THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961—66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th May, 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., *(Speaker);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries);* Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees);* and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

I have the honour to inform hon. members that I have received a letter from the Deputy Clerk, Mr. H. Lisle Thomas, (on behalf of Mr. H. O. St.C. Cumberbatch, the Clerk of this House) dated 3rd May, 1966, which reads as follows:-

"His Honour,
J. E. T. Brancker, Q.C., M.P.,
Speaker, House of Assembly.

Your Honour,

As you are aware, I have to attend meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Trinidad and hereby apply for two weeks' leave of absence from my duties as Clerk of the House of Assembly from the 4th instant.

The Deputy Clerk has, subject to the approval of the Honourable House, consented to act as Clerk, and Mr. Chezley R. Boyce, Barrister-at-Law, has consented, subject to such approval as aforesaid, to act as Deputy Clerk, during my absence.

Yours faithfully,
H. O. St.C. Cumberbatch.
Clerk, House of Assembly.
per H. Lisle Thomas."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Clerk be granted two weeks' leave of absence from his duties as Clerk of this House from 4th May of the current month.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CLERK TO ACT AS CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk, Mr. H. Lisle Thomas, be appointed to act as Clerk of this House during the absence of the Clerk.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF Mr. CHEZLEY R. BOYCE TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. Chezley R. Boyce be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk of this House for two weeks from 4th May, 1966.

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

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter dated 10th May, 1966, from the Librarian and Secretary of the House of Assembly, which reads as follows:-

"His Honour,
J. E. T. Brancker, Q.C., M.P.,
Speaker,
House of Assembly.

Your Honour,

Having been selected as a member of the Barbados Bridge Team to be engaged in a tournament against Trinidad from 13th to 16th May, in Trinidad, I would be grateful if the Honourable House would grant me four days' casual leave, beginning the 13th inst., so as to represent Barbados.

I am,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Lionel Hutchinson

Librarian and Secretary
House of Assembly."

CASUAL LEAVE GRANTED LIBRARIAN AND SECRETARY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that four days' casual leave as requested be granted to the Librarian and Secretary.

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

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

ACCOUNTS AND STATEMENTS RECEIVED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Accountant General Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1965 as prepared by him and similarly as prepared by him Accounts and Statements for the month of December, 1965.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.4) Order, 1966.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the Quarter ended 30th September, 1965.

The Customs Duties (British West Indies Central Cane Breeding Station) Order, 1966.

The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1966.

The Customs Duties (Canadian Technical Assistance) Order, 1966.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1966.

Also, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 99 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 83 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is ready.

Also ready is Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 78 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael which was given notice of previously.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question.

To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

Will the Premier state whether it is the Government's intention to bring into force single member constituencies as provided for in the Boundaries Commission Order?

Will the Premier state the reasons why the said Boundaries' Commission Order has not been proclaimed by the Governor?

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider a Bill to amend the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society Act, 1851.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to enquire of the Hon. Leader of the House the reason for suspending the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not suspending, in fact he cannot do so; he has merely made a motion. Only the House can suspend.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that I made a lapse and I apologise to Your Honour. However, I want to enquire of the hon. member the reasons for asking this Hon. Chamber to suspend the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who desires to contribute before the Hon. Leader of the House replies? No other hon. member desires to speak, and the Hon. Leader of the House may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is that this is my usual practice, and it does not inhibit hon. members from exercising whatever franchise they wish to.

The question that standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

QUESTION TIME

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

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

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

QUESTION re PROPERTIES BOUGHT BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 99 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Has Government bought any more private properties since Culloden Farm?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state how many, and the cost of same?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"Yes, Sir.

The number of properties bought is twenty-one (21) and the cost is $396,777.98."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, will the Hon. Minister give a breakdown as to the cost of individual properties?

Mr. SMITH rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is entitled to put his question supplementarily now and have all the answers one time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the properties bought are as follows:-

On 18/12/64 land and wall building at Tweedside Hindsbury Road 11,906 square feet,price $50,000; on 18/8/65 land and wall building at Tweedside-Hindsbury Road 4,672 3/4 square feet,price $22,000;on 31/12/65 land at Tweedside/Hindsbury Road 970 1/2 square feet $3,882; 23/4/65 land and wall building at Belmont/Martindales Road/Halls Road 3,309 square feet, price $18,900; 17/12/65 land at Fairfield/Welches Road 17,520 square feet, price $15,768; 31/5/65, land at Collymore Rock 6,523 square feet, price $1,485.20; 9/10/64 land at Mangrove, St. Philip 3 acres, 3 roods, 29 1/2 perches, price $5,900; 23/12/65 land at Fairfield/Welches - two bits - 7,487 square feet and 50 square feet, price of both being $3,617.76; 2/12/65 land and wooden building at Fairfield/Welches 6,355 square feet, price $35,000; 3/9/64 land and wall building at Jemmotts Lane/Bay Street 6,360 square feet, price $40,000; 9/10/65 land at Aquatic Gap, Bay Street 1,667 square feet, price $1,714; 31/8/65 land at Constitution Road 7,985 square feet, price $8,000;24.1.65 land at Clermont, St. James 6,719 1/2 square feet, price $671.95; 17.11.65 land at Hart Street 6,522 square feet, price $35,928; 7/1/66 land at Lodge Hill - two portions - 34,297 6/10 square feet and 1,075 2/10 square feet, price $14,149.12; there was a gift of two portions of land at Molyneux, St. James 27,682 square feet and 4,875 square feet; 18/2/66 land at Fairfield/Welches 2,320 square feet price $775; 1/10/64 land and building at Coleridge Street, 3,205 square feet, price $39,076.45; 4/3/65 land and buildings at Weymouth, 1 3/4 acres, price $31,422.50; 19/11/65 land and building at Farley Hill, St. Peter 12 acres, 2 roods, 27 1/2 perches, price $48,146; 4/4/66 land and buildings at corner Mahogany Lane/Tudor Street 3,550 square feet, price $20,342 - making a total of $396,777.98.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, has the Government ever bought "Flodden".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir; Government has never bought "Flodden".

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a supplementary,are there any negotiations going on between Government and the owners of "Flodden"?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must have notice of that question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did the hon. member hear the question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House said that he requires notice of that question, but I must say it does not arise in my view even supplementarily from the substantive query which deals with properties which have been bought.

QUESTION *re* PROPER DRAINAGE AT BAYCROFT ROAD

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 78 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that because of the lack of proper drainage, the residents of School Road, Baycroft Road, Baycroft New Road - all in the Parish of St. Michael suffer grave inconvenience owing to -

(a) the deposit of refuse from other districts on their lands;

(b) the flooding of their premises after a heavy rainfall; and

(c) the prevalence of mosquitoes as a direct result thereof?

2. Will the Government take steps as speedily as possible to lay a proper system.

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

"(1) Yes, Sir.

(2) Consideration will be given to the provision of a proper drainage system for School Road and Baycroft New Road when funds become available. "

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, would Government say whether it would be available in this case during the present financial year?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this is possible.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When the Hon. Minister says this is possible, I would like him to say whether it would be probable.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I did not know I had reached the stage where the Leader of the Opposition could teach me the English language. I said it is possible, and a lot of things are probable. The hon. member cannot tell me what I should say, or he can answer the question himself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is rude, but it is not for the Minister to be rude when an hon. member asks questions. Unless there is rudeness from this side, it is unnecessary for the hon. member to be rude.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that intended as a supplementary question - as to whether the hon. member has been rude?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, is it not a fact that the Government voted money for drainage in Baycroft Road in last year's Estimates?

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.....

Mr. SPEAKER: As a supplementary!

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, do hon. members on the other side realise.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid a supplementary question cannot be apropos hon. members on the other side. A supplementary question must be put to the Minister.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works says.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member put his supplementary question.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking if the hon. member realises the meaning of "possible"?

Mr. SPEAKER: That alleged supplementary question is disallowed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the supplementary question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I could not tell him if money was voted for drainage in Baycroft Road last year, but even if it were, how would I know that something of a more serious nature did not arise that may have caused this money to be diverted? There is no law saying that if money has been allocated to drainage that it has to be a specific drainage job. I could not say whether money was allocated for drainage or for Baycroft Road for that matter.

In reply to the question about the meaning of "possible"..

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member want notice of that?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I really do not want notice of it.

QUESTION *re* DANGEROUS BEND AT JOES RIVER: St. JOSEPH

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 83 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware that there is a very dangerous bend on Highway 3 Joes River Road known as "Back Gate"?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government, in view of the heavy increase of traffic as a result of vehicles going to and coming from the East Coast Road - and further in view of the fact that a school is being built nearby, and in addition to the School's playing field there is to be a general playing field which will increase the risk of accident - take the necessary action to have the course widened at the earliest convenience?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government cause an inspection to be made with a view of ascertaining what should be done in the circumstances?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now after 3.15 p.m., but in view of the suspension of the Standing Orders, Question Time is still permitted.

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

"(1) Yes Sir.

(2) Consideration will be given to the possibility of improving the bend on Joes River Road, St. Joseph, known as "Back Gate", when the 1966-67 road works programme is being prepared."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Hon. Minister for his reply.

QUESTION *re* REPAIR OF ROADS AT MARCHFIELD AND COTTAGE VALE

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 103 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that two roads viz:- Marchfield and Cottage Vale, St. Philip were never repaired since they were built by the defunct Vestry approximately twenty years ago?

Mr. Speaker, I think part of this question has been omitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am having a check made as to whether there is anything omitted.

Whilst we are awaiting a check in respect of No. 103, Question No. 104 also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip.

QUESTION *re* DISREPAIR OF ROAD AT HEADINGS, St. PHILIP

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that certain residents of Headings St. Philip find it almost impossible to leave their homes in case of rains, owing to the bad condition of the road over which they must travel?

Will the Minister consider the possibility of alleviating the inconvenience and hardship of the residents of the district by repairing the said road during the year 1966-67?

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

"No, Sir.

An investigation has shown that the road at Headings, St. Philip, which until recently was the responsibility of the Southern District Council, is in need of reconstruction and of improved drainage. Consideration will be given to this project when the 1966-67 road works programme is being prepared."

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware of the number of roads that are called "Headings" in St. Philip?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not that is a supplementary. The answer to that question is "No". But I know Headings.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, will the Minister state if he has inspected the road which I have mentioned?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is that I have not inspected Headings since this question was asked, but I am a frequent visitor to Headings. I do not inspect roads when questions are asked; that is what we have the Highways and Transport Department there to do; but if I am not satisfied, then I go myself.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state who has inspected the road?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I could not really tell the hon. member who inspected the road. Highways and Transport employs over 1,500 workers, and among them are some 30 or 40 Superintendents, Supervisors and engineers; so I would not know who by name inspected the road. All I can say is that when a question is submitted to this House relative to a Ministry, it is sent to the Head of the Department who is asked to look into the matter. The matter is looked into and an estimate sent along to be included, if necessary, in the reply. So I cannot say if A, B, or C inspected the road.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister consider the possibility of making an enquiry concerning this road?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I must draw to the attention of the House that the road in question came under the hon. junior member for St. Philip when he was Chairman of the Southern District Council; so if I tell him that this road was inspected, I cannot have him asking things that are irrelevant. I have given the answer that the road will be fixed, but every minute he is jumping up like a Yo-yo asking.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member not to speak of Yo-Yo in this context.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is not meant to be in any way derogatory towards the hon. member, but I am drawing to the hon. member's attention that I have answered the question fully.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot rule that "Yo-Yo" is unparliamentary, but nowhere would it be found in the Oxford Dictionary, and debates here shall be conducted in the English Language.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit here and allow this sort of thing to go on. This is absolutely out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition understand that no one in this House decides what is out of order in this House other than myself when I am in the Chair. Let the hon. member understand that very clearly now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, more than three supplementary questions have been asked, and I will ask the

Clerk to confirm that more than three questions having been asked, it is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will counsel the Hon. Leader of the Opposition not, even in his untrammelled exuberance, to allow his temper to carry him away. I have ruled that it is not out of order, and that there is no limit to the number of supplementary questions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am surprised that the hon. member is not acquainted with this aspect of Parliamentary procedure. But the questions genuinely must be supplementary!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no limit to the number, but they must be relevant.

I promised the hon. junior member for St. Philip that I would send for the original question No. 103 as put and signed by him, to ascertain whether or not there was any omission in the question as printed. I will read the question which was handed in after being read out in this Chamber. I am referring to No. 103 which was deferred. The original reads as follows:

"Is the Minister aware that two roads viz: Marchfield and Cottage Vale, St. Philip were never repaired since they were built by the defunct Vestry approximately twenty years ago?

Will the Minister consider the possibility of repairs to them during the year 1966-67?"

That separate question does not appear on today's Order Paper, and I must apologise profoundly to hon. members of this Chamber for these frequent errors and omissions due to lack of a proof reader or proof readers either in here or at the Government Printery or elsewhere or to other cause; but I deplore these all too frequent happenings.

Does the hon. junior member for St. Philip now wish to put that question No. 103?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that two roads viz: Marchfield and Cottage Vale, St. Philip were never repaired since they were built by the defunct Vestry approximately twenty years ago?

Will the Minister consider the possibility of repairs to them during the year 1966-67?

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

"No, Sir.

An investigation has shown that the roads at Marchfield and Cottage Vale, St. Philip, which, until recently, were under the control of the Southern District Council need to be resurfaced and properly drained. Consideration will be given to these projects when the 1966-67 road works programme is being prepared."

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the Hon. Minister for his reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: For the information of hon. members, apropos of the point which was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, Standing Order No. 14(5) says:

"Supplementary questions may be put for the purpose of elucidating an oral answer, but the Speaker may refuse any such question which in his opinion introduces matter not related to the original question, or which infringes the provisions of Standing Order No. 12 (Contents of Questions)."

So far as Standing Order No. 12 is concerned, that deals merely with contents of questions and points out that questions may be put to Ministers relating to public affairs for which they are officially responsible, and points out that such questions shall conform to certain rules.

That concludes questions in respect of which Replies have been laid.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we are not ready on this side of the House to discuss any of the matters under Private Members' Business, but I understand that the Select Committee has reported on Item No. 4 under Private Members' Business, and I believe that the hon. junior member for Christ Church would like to complete that Item.

I therefore beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, is the hon. member saying that the Government is not in a position to do Private Members' Business?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I said we are not ready today to deal with any of the matters which might be raised under Private Members' Business, but I know that a Select Committee has reported on an Item in which the hon. junior member for Christ Church is engaged, and therefore I move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The point I was making is whether it would not be right for Private Members to deal with their matters, but I see the point the hon. member is making.

The question that Private Members' Business be now taken was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip has been referred to Select Committee.

Order No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

When debate on this matter was adjourned, I intimated that I would give a ruling in respect of a two-fold query which was addressed to the Chair. That ruling has been duly given. I understand it is not yet printed, and I know that a wholly inaccurate version of it has appeared, through no fault of the Government Printer, in the Official Gazette. It was deferred for my ruling which has been given, but it will be recalled that the Hon. and Learned member for St. John explained that he was reserving the right to speak, should my ruling be that the matter was debatable, and I have so ruled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I bow to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and was also referred to Select Committee.

Order No. 4 also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and was referred to Select Committee.

It is the Third Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society Act, 1851.

THE BARBADOS MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1966

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier today, the Select Committee reported and recommended that

the Bill be passed in its entirety. When I moved the second reading, I explained the purposes of the Amendment, but just to refresh hon. members, it was to eliminate the restriction which was put on the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society which was established since 1851. With this restriction removed, the Barbados Mutual Life Insurance Society would be empowered to deal in money matters much bigger than they have been doing in the past, and for that reason I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who, I observe, is not in his place.

Order No. 6 also stands in the name of that same hon. member.

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip who, I also observe, is not in his place.

And that concludes the Orders under Private Members' Business.

REPORT OF MATTER IN ADVOCATE NEWSPAPER

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to a report appearing in the issue of "The Advocate" newspaper of Monday, 9th May, 1966, on page 5, under the caption "Social Security debate tomorrow". It represents that the Bill on National Insurance and Social Security was to be debated in this Chamber today. I thought I should draw this matter to Your Honour's attention, and I should also like to draw to Your Honour's attention that a similar article appeared in the "Daily News" of today's date.

I should like to explain that I did not give the undertaking last week to have this matter debated today. I was very emphatic that I intended to give hon. members at least two weeks after laying this Bill last Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like first to see the document to which the hon. member has drawn my attention.

Mr. SPEAKER was handed copies of "The Advocate" and the "Daily News".

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the Hon. Minister of Trade and Labour, has been good enough to draw to my attention in a copy of a newspaper "The Advocate" of Monday, May 9, 1966, and in particular to page 5 thereof, sixth column, the caption of which is "Social Security debate tomorrow". "Members of the Barbados House of Assembly will tomorrow consider a Bill to establish a system of national insurance and social security for Barbados." Then there are three paragraphs which immediately follow in which an attempt is made to explain the system, and the fifth and final paragraph reads as follows:

"Notice of these Bills was given and they were read a first time on May 3, this year."

I can say in view of this matter having been drawn officially to my attention that I clearly recall the Hon. Minister when he gave notice of this Bill on 3rd May, stating that he did not propose to ask the House to deal with this matter in less than a fortnight from that date, and I recall that the matter did not end there because there was a brief - should I say - controversy or cross-talk between the Hon. Minister and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as to whether the two weeks to which the Hon. Minister referred was due to start from that day, or whether it would start from the date when the Bill was circulated to and received by hon. members. That is my clear recollection of what occurred. I do not know if the Hon Minister, or the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, would bear me out as to that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I bear you out as to that, and I think the Hon. Minister is absolutely correct in what he has said. He did say that he intended to give at least two weeks to consider this Bill and would deal with it next Tuesday. I want to draw to his attention, however, that the Bill has not yet been printed and has not therefore reached members; so the question of dealing with it next Tuesday is going to be out of the question, because we have not seen the Bill yet. Seeing this information in the Press, I was wondering whether my Bill had been lost, strayed or stolen, but I am glad the Minister has raised this question. He is absolutely correct in saying that he had said he intended to give two weeks to consider the Bill and that it would be dealt with next Tuesday. The Press is wrong.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that I am aware that the Bill on National Insurance and Social Security has not reached hon. members. As a matter of fact, I did make enquiries yesterday at the Government Printery, and I have asked them to press on with the Bill, because if we can have the Bill from the Printery by tomorrow, it will be sent to hon. members by despatch riders so that members would have some time to study it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually there is no motion before the House. I merely invited two hon. members, the Hon. Minister who has drawn this officially to my notice and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if they would confirm, in the present unavoidable absence of the printed Hansard, my recollection of the statement made by the Hon. Minister last Tuesday and the short discussion that there was between the Hon. Minister and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I gather from each of these hon. members that they confirm my personal recollection which is thereby fortified by their expressions of views. But this matter is not now up for discussion. Any comment might be made - very briefly - on the motion for the adjournment of the House in respect of proceeding with a particular matter on the date to which it is proposed to adjourn.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister rose on a point of privilege, and I am rising on one too.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the question of privilege, I would remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 68 which reads as follows:-

"A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business.

If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

I do not rule that a matter has suddenly arisen which appears to involve the privileges of the House in respect of the matter which has been drawn to my attention, and I merely again point out that I asked two hon. members if they would in the absence of Hansard, confirm my recollection of what took place. The matter is not now up for discussion. The Hon. Minister drew something to my attention. I recalled what took place and I queried that Hon. Minister, and the only other hon. member of the House who took part in a brief discussion which took place last Tuesday, if their recollection was the same as mine, I called on them personally. This matter cannot be made a subject now for discussion; but, in any event, I have now to consider the other newspaper.

I have now received a copy of the other newspaper which is called "The Daily News", of Tuesday, May 10, 1966. On the front page, column at the extreme right, appears: "Edwards to move second reading of bill. On Tuesday, when the House of Assembly meets at 2.30 p.m., the Minister of Trade, Mr. DaCosta Edwards is expected to move the second reading of a Bill to establish a system of National Insurance and Social Security for the island, also the establishment of a National Insurance Fund for purposes connected with the scheme."

The only redeeming feature that appears to me in repect of this article, is that it says "On Tuesday when the House of Assembly meets at 2.30 p.m.", without stating to which Tuesday it refers, and the House generally meets on Tuesday.

Now I would like draw hon. members' attention apropos of the matter officially drawn to my attention by the Hon. Minister, to a passage in Sir Erskine May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament," the Seventeenth (1964) Edition, on page 136. It reads as follows:-

"A Member who complains of something published in a newspaper ought regularly to conclude by moving that the passage or passages complained of be read by the Clerk at the table, but in recent years the Speaker has not insisted upon the observance of this formality. When the Member has concluded his complaint the Speaker desires him to bring the document to the table and, when the document has been brought to the table, directs the Clerk of the House to read the passages complained of."

Mr. Clerk, will you please read the passages complained of?

Mr. CLERK: "The Advocate", "Monday, May 9, 1966, page 5:

"Social Security debate , tomorrow

"Members of Barbados' House of Assembly will tomorrow consider a Bill to establish a system of national insurance and social security for Barbados.

The system will provide for payments by way of sick benefits, maternity benefit, invalidity benefit, funeral grant, old age contributory grant or pension and survivors' benefit.

This system will substitute for the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1963, a plan of insurance against personal injury caused by accident arising out of and in the course of a person's employment and against prescribed disease and injuries due to the nature of a person's employment.

One other Bill to be discussed seeks to provide for the operation, interpretation, citation and printing and recording of enactments and for related purposes.

Notice of these Bills was given and they were read a first time on May 3, this year."

In the "Daily News" of Tuesday, May 10, 1966.

"Edwards to move second reading of Bill.

"On Tuesday, when the House of Assembly meets at 2.30 p.m., the Minister of Trade, Mr. DaCosta Edwards is expected to move the second reading of a Bill to establish a system of National Insurance and Social Security for the island, also the establishment of a National Insurance Fund for purposes connected with the scheme."

Mr. SPEAKER: Continuing to read from page 136 of Chapter VIII:-

"When the document or the particular passages complained of have been read, it is the duty of the Member who has brought the matter under the notice of the House to follow up his complaint with a motion. Where he is not prepared to do so, the House has proceeded to the orders of the day."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of the following Resolution:

"RESOLVED that His Honour the Speaker be requested to inform the Advocate Company Limited, publishers of "The Advocate" newspaper, of the grave displeasure of this Honourable House at the inaccuracies contained in an article appearing in the issue of "The Advocate" newspaper of the 9th May, 1966, under the caption "Social Security debate tomorrow", on page 5 thereof."

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby direct the Clerk, without delay, to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the publishers of the newspaper "The Advocate".

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO HON. JUNIOR MEMBER FOR CHRIST CHURCH

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of this House for three months' leave of absence from my duties as a member of this House as from 12th May, 1966.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Christ Church is asking for leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House for three months dating from 12th May, 1966, and if there is no objection, the hon. member will be granted leave.

There being no objection, three months' leave of absence is granted from 12th May, 1966, to the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th May, 1966, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment the Hon. Minister said just now that he took up the matter of the Bill on Social Security with the Printers, and there is a possibility that it will be sent out this week to hon. members. If this Bill is received by members on Friday or Saturday, or even tomorrow afternoon, I am wondering if the Minister would still want to deal with it next Tuesday because it would not be fair to hon. members on this side of the House to be given such short notice of a Bill and expect us to come here next Tuesday and do justice to that Bill. I do not know how voluminous or otherwise the Bill is, but I am sure it is a very important Bill and would take some time to study; so two or three days would not be sufficient time to study it. The Minister cannot expect a member to take Sunday, his day of rest and going to Church, to delve into a Bill; so Sunday would have to be ruled out completely, and the other days are working days for working men.

I am drawing this matter to your attention, Mr. Speaker, so that you can take the matter up with him pri-

vately, and let him know that it would not be fair to press for this Bill to be dealt with next Tuesday. The Hon. Minister said he was giving us two weeks, and if the Bill comes out tomorrow, it would not give two weeks for study. I do not want the Minister or the Government to feel that they can bully us into anything, and, because they have the numbers, can come here and pass Bills as they like, because they would not be seeing us over here; they would be talking to the seats on this side.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the hon. member telling this House that he is not prepared to come here and debate the Bill on Social Security? Is he serving notice that they are going to be absent on that again?

Mr. SPEAKER. I must confess I cannot regard that as a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity. It annoys me when the Minister of Education gets up with these frivolous things. If he wants to go outside and tell the people that I do not want to debate it, let him do so; but he should not get up here and ask such frivolous questions. This Bill was to come to us a week ago, but it has not reached us yet, but he wants to know if I do not intend to come here and debate it. Suppose I did not intend to come here and debate it! What would it help him? It is not fair to us because they have the numbers, and because he feels that a Social Security Bill is in favour of the people. They had it from the time they came into office in 1961 and they could not get through with it, but they would like to give us two or three days to study it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SMITH: What is he getting up on now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said "on a point of order".

Mr. SMITH: Do not let him get up here and make a speech for a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members seem to think that they can sit around this Table and direct the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is completely misleading the House and misrepresenting the facts. He said that the Government had the Social Security before it from 1961. This is nothing but contrary to the truth, because the Social Security Bill was only sent to the members of the Government on Tuesday morning last week when we had an emergency or special Cabinet meeting to deal with it. The members of the Cabinet saw it for the first time on Tuesday morning, and it was due to my own efforts over the past four months that this Bill was presented to them on Tuesday morning.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know now who is telling the truth. The Hon. Premier said in St. Philip that the former Minister had it for four years and would not bring it down, but that the present Minister would be introducing it last Tuesday. The Hon. Minister is now saying that the first time the Cabinet saw it was on Tuesday morning. All the same, he knows who tells the truth!

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS rose.

Mr. SMITH: What is he getting up on now?

Mr. SPEAKER rose, and the hon. member took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has risen on a point of order, I understand.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not understand the difference between the Government and a Minister of Government. I have been dealing in my Ministry with the Bill for the past four months, that is, the Bill on Social Security. I am not speaking of the Social Security Report. The Government as a whole saw the Bill for the first time on Tuesday morning and approved of it for introduction to the Legislature. It is not a voluminous Bill, and I think the hon. member should try to get his facts before he talks what can be termed nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister says I must get my facts. From whom am I to get my facts? We have the Leader of the House, and the Leader of the Government who is the Premier of this country. It appeared in the Press that the Hon. Premier said on Monday last at King George V Memorial Park that the Minister would be bringing in the Bill next day, which was Tuesday last, which the hon. senior member for St. Philip would not bring down though he had it for the last four years.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to recall that only a very short while ago, the attention of this House was drawn to inaccuracies appearing in certain newspapers, and I gather that the hon. member is referring to something which he read in a newspaper for the accuracy of which he cannot - and I suggest he dare not - vouch.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, have you finished? I am speaking; is the Minister speaking too?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister rose on a point of order, but I had something to say to the House and he gave way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph continues to distort the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that and substitute another word.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member is making misleading statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: A misleading statement is not necessarily wilfully misleading. Wilfully misleading is unparliamentary, as I have already ruled here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I personally feel he has been doing so unwittingly. Each of us has various approaches to things. If I think I am right, I will approach my points of order by introducing them the way I think I should introduce them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us bear in mind that we have Standing Orders, and in respect of "Interruptions", Standing Order No. 28 is very clear; "The member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, that is what I have been doing. I have been trying to point out that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is innocently misleading the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a point; he has not completed it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: When the hon. member referred to the fact that the Government had this Bill for four years, what I should explain to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is that the Government is made up of eight Ministers who form the Cabinet, and those members saw the Bill for the first time. I am not speaking of the Reports on Social Security, the Stockman Report and other Committee Reports. I am speaking of the Bill on Social Security which was dealt with for the first time on Tuesday; so if the hon. members want us.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no! The Hon. Minister has departed from directing my attention to the point.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, eight Ministers saw the actual Bill for the first time last Tuesday morning. Now I would not be so rude as to ask why, but I would like to know where it was drafted, who drafted it, and if they did not approve of it even before the Minister came in here and introduced it and said he was giving two weeks to other members who had not seen it at all. Then the Minister merely saw it on Tuesday morning? How much then can he do with it on Tuesday next? He has his other business to do. How much can he expect his colleagues to do?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I clearly and emphatically pointed out that I personally dealt with the Bill, and it was my duty as the Minister dealing with the Bill to be able to convince my colleagues of the provisions of that Bill.

Mr. SMITH: It is right for the Minister to convince his colleagues. I was never a Minister. I cannot even remember going into the room up there where the Ministers go. Are you telling me that on such an important Bill the Cabinet should not sit on it even for ten minutes? Do you mean to tell me that after ten minutes the entire Cabinet should not be sitting.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not say that the Cabinet did not sit in on the Bill for as much as ten minutes. I said the Government as a whole saw the Bill for the first time on Tuesday morning, and it was brought to this Chamber in the afternoon.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, the Minister said the Government consists of eight Ministers; so it means that the eight Ministers saw it for the first time on Tuesday morning. That is what he made me to understand. So it was left for him to convince the other seven Ministers. I know he would never be able to convince the Premier on anything; so he can talk as much as he likes. He may be able to convince the other seven; so when he says it is left for him to convince his colleagues, he would not be able to convince the Premier of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that this talk about convincing this or that hon. member cannot arise in a discussion on a motion for the adjournment of this House.

Mr. SMITH: Because they are Ministers, they feel they can get up and do as they like, and run to their boxes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust that Ministers do not feel that way when I am here. I know they do not feel that way when His Honour the learned Deputy Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: I am not afraid of either of them, and the more silent they keep, the better for them. My shoulders are broad and I am strong. The Minister came here and told us that the Bill would be coming before us and he would give us two weeks, but up to now we have not seen it. I am only drawing to the Minister's attention and to yours, Mr. Speaker, that if we do get it anytime this week, it would not be two weeks as he promised, although I know that promises can be broken and are broken very regularly and at all times over there. I would not be at all surprised, therefore, if the Minister came in here next Tuesday and carried on with it. I feel it should be two weeks from the receipt of the Bill by hon. members.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Lucy jumped up very quickly and wanted to know if I am not going to discuss the Social Security Bill as though it is his Bill. I do not know if he has a Bill in here. He must mean a cane bill.

I am leaving it to you to protect us, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure if you were on the floor you would agree with me that three or four days are not sufficient time for a member to study the Bill, especially one who is not legally trained. I am a layman, and even legal men make mistakes when they go into Bills, and sometimes a layman has to correct them. You cannot see everything because you are a legal man. I am therefore reminding the Minister to keep his promise so that I will be able to say for him that once in his life..... I will not say it; I will not interfere with my friend..... he has made a promise to this House and has honoured it. If he brings it for discussion next Tuesday, he knows what will happen. He does not want anybody to tell him.

I am therefore appealing to you, Mr. Speaker, to take the matter up privately with him, and if he has any intention of doing it next Tuesday, ask him not to do so. Let it be two weeks from the date of receipt of the Bill by hon. members.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I really could not allow the Government's case to go by default or to allow the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has just sat down to distort.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member has accused me of distorting, and I am objecting to it. He must withdraw the word "distort". I am objecting to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has taken exception to the use of the word "distort" in the context in which it was used by the Hon. Leader of the House, on the ground, presumably - although he did not state specifically - that he regards it as a contravention of Standing Order No. 26(5) which states that it shall be out of order to use offensive or insulting language about Members of the House.

I have consulted the Oxford English Distionary, Third Edition, page 539, word "distort" - it is stated on page 539 - means "to give a twist to (the mind, thought, views); to pervert (statements, facts)."

If it were used in that sense of "to pervert statements or facts" it would -in my view - constitute a contravention of Standing Order No. 26 (5), but I do not recall the exact context in which the Hon. Leader of the House used that word, nor have I yet got a copy of the shorthand note.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Do you wish me, Mr. Speaker, to continue my sentence?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be grateful.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I did not wish the Government's case to go by default.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to the word, and the hon. member must not be allowed to do anything until the word is withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: That situation has not yet arisen. The hon. member has stated that he has not completed the sentence. I have already made it clear that the word "distort" is capable of being regarded as offensive or insulting, because it means "to pervert statements or facts". The Hon. Leader of the House has asked to be allowed to complete the sentence in which he used the words. In other words, to have the word in such context as he proposes or intends to use it. I now permit him to complete the sentence.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I could not allow the Government's case to go by default, nor could I allow the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has just sat down to distort, albeit unwittingly, the Government's declared intention of carrying out its programme. That is what I intended to say, and I have just said it. If the hon. member wishes to object to that, he may do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not rule that "distort" used in that context and immediately preceding the words "albeit unwittingly" is a contravention of No. 5 of Standing Order 26, because "unwittingly" means "not realising", "not appreciating". Has the Hon. Leader of the House completed his speech?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: When I think, Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker you have ruled. I am not saying anything about your ruling, but I have never seen anything like this happen since I have been in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph just risen and spoken? Surely not a point of order? Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are certain facts which have got to be put in perspective. The first is this: on Tuesday last week the Hon. Minister of Trade gave notice of a Bill to establish a National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. In view of the fact that (a) notice was only being given on that day and (b) because of that the Bill could not possibly have been printed and (c) because of the intrinsic importance of the Bill, the Hon. Minister said that he was not prepared to deal with the Bill until two weeks had elapsed - two weeks from the time of giving notice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister never at any time said two weeks from the time of giving notice. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He did.) He did not. If you want to sell your soul for that, sell it!

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot refer to Hansard about that matter, because Hansard is not instantly available.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I was here on that day, and the Hon. Minister said he would deal with that Bill in two weeks' time. He gave us two weeks to consider it, and if you read the debates, you will see that he said in two weeks' time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I insist very firmly that every member of this House left the House last week not only with the impression, but with the clear impression that this Bill would be dealt with on Tuesday coming, which would be two weeks from the day of giving notice of it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but he said that every member of this House left here with that impression. I am still a member of this House, and I did not leave here with that impression, because you will remember that the Minister did not answer when I pressed him to say whether it would be two weeks from that day or two weeks from the day we got it. I think the Minister is honest enough to say he did not commit himself to that. Quite honestly I left with the impression that it would be two weeks from the time we got the Bill. We want it decided whether we will deal wi th it next Tuesday if we get it on Wednesday.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there must be no misunderstanding about this point, because the same hon. member who has just sat down was answered by the Hon. Minister that it would be two weeks from today, and today was the 3rd May, and this is clear in everybody's mind. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister said that, he confidently expected in the normal course of events that the Bill would have been in members' hands certainly by the week-end or possibly by today. He said last week that he wished to deal with it next week; but I am saying that I see no reason why the Bill could not be proceeded with next week, provided hon. members do not get it in their hands for the purpose of studying it later than Thursday, and I will tell you why. They may possibly get it this evening, because I know it is being printed; they may get it tomorrow, and I think they will certainly get it on Thursday, and if it arrives after Thursday, the case which hon. members opposite will make out for not having it in time will be a difficult one for us to answer; but if they get it between Tuesday and Thursday, it will certainly be studied for debate on Tuesday.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it is an enabling Bill. It is a Bill which deals only with the principles and certain very broad administrative details of the Social Security scheme. What hon. members would have a valid quarrel about would be this: if within the same time limit we were laying the Regulations connected with the Scheme which are a mass of detail and which are very voluminous, and which call for a considerable amount of study, I do not think myself that these Regulations could be studied within three or four days for anybody to have had time enough to debate them; but it is not the Regulations with which we are dealing. We are dealing with an enabling Bill, a Bill in which permission of the Legislature is being sought to establish the scheme. When this is all over and done, then the details of the scheme will be presented to the Legislature. Therefore I say this now in my capacity as Leader of the House: if the Bill is printed and circulated to hon. members by Thursday, I would advise the Hon. Minister to proceed with it next Tuesday. If hon. members do not get it by Thursday and get it on Friday or Saturday, I will advise him to put it off for another week. This, I think, is a fair way of looking at it, because if hon. members get it this evening, or tomorrow morning or by Thursday evening, from Thursday night until Tuesday morning next week would be adequate time to study it, because it is a Bill of principle and not of detail. If however it were to arrive in their hands after Thursday, I will advise the Hon. Minister not to proceed with it.

I want to say this however: I know that since this is an election year as everybody knows, the Opposition is always now looking for areas of disagreement against the Government. I myself am not worried about this because I know this is inevitable in this kind of situation, but I ask them to reflect on one or two things: if they wish us to be fair to them, they have to be fair to us. We have a certain amount of legislation to get through, and they cannot on the one hand accuse us of not carrying out our mandate, and on the other hand, when we attempt to carry it out, want to obstruct us. That is the reason why I interrupted the hon. junior member for St. Joseph when he said that we will see what they will do if we do not give them time to study the Bill. Are they willing to tell the people of this island that even at the shortest possible notice they are not willing to consider the enactment of legislation providing social security for the people? This is all they have to settle with themselves.

I have given my word. If the Bill is received by hon. members by Thursday evening, I would think that would allow a reasonable enough time to consider it for us to proceed with it on Tuesday. As Leader of the House I am responsible to the Cabinet for the expedition of Government Business in this House, and I have never, since I have been Leader, forced on this House any measure or the passage of any measure at any speed beyond which I really did think it was the House's capacity to bear. I have always been fair in pushing legislation through the House, and I have asked the House to accommodate me when I felt I had to be accommodated, and I have always paid full regard to the wishes of the House.

The Social Security Bill must be got through this House by next week, and I will personally undertake to see that the Government therefore expedites the printing of the Bill and see it is delivered to hon. members perhaps by tomorrow morning or at the earliest by Thursday morning. If I can carry out my part of the bargain by seeing that hon. members are in receipt of the Bill by Thursday, I will therefore expect and will so advise the Minister to proceed with the Bill on Tuesday. It is too important a Bill to be held up for another week. Hon. members, so far as I know, are in favour of its principles even although they have not read it, and I cannot conceive of any set of circumstances which would make hon. members on that side want to stay away or want to refuse to participate in a debate of that nature when on both sides of the House members know that the people of this Island are waiting for the enactment of social security. The hon. member must know why he said what he said when he attempted to threaten the Government that the Opposition would do this, that and the other. He must know that; but at the same time, while I am not responsible, Mr. Speaker, for whatever ideas and motivations they may have on that side, I just want to say

that so long ago I personally can guarantee that there is fair treatment from this side of the House, I shall expect to get Government work done and get our legislative programme put through; and so long as I am certain that adequate time has been given to the study of proposed legislation, I see no reason to vary our time table. If an emergency occurs, I have always, from the time I was Leader of the House, consulted Party Leaders on the other side, put our particular problem to them and I have always gained their co-operation. There is no need for consultation on this matter, because it is a matter dealing with the interest of the entire population; it is a matter to which I hope the House will give its assent without dividing, and consequently even if the Hon. Minister has not been able to get the printed Bill in the hands of hon. members, say, from last Thursday or Friday, I would think the importance of the matter to the people of this Island would be sufficient to crave some indulgence from hon. members for the shortness of time they have had to study the Bill. I cannot go any further than that.

Again I give my promise, I will see to it that hon. members receive the printed Bill at least by Thursday evening of this week. If they do not receive it by Thursday evening, I will recommend to the Minister not to proceed with it next week; but if they receive it by Thursday, I will recommend to proceed with it, because I think Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday will be enough time to study the principles of the Bill for hon. members to be able to deal with it in those circumstances on Tuesday when we meet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that in my absence I was accused of the inability to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has, according to the official record supplied me, already spoken on this motion. According to this record, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has already spoken.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rose on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking. I have been supplied with a copy from the official record of the speakers in this debate on the motion for adjournment, moved by the Hon. Leader of the House and seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. The next speaker in order is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; then the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the Hon. Minister of Trade and Labour; the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; the hon. senior member for St. Andrew; and the Hon. Leader of the House then rose, as I understand, to exercise his right of final reply. That is the official record.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rose on a point of order and said so. It does not matter who put down what they put down. I rose on a point of order, and I challenge anybody to say I did not rise on a point of order. I do not care who wrote it; I did not speak, and you can ask hon. members over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to speak again in this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You can rise and do what you like. I spoke on a point of order, and I am asking you to get the official record straight. Ask the members of the Government; ask the Leader of the House. You can name me if you want to. I spoke on a point of order and I am not asking for leave to speak again. I say repeatedly that I spoke on a point of order; so I do not care who wrote that down. If you want to name me, name me!

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting stands suspended for fifteen minutes an account of grave disorder, an hon. member having refused to sit when the Chair had risen.
4.55 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the Sitting was suspended, I have had an opportunity of checking the Stenographer's Shorthand note, and that note reveals that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated when he rose "I must rise on a point of order". As I informed the House, I gave my ruling (that he had not risen on a point of order) on the authority of the record on which I am fully entitled to rely - although there are occasions when there are mistakes - of the Clerks at the Table, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had spoken, without any qualification that he had spoken on a point of order. Normally my procedure is, in any debate other than a substantive motion for the adjournment of the House, that I note the name of every member who speaks in the order in which he speaks, making no written record of members who rise on points of order. But that has never been done when there is a motion for the adjournment of the House, because normally that goes through with the minimum of discussion with only two hon. members normally speaking.

In view of the fact that personally I have no note, I referred to the Clerks at the Table who advised me that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, had spoken, and they had not recorded that he had spoken on a point of order. In view of the shorthand note, I declare now that the record of the Clerks at the Table shall be amended to show that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rose and spoke on a point of order.

Now there is another aspect of this matter to which I must direct attention, namely, standing Order No. 27 - "Right of Reply":

"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 a Government Officer."

So the position is this: the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not spoken in this debate other than when he rose on a point of order in this debate on the adjournment of the House, but after every member present had had an opportunity of addressing the House, and he had given no intimation that he intended - or sought - to address the House, after I had looked around, as is my custom from which I do not ever depart, the Hon. Leader of the House rose to exercise his right of final reply. That is how the Hon. Leader of thw House came to be speaking then, to conclude debate, and - after such reply - no other member may speak.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, while it is true that what you have just said it both technically and juridically correct, hon. members on this side of the House have no objection whatever to the hon. member being allowed to speak, and I would like to suggest to him through you, if he asks leave of the House to speak, this will not be resisted on this side, provided of course that I must have the right to reply if any matter arising out of the speech appears to me to be critical or censorious of the Government. Apart from that, no objection will be raised if the hon. member seeks the leave of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have risen to seek the leave of the House to make my contribution to this matter. But before I do so, I would like first of all to offer my apology to what might appear seemingly to be rudeness to the Chair and unparliamentary conduct. You will appreciate that as an old Parliamentarian when one feels he is absolutely correct, in a heated debate one loses one's temper. I unreservedly withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The apology is unreservedly accepted.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown is asking the indulgence of the House to speak after the Hon. Leader of the House has concluded his speech in reply, and such leave will be granted if there is no objection.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on this motion for the adjournment, because I actually discussed this matter with the Hon. Minister in charge and he explained to me the entire situation. I however wanted to get clear that at no time would the Hon. Leader of the House find any member on this side of the House attempting to hinder the progress of legislation for the purpose of social security and a national scheme. He had given an undertaking and I find no reason why I should not accept the undertaking, that if we get the Bill between now and Thursday, he would like to proceed with it in the usual manner next Tuesday.

I should just like to say this: despite the fact that I have been accused in my absence of being unable to deal with matters of importance - a statement which I brush aside for the moment - on a Bill of such magnitude, and one which changes the social structure of the community, I claim that we should have two weeks in which to study it. This is a matter in which Barbados would be the first Island in the West Indies to have a social security system operating, because the Bill in Jamaica is not yet operating, and the other two bills to guide us would be the United States Bill and the United Kingdom Bill. I do not claim like some others to be all powerful on these matters. There are persons trained in these matters, and in this Island there must be copies of the English Bill, the United States Bill and the Jamaica Bill, and you can only discuss this Bill and bring arguments to bear on it in a Legislature if you see how it is working in another country. That is why I say that if we have a Bill of this nature for two weeks, we would be able to meet with the legal luminaries who would understand the intricacies of the Bill better than we would, and sit down and make comparison with these other Bills, and thus be able to make some contribution which the Government can appreciate.

I think the hon. member would agree with me that all the brains are not in the Government or in the Legislature of this colony. You may not give us two weeks to study it, but the Other Place which is not elected would have four or five weeks to discuss it and make a better contribution. No wonder it is said that the columns of the Press bring out more contributions from the Other Place than from the elected representatives. The Hon. Leader of the House knows well enough that you do not individually study these matters, but you meet with your executive or those persons who can make a contribution and go through them section after section. As an individual you can read the Bill, but to make a valuable contribution you must discuss it with others who can make comparison with the various sections in the other Bills. It is well known that there is none in Trinidad, and none in Jamaica up to the present at least, because I know that it is not working according to plan. I could not therefore take this Bill and read it on Thursday, Friday and Saturday and come here on Tuesday and say that this Bill is good without making some comparison. I would therefore suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that after Thursday would certainly not be enough time. Although I have not seen the Bill, he says it deals with the principles and is not voluminous, but it gives the right to the Cabinet to make Regulations, and once those Regulations are make, they are either accepted or thrown out; they cannot be amended. After they are laid in this House for forty days, they become law.

I will say to the Hon. Leader of the House that there is no attempt at all on our part to obstruct legislation, and I regret he had cause to use that remark. He made it clear that he is always willing to give and take, and in this case this is of great importance. As a matter of fact, I am going to say this: social security is the greatest piece of legislation introduced in democracies within the last three hundred years. There can be no question about it. I am not fooling you that I can sit down with a son of mine or somebody else and discuss this; we have to get in Council and make a comparison. That is my appeal, and if it is an appeal which is going to be called obstruction, I will have to plead guilty. I have had the opportunity of sitting with the Hon. Leader of the House on the other side, and I am absolutely certain that he would under such circumstances ask for two weeks to be able to sit down and make comparison with the Jamaica Bill which is not working, the United States Bill which is very comprehensive, and the United Kingdom Bill which is also very comprehensive, before bringing any argument to bear here.

It is true that this Bill only deals with the Principle, but the principle gives the right to the Cabinet to make Regulations which cannot be amended in this House. There is no attempt by us or by anybody at all to do anything, Mr. Speaker, that would prevent this Bill from going through, but we do plead that it should be in our hands for two weeks. The practice of Parties in this House is to meet on Monday night and discuss things laid on the Table and see what contributions we can make on Tuesdays. If we get it on Thursday, we will have four days to study it, but the Other Place will get it the same time and discuss it six weeks after. That is all I have to say and the contribution I wish to make. Again I say there is no Bill in Trinidad, the Jamaica Bill is not working, and there are the United Kingdom and United States Bills.

Bills, Mr. Speaker, are drafted primarily to suit the social conditions of a country by the legal draughtsmen, approved by the Minister and sent to the Cabinet. If under the circumstances it takes that time, and you believe in democracy, and that an Opposition is absolutely necessary not to obstruct as I have always said, but to express its views, then I feel we would be entitled to two weeks; but if people do not like me to express my views, that is a matter entirely for them. What difference would it make if in another week we had an opportunity to sit down with persons around a table and discuss this matter to be able to make a worthwhile contribution? That is all I have to say.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would only like to say this: I cannot give in to the hon. member's appeal for more time, and I cannot go back on the undertaking which I have given; but I would like to assure him that the Social Security Bill has been so drafted and so easy to grasp, that the hon. member will not have any difficulty in becoming aware of its principles, and will therefore be in a position, if he gets it not later than Thursday, to be able to make his full contribution to the debate next Tuesday as I know he will.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th May, 1966, at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.28 p.m.