. junior member for St. Joseph (Sir G. H. Adams), the hon. junior member for St. James (Mr. Holder), the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. Yearwood), the hon. junior member for St. Philip (Mr. Sargeant), the hon. senior member for St. George (Mr. Lowe), the hon. senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Springer) and the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown (Mr. Mottley).

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

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

VICTORIA EMIGRATION SOCIETY

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the Victoria Emigration Society the members of which are appointed by the Speaker, I hereby declare that the Members of this Society at the

end of the last Session be the members whom I now appoint for this Session. They are:- the hon. junior member for St. James (Mr. Holder), the hon. senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Weekes) and the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown, (Mr. Lynch).

I am well aware that a Bill has been given notice of in relation to the Victoria Emigration Society, but until that Bill becomes law, it is my ineluctable duty to make this appointment.
8.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are of course certain portions of the staff of the House who have not been covered and it is our intention to cover that staff. I would like Your Honour to summon a meeting of the Debates Committee so that their matter can be attended to. If that is convenient to Your Honour, I would like it to be done before the end of this week.

Mr. SPEAKER: That can be set down for Saturday morning of this week. That time may be slightly inconvenient to certain hon. members: but knowing that they are interested in the staff, I know that they will avail themselves to attend.

Mr. Clerk, I ask that you summon a meeting of the Debates Committee both orally and by writing to meet on Saturday.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we have concluded all the business which was to engage our attention; but before I move the motion for adjournment, there are two things which I would like to bring to the notice of hon. members.

One of them is this. I would like to express strongly, in the most emphatic terms, the firm disapproval of members of this side of the gross contempt of Your Honour which was manifested by five hon. members who notwithstanding the fact that Your Honour was in the middle of giving a ruling left this Chamber. That action on their part is contrary to decency.

There is nothing, perhaps, which we can do about it now; but I would like to put on record that this side of the House regards it as most discourteous behaviour, and in view of the fact that the position which Your Honour holds rests on the approval of the whole House because the Leader of the Opposition seconds the motion for your election to the Chair, it is most reprehensible that one of the members who approved Your Honour's election to the Chair should so early in the Session exhibit such behaviour and such gross misconduct. Whatever may be the feelings of hon. members on this matter, Your Honour was giving your ruling, and we feel that a line must be drawn and the ruling of the Chair must stand. At the same time, whenever the Chair is speaking it must be heard in silence.

We think that this is the worst manifestation of gross misbehaviour we have seen manifested in Parliament. I think, what makes it worse is the fact that one of the five members was himself a former Premier of this House and the Ex-Prime Minister in the now defunct West Indies Parliament and is the oldest member of this House. He therefore has a lot of experience in the service of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just say that in giving my ruling, I did not look at either side of the House. I was referring to two references before me and I did not observe what other hon. members were doing during the time when I was giving my ruling. I observed the absence of certain hon. members whom I had seen a very short time ago. I did not observe when they were in the act of removing themselves.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the second is much more pleasant. It is to avail Your Honour of the Season's Greetings which I do think Your Honour richly deserves.

We had a very satisfactory year and Your Honour has played a full part. Early in the year Your Honour took the Chair one day and sat through continuously during the five days of that debate.

I know that Your Honour would feel pleased of the part you played in that historic debate and to know that it has borne fruit in the getting of Independence in the same year in which that debate took place.

In connection with this, it is only a few weeks from now that we shall have the great privilege of celebrating -- we are happy to know at Your Honour's expense -- your thirtieth year of unbroken service in this House. We need not say that with your hospitality we look forward to that time.

On behalf of all of us, we wish Your Honour a very happy Christmas and a very prosperous New Year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very grateful to the hon. Leader of the House for the sentiments which he has expressed of me, and I hope that we would all live to see the 26th of next month. As to that remark he made, for obvious reasons I will not reply. To hon. members of this House, these greetings I heartily reciprocate.
8.15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before making the motion for Adjournment, I should like to pass through you on behalf of this side our greetings to members of the Staff.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th January, 1967, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will undertake to pass on to all members of the Staff the good wishes of members of this House, which I am sure members of the Staff will also fully reciprocate.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th January, 1967 at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.17 p.m.