
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st January, 1967

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Cooperatives and Fisheries*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); 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., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy Speaker*) and Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that no Minutes are yet available for confirmation.

Mr. L. A. LYNCH and Hon. C. E. TALMA entered the House and took their seats.

INDISPOSITION OF DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform hon. members that I have received a letter signed by Dr. Harold E. Skeete in respect of the Deputy Clerk of this House, Mr. H. Lisle Thomas, whom the doctor says will be unable to perform any duties, either professional or parliamentary, for one week as from the 24th of this month. Mr. Thomas has asked to be excused and given leave of absence from his duties for a period of one week.

DEPUTY CLERK GRANTED LEAVE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be excused from his parliamentary duties for one week.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. Chezley Boyce, Barrister-at-Law, be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk of this House for today's sitting.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order 1967.

The Customs Duties (Bottles for Use in the Manufacture of Toilet Water) Order, 1967.

An Account of the transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 31st December, 1966.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1967.

A Bill to amend the Marriage Act, 1904 and the Marriage of British Subjects (Facilities) Act, 1916; to validate certain acts done thereunder and to indemnify persons in respect of such acts.

A Bill to provide for the discharge, modification and interpretation of certain restrictions affecting land, and for other matters connected therewith.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$13,216 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67 No. 45 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

MESSRS. J. B. SPRINGER and H. B. ST. JOHN entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter:-

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that a number of patriotic Barbadians who returned to Barbados from Britain by chartered flights during the month of November, 1966 for the Barbados Independence Celebrations have been fleeced?

Is it within Government's knowledge that the Barbados Tourist Board is named as co-sponsors of one of the two chartered flights from Britain to Barbados for the said Independence Celebrations?

Would Government seek information as to the existence of and/or the bona fides of the Caribbean & Guyana Social Club, and in particular of the Chairman of the said Club who, incidentally, is a Guyanese national?

Would Government seek information as to the number of Barbadian nationals lured into travelling from Britain to Barbados and return on the chartered flights sponsored by the Caribbean & Guyana Social Club? The amounts they paid per person for return or single fare or otherwise; and to determine by simple mathematics to what extent such Barbadian nationals might have been robbed in this chartered flight exercise?

Would Government act speedily and instruct the Barbados High Commissioner in Britain to assist the Board of Trade in England with any investigations into this matter which may be instituted there on behalf of Barbadian nationals?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I make no comment on the subject matter proposed in the Question of which the hon. member has just given notice, but I would like a ruling from you, Sir, as to the form in which Questions are framed. It is common parliamentary practice, and that has been attested by authorities, that Questions should be so framed as to elicit information from the Government on matters within the province of a Minister and not any general argumentative or other matter which might more properly be the subject of a substantive motion. I would like to have Your Honour's Ruling on that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give consideration to this matter, but the Question has presumably passed through the usual channels of the Clerks at the Table, which caused it to be placed on the Notice Paper. The matter was never referred to me as being in the doubtful class of passing the border line. I will give the matter consideration as soon as I have had an opportunity to do so.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that the plantation known as Tam-arind Hall in the parish of St. Joseph, abutting and bounding on Blackman's Plantation and the highway leading to Bathsheba via Horse Hill, is for sale?

2. Will the Government consider the immediate purchase of this Plantation to establish a housing area for the upper part of the parish, and embracing those residents of Hackleton Cliff, Church Village, Vaughan's Land, Suriname Village, and all the other surrounding areas, where, as evidenced recently people are living in great danger due to the insecurity of the land they now occupy?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention by the Clerk that he has not had the opportunity of considering the question which has been given notice of by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, notwithstanding the fact that it was handed in as long ago as week before last; but in view of the fact that no notice of a question should be given without having been vetted by the Clerk, I cannot allow that question to go on the Order Paper for the next meeting. I am not saying that it is out of order. I apologise to the entire House for the incident.

NOTICE OF AMENDMENT

I have been handed by the Clerk of the Table a notice under the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which,

I am told, was handed in in time, but somehow or the other has not found itself on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following amendments to the reply of the Speech from the Throne:-

Delete all the words after the words "The House further", and substitute the following:-

regret that there is no clear indication of what is the policy of the Government with respect to membership of the Organisation of American States and urges that the utmost caution should be exercised before it adopts a course that might bring it into conflict with other Commonwealth countries in respect of this membership;

regret further that there are grave omissions, in its dealing with economic matters, in its reference to the Caribbean Free Trade Agreement e.g. whether the Government is pursuing a policy of persuading other Caribbean territories to join this Agreement, to the Tripartite Economic Survey whether, and if so, when it will release the Report of the Commission who made the survey;

consider that immediate comprehensive and thorough going consideration should be given to an overhauling of the legislation dealing with land holding in Barbados with Urban Development and Town and country Planning and with the administration of the Departments in charge of such matters. In this respect the House is of the opinion that more than one satellite town is needed in Barbados;

while they note the Governments promises as to the provision of export markets for vegetables they deplore the absence in the Gracious Speech of any mention of plans to control the constant rising cost of living more especially in the price of locally produced foodstuffs;

is profoundly disturbed at the general proposals for Educational Reform set out in the Government programme for Education and urges that the Government should immediately appoint a Select Committee of members of the Legislature, with powers to co-opt persons interested in educational matters, to study in all their aspects what is now proposed.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Marriage Act, 1904 and the Marriage of British Subjects (Facilities) Act, 1916; to validate certain acts done thereunder and to indemnify persons in respect of such acts, be 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 provide for the discharge, modification and interpretation of certain restrictions affecting land, and for other matters connected therewith, be read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 14, 15 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an objection to the suspension of Order No. 19 specifically.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am also objecting to the suspension of Rule 20.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if I may remind the hon. member of something, I have not moved the suspension of Order No. 20.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 62 - suspension of Standing Orders - is as follows:-

"A question the object or effect of which may be to suspend any Standing Order of the House shall be proposed only with the consent of the Speaker, either after notice given or after the expression of the general assent of the House."

I interpret "general assent of the House" to mean a decision after a vote is taken.

Therefore, only then can the general assent of the House be known. Accordingly, this motion may be put. 12.35 p.m.

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. SARGEANT; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. LYNCH - 13.

NOES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. St. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 6.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first item under Private Members' Business.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed, as you know, Sir, I had given an undertaking last Tuesday from this side of the House that we would provide an early opportunity for the Censure Motion against Your Honour to be debated today. I propose now to make Order No. 3 under Private Members' Business the first item under that Section.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with a Statement which I made in the course of my ruling as to the validity of this Resolution that I do not propose to follow the precedent set by a former Speaker of this House in 1957, it is not my intention to preside during this discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

CENSURE MOTION AGAINST HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The instant Order of the Day is Order No. 3 standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution deploring the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December, 15, 1966, he disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker and further that His Honour the Speaker

was himself guilty of conduct unbecoming the dignity of the Chair and is deserving of the gravest possible censure.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I make this motion, I am taking objection to, and asking Your Honour to rule on, the amendment to this motion on the ground that it is irrelevant and contrary to the Standing Orders, and I make bold to say that nothing could be clearer than that this amendment is completely out of order, because it is irrelevant to the subject of the motion.

Under Standing Order No. 21 (1) and (2) -

"When any motion or Bill is under consideration in the House or a Committee thereof, an amendment may be proposed to such motion or Bill if it is relevant to the question or matter then under discussion; provided that no amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, if a question has been proposed from the Chair upon such amendment."

The relevant portion of this Order is, of course, the first two lines.

Secondly, "an amendment may be proposed to any amendment if it is relevant thereto." 12.45 p.m.

There is a wealth of authority in 'May's' dating very far back as to what is irrelevant. I refer to 'May's' Sixteenth Edition - I suppose I will be told later on that the Edition of the House is the Seventeenth Edition - at page 410, I believe that the Edition of the House is in the Fifteenth Edition. I refer to the chapter which deals with the process of debate and amendment to questions. This is what 'May' says:-

"The general practice in regard to amendment is explained on pp. - 418 - 26; and here such amendments only will be mentioned as are intended to evade an expression of opinion upon the main question by entirely altering its meaning and object. This is effected by moving the omission of all the words of the question after the word 'that' at the beginning and by the substitution of an alternative proposition (which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question).

In the case of amendments of this type the proposal of the question 'that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question' places before the House two alternative propositions, contained in the motion and in the amendment respectively, between which the House has to make a preliminary choice before deciding finally to agree to either of them (see p. 401). Consequently, if the words proposed to be left out are ordered not to stand part of the question, this vote does not by itself express a decision against the motion but only a preference for taking a decision upon the alternative proposition contained in the amendment."

"May" goes on to deal with other methods of amendment like added words and the proposed deletion of words without proposing the substitution of other words. "May" goes on like this:-

"If, however, the words of the amendment are added, and the main question, as so amended, is agreed to, the original motion may be regarded as having been negated by implication. This depends both upon the fact that the amendment has been agreed to and upon the fact that its terms are such as to imply disagreement with the motion."

On page 421 under the subhead "Rules with Respect to Form and Content of Amendments" "Amendments to be relevant", this is what it says:-

"The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question (see p. 451) necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

Stated generally, no matter ought to be raised in debate on a question which would be irrelevant, if moved as

an amendment, and an amendment cannot be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question."

I pause here to say that the amendment is one which is almost a eulogy of His Honour the Speaker and it has nothing whatever to do with the subject of the motion which is that on a specific occasion the Speaker gave a wrong ruling. I should later have to say that this matter is altogether above Party. Hon. members are sitting as judges and they can interpret the Rules of procedure as laid down in the Standing Authority which is "May". "May" goes on to say this:-

"Thus, the Speaker has ruled that on the third reading of a bill (a stage on which debate is limited to the contents of the bill) a reasoned amendment should not urge the rejection of the bill on the ground of what it omits (see p. 578). The effect of moving an amendment is, rather, to restrict the field of debate which would otherwise be open on a question. This is not obvious in the case of the type of amendment which proposes to leave out all the words of a question and substitute a different (but of course relevant) proposition. But it is true even in this case. For such an amendment, by concentrating debate on the main question and the amendment as alternative propositions, tends to exclude the consideration of other relevant alternatives.

It would be useless to attempt here a classification of the grounds on which amendments have been held to be irrelevant to a question. Some examples are given in connection with specialized forms of procedure such as bills, particularly in committee (p. 553), votes in supply (pp. 732-3) and business motions." And then an instance is given:-

"The Speaker has ruled that to a question declaring the expediency of establishing a tribunal for the purpose of inquiring into a definite matter of urgent public importance, which followed the directions of the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921, an amendment to add another subject for inquiry would not be relevant, but an amendment relating to the constitution of the tribunal has been allowed."

And then he quotes what the old practice was and that the contrary prevailed. "May" goes on:-

"An illustration may be given of the former licence in amendments. To the question for the Speaker's leaving the Chair for the Committee on the Reform Bill, 16th August 1831, an amendment was moved for the production of papers on the state of Poland; and on an analogous proceeding, 9 May 1834, the Speaker stated "that, according to the forms of the House and the law of Parliament, there was no necessity that an amendment should be akin to the question".

According to Standing Order 21, the amendment must be relevant to the subject, the subject being that on a specific occasion His Honour the Speaker ruled wrongly and contradicted a previous ruling of his. I know what will be said on the other side about that and I am prepared for it. On page 423, par. 3, "May" says that certain forms of motion may not be made. It goes on to say that an amendment cannot be made, by the addition of words to the main question. We are not dealing with that at the present moment. Skipping paragraph 2, "May" goes on like this:-

"To certain forms of motion, which may be called stock forms of procedure, such as the motions made on the various stages of a bill, only certain recognized forms of amendment are permissible. Thus, on the second reading of a bill, after any words proposed to be left out have been ordered to stand part of the question, an amendment cannot be made, by the addition of words, to the main question. The same rule applies to the question for the Speaker's leaving the Chair on going into Committee of Supply.

On the same principle an amendment to a motion of thanks for a sermon preached before the House has been ruled out of order."

Further on it says:-

"The principle applied to amendments to the questions proposed on the stages of a bill, namely, that established forms of procedure can only be dealt with by recognized forms of amendment, is also applied to motions for adjournment; for just as motions for the adjournment of the House or the debate, moved as dilatory motions cannot be amended, so to a motion that the House at its rising do adjourn till a future day no amendment is permissible unless it relates to the term of the adjournment; but an amendment has been moved to alter the hour of meeting on the day proposed for reassembling.

When to the question of adjournment from Friday till Monday an amendment was proposed relating to a day of thanksgiving on the restoration of peace, the Speaker ruled the amendment to be out of order, as the only amendment which could be moved was that the House should adjourn to some other day than Monday." 12.55 p.m.

The only amendment to be moved was "that the House should adjourn to some other day." I invite hon. members to see that the amendment to the motion of censure for a specific act of omission or commission is irrelevant and completely out of order.

I have an old Edition of "May's" in which it is set out, perhaps more fully, although it is not necessary to quote more than a short passage. On Page 285 of the 13th Edition it is stated:

"It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed."

I was pointing out the different methods of amendments.

"In the case of an amendment to insert or add words the proceeding is more simple. The question is merely put that the proposed words "be there inserted" or "added". If it be carried, the words are inserted or added accordingly and the main question, so amended, is put; but if negatived, the question is put as it originally stood, unless it be afterwards proposed to insert or add other words."

However, it is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

Some instances are given in the footnote. It talks about a tribunal and an amendment to add another subject for the inquiry was deemed irrelevant. It goes on to say that an illustration may be given of the former licence in amendments.

"To the question for the Speaker's leaving the Chair for the committee on the Reform Bill, 6th August, 1831, an amendment was moved for the production of papers on the state of Poland; and on an analogous proceeding, 9th May, 1834, the Speaker stated "that, according to the forms of the house and the law of Parliament there was no necessity that an amendment should be akin to the question."

However, in short, it comes back to this. This is overwhelmingly covered by authority. There is no one who would say that the Speaker did what was right.

They made one slight error in bringing that in here. I understand that His Honour the Speaker, either today or yesterday, reaches his thirtieth anniversary in this House. That is an excellent thing, but that amendment is no more relevant to this matter which is before the House than any matter which any school boy or any one can think about. I am not saying more than that the amendment is irrelevant. It reads:

"Delete all the words...."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If it is a point of order I am not giving way - and I do not propose to do it. I am not

giving way. There can be no point of order on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I remember correctly, when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph rose to speak, I think he said he rose to seek my ruling. I did not understand him to say that he was speaking on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I rose to speak on a point of order and I ask you to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is speaking on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am on a point of order.

(VOICES: Name him if he is not going to sit down.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. junior member for St. Lucy on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my point of order is this. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he rose said he wanted to seek your ruling on a parliamentary point and in developing that point, he quoted authority as to whether the amendment which is not yet before the House is out of order.

I am pointing out that the hon. member must address himself to the points which he is making and cannot go into the subject matter of the amendment itself.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like Your Honour to rule. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy ought to set an example to this House. You would stop me if I am wrong. Why does he not read the text books that deal with this matter? In moving this motion, I can refer to the amendment at the same time. I was speaking on the amendment and then the hon. member says something which was utterly uncalled for.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would like to draw to the hon. member that the amendment is not yet before the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am trying my best to respect the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member's remarks to the Chair are offensive. The hon. member said in the course of his remarks that he is trying his best to respect the Chair. You should ask him to withdraw that remark.
1.05 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am trying my best to respect the Chair and to say nothing that is disrespectful to the Chair. What is wrong with that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I contend that when the hon. member says that he is trying his best to respect the Chair, it is a contemptuous remark, and it is aimed at the dignity of the Chair, and he ought to be asked to withdraw it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am trying my utmost to control myself and my language out of respect for the Chair, and therefore I shall not make the comments to the Chair that I will make to hon. members not in the Chair that there are making some most inaccurate remarks. If they say there is an amendment, you discuss the amendment at the same time that you discuss the motion. That is elementary because speaking on one side you refute the other side, and that applies to both sides. That is to say, speaking on the amendment, you show the absurdity of the motion, just as speaking on the motion you show the absurdity of the amendment. These constant interruptions on points of order that are not points of order are unworthy. I ask Your Honour for a ruling as to whether I am in order in stating that this attempt to have an amendment which is totally irrelevant to the motion is in order or not. After hearing what I have read out to the House, I

repeat, no matter how long you take, it will come back to this. "May's" points out that you must have reference to the subject of the motion and not some reference, as here, to the Parliamentary life of His Honour the Speaker as distinct from His Honour on a particular occasion. I sit awaiting Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the request made by the Hon. and Learned member for St. Joseph is a bit premature. As I understand him, he is asking me to rule that the amendment is out of order, when up to and including this moment the amendment is not before the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not intend to overstep my bounds at any time, but it is very difficult to interpret that and make a speech. If the amendment is not before the House so far, the motion is not before the House, because I have not moved it yet. Is it Your Honour's ruling that in the course of making this motion, I cannot refer to the amendment?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair so rules that in the course of making these preliminary points, you cannot refer to the amendment.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before a word of evidence is given in a Court of Law, every side may make preliminary points, and the same thing applies to Parliament. If something which is coming before Parliament is out of order, you make preliminary points that it is out of order so that it would not be entertained. I must get guidance from Your Honour. If I make a speech on the motion and the motion is not carried, how does the amendment come into it at all? How is it possible to have an amendment to deal with a motion which is voted out and then to come to the amendment? I would suggest with the greatest possible respect - and, I must say, humility because I am merely a member on the floor and Your Honour is in the Chair - to adjourn this question at this time and give further consideration to it before we make ourselves a laughing stock. It does not matter what hon. members on the other side do, but before this House tells the world that it goes absolutely contrary to the Rules of procedure, a little further consideration may be given to it. I am speaking now as a Barbadian and not as Leader of the Opposition. I want to say that some people are so obstinate that when daylight is shown to them, they cannot recognise it as daylight. I do not want it to go forth that a clear indication has been put to them from the authorities as to whether this amendment is in order or not, and yet a majority in a three-hundred-year-old Parliament of Barbados says it is nothing to do with the procedure. If I have not made myself clear, I repeat I am asking guidance from Your Honour as to when I can speak on the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is quite willing to hear the Hon. and Learned member for St. Joseph on that point when the amendment is before the House, and only then.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: When does the amendment come before the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The amendment, as I understand it, is before the House when it is moved and seconded; not until then.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I hope that you will not say anything more except again to ask the Government side to take a vote on it to advise that further consideration be given to this matter. I do not mean the whole motion; I mean the question as to whether the amendment is relevant. I want the motion to be debated; I am not trying to get away from the whole question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I am trying to be as restrained as I can be. It would be as well to establish what we are doing. As I understand it, Your Honour has ruled on the points submitted to you by the hon. member opposite. Your Honour having ruled on this point, your ruling has to be accepted by the whole House. It could conceivably be challenged subsequently, but

not now, and the only thing left for the hon. member to do is to move his substantive motion which stands in his name, which he is apparently trying to get away from doing.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December 15, 1966, he not only disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker that he should withdraw words that he had spoken and to which objection had been taken but added to his refusal to do so language completely destructive of parliamentary order and respect for the Chair;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House considers that His Honour in reversing a ruling which he had given with respect to language used by the Leader of the House with the result of freeing him from the punishment which the Standing Orders provided for a member guilty of gross disorderly conduct or of disregarding the authority of the Chair was himself guilty of conduct unbecoming the dignity of the Chair and is deserving of the gravest possible censure."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know it has been winded about, and the printed copies of the debates which have been put before us seem to give - only seem - some support to His Honour's reference to the statements of the Press..... 1.15 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I certainly do not agree with the language he has used that the Report as published in the *Official Gazette* "seems to". As I understand it, this is the Official Document of the House and we are all bound by it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It would be difficult to know what Your Honour is correcting me about. I say that when you read this, it seems to give weight to what His Honour the Speaker said. With great respect, what is wrong with that? It has been said that the Speaker did not rule; events are fresh in the memory of hon. members and I need not quote every word that was said, but my statement is one of those declared to be not fair or accurate. In a letter to the Press written while everything was fresh in my mind and memory and confirmed by the recollection of those of my colleagues from whom I enquired what were the actual words the Speaker used; I made the statement; but even if this Report in the *Official Gazette* is accurate, then the Speaker is guilty of even more than what I have accused him of. My recollection - and the recollection of some members on this side of the House - is that the Speaker said that the words should be withdrawn and then he requested - or then asked - the hon. junior member for St. Lucy if he would withdraw them. That, I repeat, is a stronger action than that of which I have accused him. Is it the duty of the Speaker, when insulting and annoying words are used, to ask the member if he will withdraw them? He calls on the member to withdraw them or the House insists that he withdraws them. If somebody is wrong, does the Magistrate ask if he should be punished when he has been proved guilty? That defence, which will be made from the other side, is a worse accusation. We do not ask a member if he is inclined to withdraw words. When the hon. junior member for St. Lucy replied to the request, as it will be said from the other side, we say that the Speaker did both things. He said that the words should be withdrawn and then he asked the hon. member if he would withdraw them. I do not accept that the words are complete; and if anybody is inclined to say so - I do not include Your Honour in this - these words are not sacred words. They need not be accepted if the House said that this was not really what was said.

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is said by some people to be quite good on the English Language. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not use my recollection now, but I will use the words here: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." My recollection and the recollection of others was that the hon. member said: "If I obeyed your

ruling", but the super-English knowledge of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy says: "If I obeyed you or your request". You do not obey a request; you obey a command. I give you a command and you say you do not obey it. What you obey is a command. I cannot speak from personal knowledge as regards the Speaker's way of putting a question of withdrawal to hon. members because I was not in the House previous to this Session. I was not in the House during the last session, but if hon. members misquote words I will reply to them.

If hon. members will remember their procedure, as soon as offensive words are used and objected to, the usual procedure to make sure that the exact words objected to were really spoken, is to call on the Speaker to take down the words and get from the Reporter confirmation of those words. There is no question of asking a member if he has done wrong; however much a Speaker may be in the habit of asking that words be withdrawn instead of asking the member to withdraw them, that is not the duty of the Speaker. Need I ask this House to say that these words were offensive and insulting? The words used were "pretended patriotism" and "gross hypocrisy". I should have thought that that was something like that used by petty-fogging lawyers - I do not mean local lawyers - and one would realise that you tried to make a distinction which is not in reality. For instance, you catch a man taking away things and you say that this man is stealing, but you must not call him a thief!

1.25 p.m.

You can say this man is stealing, but you cannot call him a thief! In this case the words used are "rank hypocrisy", but he is not being called a hypocrite! Could anything be more childish than to have a Speaker making a ruling as that? I ask hon. members if they are going to defend those words, faced with the Standing Order that speaks of offensive and insulting words. "Hypocrisy" is a word which has always been held to be unparliamentary. What does it mean? It means that a man is saying something which he does not believe in. If I were teaching a school of mentally defectives, they would understand that. Can any hon. member seriously defend the statement by Mr. Speaker when he said that the word "hypocrisy" was not used in respect of the person but was used in respect of the words he used?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to read to you some of the things which are deemed unparliamentary. Some of the words are here before me in this volume. In the 16th Edition on page 457 - and I think it is in the older Edition which gives more words than this - you will find "hypocrite" was held to be unparliamentary. There are a whole long list of unparliamentary words in that volume. The Speaker used the words referred to in "May's" 16th Edition. Of course, I have it before me, but you find the phrase used is "rank hypocrite" and both words were held to be unparliamentary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would recall the occasion in which these things were said when I referred to this remark. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy at the bottom of page 19 in the first half said:-

"Ordinarily, I would not wish to have made the sort of speech I have to make now, and I 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 remarks 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 were a crowd of wild people and rascals."

Of course, I never said anything of the sort but I would expect this sort of statement from the hon. member.

The hon. member went on to say:-

"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."

I must comment on that report. I most certainly heard the hon. member saying "pretended" patriotism.

I got up and objected to that remark and His Honour the Speaker said:

"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."

The Hon. junior member for St. Lucy then said:

"I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you accept the fact that the Speaker heard those two words, the rules are very emphatic. When objection is taken, the person is asked to withdraw that remark. He is not asked if he is willing to withdraw that remark. He is expected to obey. "Obey" is the word used. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said, "I would not obey your request." You are not requesting me to do something; you are asking me to do something.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to speak a little longer because of the grave accusation made against the ruling of the Chair. I emphatically denied in my letter to the Press that things are reported in a fair and accurate manner. Even in giving his ruling, Mr. Speaker suggested that I made an accusation which was not fair and accurate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you may have read my letter to the Press, when I said that the hiatus was 25 minutes. I turned to my colleague on my left and said, "let us look at the clock." Fancy a Speaker of five years' experience taking 25 minutes, when he could refer to the index in "May's" to discover whether the words were unparliamentary or not.
1.35 p.m.

The words in the Standing Order are.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall have to ask Your Honour when the hon. member rises on a point of order to let him state what the point of order is before he attempts to make a speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is very improper, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the hon. member to make remarks which reflect on the servants of this House. Page 19 from which he has been quoting shows that when I made my reply to Mr. Speaker it was 7.15 p.m. and that when Mr. Speaker apologised for the delay it was 7.25 p.m. In fact, therefore, the delay was only ten minutes. It is most improper for the hon. member to say that there was a hiatus of twenty-five minutes, because the import of what he has said must mean...

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, if your Honour is allowing that as a point of order, I would ask what in the name of heaven is this to do with the point. The hon. member is making a speech. There is one thing I am bold enough to say as long as I am in this House, and it is to get hon. members to stick to the Rules. That is not a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member is quoting from the *Official Gazette* of this House in respect of a certain

debate, and if that same hon. member makes reference to a point in time which is at variance with the official record, that hon. member is saying that the proceedings of this House are inaccurate as they have been reported in the *Official Gazette*. I think Your Honour ought to draw to the attention of the hon. member that he cannot do this, because it is a reflection not only on the Chair, but on the hon. members who were present at the debate, as well as on the servants of the House who are responsible for accurate reporting and recording of the speeches of this House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I was saying when I was interrupted without justification in order that the hon. member might make a speech, that to take twenty-five minutes to arrive at a decision as to whether those words were offensive.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. and Learned member for St. Joseph. If he were not quoting from the official record of this Hon. Chamber, I certainly would not draw to his attention the fact that the record says only ten minutes; but since he is quoting from the official record, I think it is my duty to draw to his attention that the record says only ten minutes.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to hear the hon. member for St. Lucy quote any authority for saying that you cannot differ from the official report. I say that I looked at my watch and drew the attention of the hon. senior member for Christ Church to the clock, and I say that with both of us watching the clock twenty-five minutes were spent. If the *Official Gazette* has it otherwise, the *Official Gazette* is wrong. I still have to see some authority which says that this is the Gospel of St. John; you must believe every word.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, again on a point of order.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will have to leave the House - and the hon. member would be only too glad - if this sort of thing is to go on, and if Your Honour allows alleged points of order to go on like this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, what is involved here is not a disagreement on two sides of the House. This is something more important. It is the integrity of the servants of the House. Everybody knows, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Official Reporters come into the Chamber at ten minutes intervals; therefore if the report says something happened.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must do your duty. Are you going to allow that to continue? What point of order has he raised?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the report says that something took place at 7.15 p.m., that Reporter X took up his stand at the Table and something else takes place at 7.25, this means it refers to the change over of Reporters in ten minute spells of duty; therefore it cannot be true that the hiatus was twenty-five minutes.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would like a ruling by Your Honour. Every time the hon. member for St. Lucy gets up, is he going to be allowed to continue to make a speech and not raise a point of order? The hon. member has a chance of speaking and correcting or contradicting anything I say, instead of to be constantly bobbing up and down when the hon. member ought to be setting a good example of good manners, proper respect to the Chair and regard for the Standing Orders which he is, under the pretence of points of order, constantly breaking. What has he said that is a point of order, jumping up and down and making subsidiary speeches or preliminary speeches? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will continue.

"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: "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."

I drew attention to the.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member for St. Joseph, but I share his sympathy in not finding that Report.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have been able to borrow some versions of the Hansard, but the ones I have already do not contain this particular debate. I think there are at least fourteen volumes of the debates of the House of Commons, but I could only get hold of three.

"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 seriously 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 in as much 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 No. 26 (5) and can be ordered by the Chair to be withdrawn or certain consequences will follow." 1.45 p.m.

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."

The same Speaker who read that did not see that to call words acts of hypocrisy is to call the person acting or speaking a hypocrite. It is fantastically clear that the Speaker made a slip, however long he might have been in this House, but we are making laughing-stocks of ourselves if we go out of the way because of party affiliation. What does the word "hypocrisy" mean? This is something of which we should be heartily ashamed. This island has a reputation in the West Indies and beyond of being a Parliament long preserving the traditions of democracy, even in the old days we were known for fair play before the term democracy spread to the English-speaking world. Everybody knows that the Barbadian reputation for that sort of thing has diminished. The small islands are sneering at us instead of in the old days when we used to press forward; they looked up to this Assembly as the leading Assembly in the area. Now that the Speaker has made a slip, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy will appreciate my quotation that the Speaker has lapsed. It is with regret that we must see that if we do not put an end to lapses from proper procedure and the observance of the Rules of this House we will drift snobbishly to what we call South American Republican Colonies. I will continue reading Sir. The Speaker made reference to the Parliamentary Debates in the Commons, 1962-63 Volume 672 Page 15, 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."

The report goes on that members of the Opposition left the Chamber. We have no defence to make of that. To hear the Speaker of the House or the Judge of a Court make a distinction between saying that a man is a thief and not calling him a thief will be much to much for us to stomach. There was a spontaneous walk-out, because at that stage

There was a spontaneous walk-out, because at that stage could any hon. member respect or have respect for a ruling like that which the Speaker gave? I wonder if the Speaker has not said that he is going to rule words like those unparliamentary. He is only hoping that no other hon. member will come so close to the line again. I wonder, if somebody on this side, in the course of a debate uses the words which were used, what the Speaker will do.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will force me to speak to you as if we are sitting around a table, if this sort of thing continues.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was only saying, Sir, if it is all the same to the hon. member, I would like to move the suspension of this sitting at 2 p.m. of the clock. I would like the hon. member to give some intimation if this is acceptable to him.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, I was speaking on the point at which the hon. junior member for St. Lucy made some comment on the fact that members of the Opposition went out. Obviously, when I saw that the Report was incomplete, I could easily refer to it. I know that in the old days no Reporter could always hear properly what hon. members said and, in some cases, it was not worthwhile reporting everything. 1.55 p.m.

It is not enough *ex cathedra* to say such-and-such is the thing without quoting the authority for it. It is not enough; so I can question the record. It is overbearing to ask hon. members to set an example to their colleagues and show them what is the proper way of conducting an Assembly. You cannot condemn the whole nation or a whole people. It is obvious that some are good. I am speaking generally. I think the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would say that this is a generalisation.

I merely repeat that for members of the Opposition to walk out, it was to show how disapproving they were that such a profound error was made by the Speaker, nor can I see anything to blame them for. We have no other way of showing our disapproval. I am sure the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would get up and say something if I am wrong. Certainly in the old days if you are in the House, you either vote "Aye" or "No". You cannot abstain and I do not think the rule is changed. If you are in the House when a vote is being taken, you have to vote one way or the other. We went out and we had the right to do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the time is now 2 o'clock and I am sure the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would move, in more flowery language than I can, the suspension of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition indicate whether he has finished his speech or not?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You must have observed that I had only given way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock p.m.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

The bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been informed by the Clerk of the Table that the Sitting of this Chamber was suspended until 3 o'clock. It is now even somewhat later than that. I am further informed that the House was still giving consideration to the matter which was under discussion and I must inform hon. members that I do not intend even now, although his Hon. the Deputy Speaker is not yet present, to preside over this matter.

I ask hon. members in view of what I stated was my intention not to pursue with the matter under discussion until my colleague the Hon. Deputy Speaker is available. I would only say now that I think something seriously has happened to prevent him from arriving in time. I would ask if there is any other matter which the Hon. Leader of the House can proceed with at this time.
3.05 p.m.

Methinks, my colleague, the Hon. Deputy Speaker is arriving.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I very much regret being a few minutes late.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I dealt with the language used, as appears in the *Official Gazette*, by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I did not, however, mention everything, as my motion reads that His Honour the Speaker accepted without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy. I have already pointed out that the very language used by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the very use of the word in the debate shows that the Speaker by whatever language he may use - if as we may assume he was doing his duty as Speaker - was calling on the junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw the remarks objected to. May I point out to hon. members that the use of the word "unparliamentary" means only that Parliament has deemed that they are offensive words! The Order says "it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House." Can any language be more insulting than to say that the utterance of an hon. member is gross hypocrisy? His Honour the Speaker had either to condone or correct that. His Honour the Speaker himself would have been in the House when on one occasion at least in my time a member was named - I being the member, when I refused to withdraw words which the Speaker said I should withdraw. I thought the Speaker was wrong and I preferred to be named and leave the Chamber and not return to the House until the Session was over. Of course, I would hardly have done it if the Session had just begun, but it was near the end; but that is by the way.

The point is that when offensive words have been used and objected to, the Standing Orders provide for both the Speaker and the House to take action. I will remind hon. members who may have heard or read my explanation in the Press what the Speaker should have done after the hon. member specifically refused to obey the Speaker, told him that he was not obeying him and that it would be hypocrisy on his part if he obeyed, and saying that using the word "hypocrisy" did not make me a hypocrite. In short, he was dishonest, insincere and all these things which are unparliamentary. On this side the hon. member on my immediate left and myself - and I think the hon. senior member for St. Thomas - drew to the Speaker's attention quite loud enough for him to hear, though perhaps improper because we sat in our chairs, Standing Order No. 36 (2) which says that if a member was guilty of disorderly conduct you would ask him to leave immediately, and if he did not go you could call on the Marshal to put him out. I believe that conduct of that sort is not entirely unknown to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. He could have been suspended or named, but if the suspension or naming was not good enough he should call on the Marshal. We sat here and waited on the Speaker, but none of us could imagine that the Speaker was hunting up May's in order to reverse what he had done. When the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said that he was not going to obey and that it would be gross hypocrisy on his

part, I do not say that he deliberately found a way to release the hon. member from his sins, but that at least was the result, and the only way he could get out of it then without admitting that he was making a mistake was to give a different ruling. This conduct is unworthy of the Barbados House of Assembly. This is utterly disgraceful conduct, and that is why I said in my motion that he is deserving of the gravest possible censure. I am sorry that personally we talk about pride and industry. Pride comes before a fall, and a little humility by Barbadians would do a world of good. We have a lot, perhaps, to be thankful for, and a lot of us use an expression to be proud of by constantly saying that we are better than other men are - and every Barbadian has that fault. This disgraceful example in a 300-year-old Parliament is a thing you cannot condone or forgive.

I appeal to hon. members again to see that this is not a Party matter; this is the dignity and respect that should be held for the Chair that is at stake. Just as if you scorn the judges of a country and run the administration of justice into contempt, so if the example from the Chair is such that you are ashamed of it, we should, to the extent that we can, wipe out that blot on it. You are in the same position. I will repeat what I said earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker; whatever your Party affiliation, if you feel that words are offensive and insulting, you automatically feel they are out of order. If you feel that the Speaker using the word "withdraw" is calling on that member to withdraw although he puts it in his own peculiar way "are you disposed to withdraw", then he gets the thundering blow "if I obey you, how are you going to get over the word 'obey'?"
3.15 p.m.

"If I obeyed your ruling" - this is my clear recollection written down not at the time, but as soon as I saw the following morning that it was not properly reported in the Press. Think of that little word "if I obeyed" your ruling". He did not say: "I am not disposed to comply with your request." There was something that I did not know personally, but it may be that the Speaker has that method of calling on a member to withdraw offensive remarks. As soon as remarks are objected to, you cannot spend half a second, let alone twenty-five minutes, to consider that words are insulting. You must find that the Speaker, after calling on the hon. member to withdraw the remarks, then made a contrary ruling that the words were not unparliamentary - and a Ruling which, I repeat for the last time, no illiterate child could defend. You are guilty of stealing, but you are not a thief! You are guilty of hypocrisy, but we do not call you a hypocrite! Can you not see that you should put your foot down on that whether it be the Government Benches or the Opposition? Let it go forth to the world that this House in a case of this sort which was proved, although he be a member of the Party to which he belongs, or although he is a member of our Party found him guilty. I challenge you to do that. Let Barbadians hold up their heads again. I beg to move that this Resolution standing in my name and which I have read out do now pass.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding the motion.....

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

Mr. St. JOHN: That is what I said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. St. JOHN: I repeat: that is exactly what I said. In seconding this motion I want to make it positively clear that we, on this side of the House, do not regard this motion as a personal attack on any member of this House. What we want to draw to the attention of this House is the specific instance which occurred on the 15th December last year where we regard that the Speaker made a fundamentally wrong ruling, which, in our view could only reflect upon this House as a whole. If it is to be treated as a precedent, it could only bring all of us in here to ridicule. I am saying that there have been many objections made to questioning

the Official Report of these proceedings. I intend to question the Report of these proceedings, and if the Hon. Leader of the House wants to object to that, he can do so. There is a glaring inconsistency in the report of the proceedings of this House and I want to draw it to the attention of hon. members immediately. On page 19 of this Report, in the third paragraph on the right-hand side, it says this: This is dealing with the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: "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." The only "he" which the hon. member could mean was the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. It says: "He is now talking about patriotism. All that is rank hypocrisy. That is what, according to this accurate Official Report, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said. A little lower down when the Speaker called on the Official Reporter of this House to read back exactly what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy had said, this is what the Official Reporter said at that time: Mr. Speaker, in the next paragraph after 7.25 p.m., said this: "I have had the advantage of referring to all available authorities and have considered the exact words as taken down by the Official Reporter. Now the words as taken down by the Official Reporter are: "He is now talking about patriotism. All that to me is rank hypocrisy." If this Report is accurate, how comes it when the Official Report was read back as quoted in this debate by the Speaker at the time when it was fresh in the minds of the Reporters, how comes it that the words "to me" were not included? How comes it that when it is reported later that in the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy the words "to me" are left out. Let them object now. The hypocrisy of all of this is that they are going to get up and say that this Report cannot be questioned. It contains within itself a blatant inconsistency. It is positively clear that somebody doctored up this report, on the occasion when it was read by the Speaker; a falsified report was read by the Speaker.

The bona fides and accuracy of this report must be called in question. That is the question in which we are operating today. The fundamental point which we want to bring before the attention of this House is this: however wrong the Speaker was whether in asking the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw the remarks or otherwise, it was gross contempt of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to say, and I quote: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." Who is the "you" he is talking about? - the gentleman who presides over the proceedings of this House. The hon. member says: "If I obeyed you I would be guilty of rank hypocrisy." I do not think it is possible to conceive of a more direct affront to the dignity and authority of the Chair. 3.25 p.m.

Now, this is where we say that "rank hypocrisy" prevailed. Those words were never dealt with in the ruling. The specious ruling which was given never dealt with that in order to get away from the affront to the Chair. So to go back to the original words of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, to say that those words were not unparliamentary. "If I obeyed you", those words were a gross contempt to the Chair and an affront to the dignity of the Chair. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy was not talking to me or anybody on this side or to anybody on that side. He was talking to the Speaker of this House and he was telling him "If I obeyed you." Look at what he is saying! He is not even saying "If I obeyed Your Honour"; he said "you". That is the full burden of the argument of the Opposition. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy praises himself on the choice of his language. How is the hon. member going to reconcile the use of the words "If I obeyed you"? If the Official Report is correct, is the hon. junior member for St. Lucy going to get up and say that he never used the word "obey"? Or that if he used it, he used it but not in relation to the words "rank hypocrisy"?

In the Mother of Parliaments the then Minister of Finance tampered with Hansard; so the idea that you cannot tamper with Hansard is an overgrown joke. Something is wrong with Hansard on this occasion. I have already said how there is great inconsistency in it.

The Speaker himself failed to deal effectively with the contempt of the Chair by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. That is what I am forcibly drawing to the Chair. From now on if this House does not put its foot down on it "hypocrisy" and "rank hypocrisy" are going to be used in the context at every debate in this Chamber. By the Speaker's ruling, the use of the words "rank hypocrisy" is not unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to ask hon. members not to use statements with the same words that this hon. Chamber is now asked to decide upon.

Mr. St. JOHN: With all due respect to Your Honour, no less an authority than the Speaker of the present Chamber on December 15th, 1966, said that I have come very near the border line. I hope that I am not mashing the crease.

Sir, that is what I want to draw to the attention of hon. members. I have great pleasure in seconding this Resolution because it places our doubt on the records of this Honourable Chamber. It shows clearly that in no uncertain terms we expect Speakers to be strong and to rule in accordance with that strength. It shows clearly that the Official Debates of this House can be tampered with or can be inconsistent within two or three sentences, and it shows that we on this side of the House will do everything we can to protect the dignity of the Chair and to see that those who occupy high positions in the land are not beyond the bounds of criticism which to us is the essence of democracy.

I have great pleasure in seconding this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Now, Sir, I would have liked that all hon. members who were in this Chamber when the incident which is now discussed had taken place, had a copy of the debate. By the discretion of His Honour the Speaker, the debate which dealt with that incident is now before us, and so I am not as handicapped as I might have been if I had not the debate in my hand.

Now, I have read the newspapers' accounts of this affair and I spoke to parliamentarians about this matter; and if the debates are right - at least in some parts - it does appear to me that in dealing with the words supposed to be used by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to the Chair on the occasion that the Chair suggested to him so as to redeem the position that he should withdraw certain words - it does appear that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy held up the Chair to gross contempt. 3.35 p.m.

As a former speaker has said, this is not a party issue. A Speaker, as I know them, has got to be a member who is prepared to face criticism from either side of the House and maintain that dignity which all sides of the House are prepared to grant him in respect of the honour they have bestowed upon him, plus the confidence they have imposed in him. Now it does appear to me, Sir, that His Honour the Speaker was very courteous. I do not think that Speakers generally demean themselves in that way when they consider that an offence has been offered by one to another when he suggests that the offending member should become disposed to withdraw words. The Speaker said "Are you disposed to withdraw the words?" The very language in which it has been couched should appeal to the hon. member who is thought to be offending, and I think he should most becomingly withdraw. This is something new if it is true. There are members in this House today who say that these words were not actually used. I cannot say they have not been used, but let us suppose that the context is correct. If a most benign Speaker on that particular occasion addresses an hon. member and tells him "Are you disposed to withdraw the words complained of", the least he could do, because the Speaker gives him the cue that he would forgive him and he has a chance for Parliament to forgive him, would be to withdraw; but the reply is "I would be guilty of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you."

No hon. member on either side of this ancient and Honourable Chamber would tell me that the Speaker as our

Speaker was not a more than tolerant Speaker at that time. The Standing Orders of this Chamber allowed him to be. This House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has Standing Orders, and the Speaker is the one who has to interpret these Orders aright. I am sure that no Standing Order tells the Speaker that he has to couch in almost Sunday School language remarks intended to convince the hon. member that he is offending against the dignity and the propriety of this Chamber.

Now as touching the Speaker's ruling, that is a ruling he has given already. It is more than implied here because the hon. member for St. Lucy uses the word when he himself thought the Speaker had given an order. You do not obey unless you receive an order. Every hon. member in this Chamber with any sanity at least has more than a nodding acquaintance of the English language. The hon. member has been a teacher at least in and out of Barbados, and I dare say a respectable teacher; therefore I am not supposing, but I feel very strongly that the hon. member knows and knew that when he used that word "obey", he was referring to some order at least he thought had been given, not just a very courteous suggestion that he be so disposed as to withdraw certain remarks. In my opinion, His Honour the Speaker went out of his way to be tolerant to the hon. member. With many a predecessor of the hon. member who is now Mr. Speaker of this Chamber, that hon. member would not have dared to do it and he knows it. I have been in this Chamber when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was the Chief Minister of this country, and on more than one occasion I told him that this is Parliament and that Parliament is supreme. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He made you pay for it.) Thus I have a high sense of the dignity of Parliament, the rights of Parliament and the responsibility of Parliament where members are concerned, and it is a foregone conclusion that when this word "obey" was used, the hon. member who used it knew that he was flouting an order given him by His Honour the Speaker. Now the Speaker made a ruling, and there is doubt about it that the Speaker's ruling is tantamount to saying that the hon. member is wrong and now he is right. Nobody can gainsay that, because it is more than a suggestion that His Honour the Speaker asked the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw, and yet the words complained of were those made out to be parliamentary. A thin line was drawn. If you read the Standing Orders, you will see that unbecoming or insulting language is offensive to the House. In other words, I think if I interpret the Speaker's Ruling, it is like this: if I said you committed an act of stealing, that is parliamentary. If I call you a thief, that is unparliamentary. What does that suggest? 3.45 p.m.

It is the action and not the man; but you cannot dissociate the action of a thief from a thief. How can you dissociate the action of a thief from a thief? A thief steals, and it is the action of stealing that makes him a thief. The fact that he steals makes him a thief. If you say he steals you say that is parliamentary, but if you say that he is a thief, that is unparliamentary. What a line of distinction! I cannot understand what sort of line is being drawn. A man's action should be deprecated by his refusing to obey and then you say the words complained of which should be withdrawn, he was wrong to withdraw. In fact, the hon. member was given an order to withdraw his remarks but then it was ruled by the Speaker that he committed no wrong by using those words; they were not unparliamentary. Were these words unbecoming being applied by a member of this House to another member of this House? That is the question. Were the words offensive when they were applied by a member of this House to another member of this House? That really is the substance of it. You get away in a pseudo-rhetorical manner and say that you looked up "May's." What the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said is true; there is no dictionary for parliamentary words. If I use language in this Chamber that you consider offensive to any member of this House, it is your duty, responsibility and privilege to make me withdraw those words. We are not to insult each other in this place or to embarrass one another by using offensive language. That is what constitutes a breach of order; that is what determines the sort of language which

one member may not use to another hon. member in this House.

It is not for me to take part in any censure of any Officer of this House; I regret to have to do it, but the time has come when we have got to put our feet down on certain trends in the Place. If we begin to do it today, then it is a good thing for the future. It is a two-way traffic. Next week I may come in here and use offensive language to another member - or it may not be myself, but some other hon. member who may care to do it. What will be the attitude? The Speaker is bound to be above Party; so also is the Deputy Speaker because there is no Party Speaker in here. I am suggesting that they open their eyes and see. Apart from the entire accuracy of this Report, it is obvious even to the purblind that when the word "obeyed" appeared in this context, an order had been given, by the admission by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that he was not obeying it. He did not intend to obey something, he did not intend to obey an order given by someone and that someone was His Honour the Speaker and things went worse. Things got out of hand. There and then the hon. junior member for St. Lucy should have been warned that if he did not withdraw the words he would be punished by Parliament and he should have told him in polite language "I consider the remarks used to be offensive to another hon. member" and the hon. member should have withdrawn the remarks. He would have withdrawn the remarks and we would not be here now debating this motion. Instead of that, the hon. member defied the Speaker and used colourful language and said "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." The hon. member added to it and magnified it by using the words "rank hypocrisy".

The Speaker found himself in a difficult situation, especially where his colleague was concerned. He tried to get out of it and in the attempt to get out of it the Speaker urged him to withdraw the words. The situation was absolutely confused. The words were deemed by His Honour the Speaker not to be offensive or unparliamentary. It is the offence you give or which you attempt to give to another which constitutes a breach of the Standing Orders of this House. An act of hypocrisy must be committed by a hypocrite; who else could effect an act of hypocrisy but a hypocrite? You have the answer, members on the other side of the House have the answer and we on this side of the House have the answer. I am not happy in Parliament today to be speaking like this. We know what will happen; we have to handle what has got to be handled and there will be another issue when I come to speak again. There is no way out of this, there is absolutely none; there could be no way out. If there is a way out, then Parliament tumbles down and you are making a joke of Parliament. Parliament is supreme and must remain supreme. When men of honour are prepared to abide by the rules of the Chair, the Chair is obliged and remains obliged to honour the Standing Orders of this House. 3.55 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not in here on the 15th December to hear the remarks of neither side as regards this incident; so I can only go by the words which are here before me relative to the behaviour of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Now, Sir, when I read what took place I can only come to the conclusion that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy took time off to make it as hard as possible and as embarrassing as possible for His Honour the Speaker. When I read those words, I saw how His Honour the Speaker called on his colleague to withdraw the remarks in such a plain sympathetic way, in a way as calm as calm could be, that I could not believe if I had not read it, that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would have made such a reply. I can only believe that he did not do it intentionally.

Now, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is the colleague of His Honour the Speaker; he is a member of his Party, not a member of the Party to which I belong, and His Honour the Speaker appealed to him because he said to him: "I will ask the Hon. Leader of the House whether he

is disposed to withdraw the words "rank hypocrisy", the last words of that sentence, and to which I gather, exception is being taken." If I were in the Chair, I would not have begged the hon. member in that way to withdraw the remark; I would have exercised my authority - the authority which was given to me by the Standing Orders of this House. Why beg him? Is it because he is the Leader of this House? When he is in the House, he is a member just like anybody else and he must learn to obey the Chair. He must learn to obey. He must do that at his home. He must do that when the poor defenseless teachers come around him begging him for an increase. He must do that to them, but not to the Honourable Speaker?

Sir, you were not in here during the last session but we had a Chairman of Committees that whenever he ruled on me, he gave a wrong ruling. He never ruled rightly on me, but whether he ruled rightly or wrongly, you have to respect the Chair. Whether the Ruling is right or wrong, you must obey it. I know my stuff; I know my Rules and no one can get around me. If I were in the Chair, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would not have got away with it. He knows just what I would have done.

Sir, when I was Chairman of Committee, the Leader of the then Government who was the Leader of my Party, wanted me to look small in the Chair by insisting on my doing something which I felt was not in keeping with the Chair. I ruled and I said: "If you insist in doing it, I would name you." The hon. member knew who said it and he did not do anything more.

When the Hon. Leader of the House used those remarks; "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you," it was then that His Honour the Speaker should have got up and put his hands down on it. If he were the Leader, he could not lead any more because I would use the sword. I know that at some time or the other we would lose our temper and we would get hot, but you must learn to govern your temper. At the time I dare suppose that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition might have been making an effort to block the motion for the adoption of the report of the Committee, and that might have made anyone get hot. However, I do not know what caused the Hon. Leader of the House to slip, but when he slipped he should have acted as a man, as a Leader as a Minister of Education, as a top-notch Oxonian would have acted and stayed calm.
4.05 p.m.

The hon. member has made himself look as small as anything by playing powerful and hitting back, not at Lloyd Smith, but at his colleague, one who in my opinion may have had to carry him on his shoulders in the last election. Is that the way he was thanking him for what he had done for him? That should never be the case. I cannot defend legal language because I am not a legal man, and when I see legal men fighting, I stand up and watch because they know the law backwards. Even if you are right and they say you are wrong you are wrong. I would more try to defend laymen, but in this case we have to defend the dignity of this House. If they continue to carry on like this, at nearly every meeting we are going to hear that someone is on the borderline if that is the ruling of the Speaker. If I get up at the next meeting and accuse any other member of rank hypocrisy, what ruling can I expect to get if I do not mash the crease but come to the borderline?

I do not want to be personal in this, Mr. Deputy Speaker but if one takes this seriously, you will see that we have opened ourselves to a lot of trouble if nothing is done about this. You elect a Speaker or a Chairman of Committee to rule because we always go off the line. You know the Rules of this House backwards but you still break them; not that you intend to do it, but in order to make your point you may break the Rules, and the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker are there to call you back even if you go on again and he has to take the same action. If you are clean enough and clever enough like me, you will put the point over while he is calling you back; but you have to know how to get around it. You cannot play you are a tyrant, that you are all this educationalist and do as you like in here. You can do as you like on the platform, because certain things I do

on the platform I cannot do in here. Sometimes when an hon. member vexes me in here, I say when I get on my soap-box I will let the people know. The Rules of this Chamber govern every member; so what do you expect when you break them? I was surprised at the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. This is not the first time that he and the Speaker have clashed in here. Really and truly he is very soft talking and nice, but he has a temperament that if you are not looking closely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Mace will disappear. That is why we have to make sure that nothing of this sort will happen again. I am sure that is not going to pass, because numbers count; so we can only let the people of this country know what we have to tolerate in here. It will not pass unless the members on the other side see it as I do and forget Party, because this is above Party. I can tell you, Sir, that I do not think there is the second person in here as friendly and as close with the Speaker as myself. We live like brothers, or like father and son, but in this case I cannot be an Eli, because if I were an Eli I would break my back. I have to tell him that he was wrong at that time. I was told that when the Speaker called on the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw, one or two members on the other side told him to withdraw. They knew he was wrong. What caused the Speaker to ask the hon. member whether he was disposed to withdraw? Do you think that if His Honour the Speaker did not know that the remark was offensive, he would have asked him to withdraw? But afterwards he tried to save the face of his colleague. We must save the face of our colleagues, but I am not going to save my colleague's face and expose something else of my own.

Now imagine the Speaker taking time off to save his colleague's face in this way, and his colleague who is junior to him making it look bad. You could not wish anything worse.
4.15 p.m.

I know that deep down in your heart of hearts, knowing you as I do, Sir, you only say that for the sake of saying it; you have to put one hundred in the fire in order to save one. There was a farmer who set a trap in order to catch cranes, and when he went to the trap he found a stork in it. The stork said that he was not a crane, he was every so sorry. The farmer replied: "You are caught and you must die." Here it is: you have tried to save your colleague after you have condemned him. You condemn a man to be hanged and you are now doing all sorts of things to save his life. I am putting to you and to the members of this House this question: Is this word "hypocrisy" unparliamentary or not? That is the question. That is all we have to deal with this afternoon. Is it unparliamentary or not? I am saying that it is unparliamentary. I am saying it is so. If you were to look up a dictionary for the meaning of the word "hypocrisy" you will find that there is a lot to it. There is everything to it except that you are a gentleman. You pretend to be a lawyer and you are not one, that would be simply misleading the people because I would be paying you money to defend me and you are not a lawyer. You pretend to be a Reverend or a Bishop and you are not one. You pretend that you are an honest man but you are dishonest. All of that belongs to the word "hypocrite". You pretend to be one of the biggest shots in Oxford, but you are not one. All of that belong to the word hypocrite. You pretend to be a man and when they hold up your clothes you are something else. (Laughter). All of that belongs to the word "hypocrite". I say that you are a hypocrite and you tell me that that is near to the border-line. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very sorry that a thing like this has happened between the Speaker of the House and the Leader of the House. I am as sorry for that as if it had happened to me. I am in sympathy. It has been said by an hon. member that the Speaker might have slipped, but I am saying that he fell down. That was only trying to save a friend; that is all the Speaker was doing at the time. He was trying to save his colleague. If His Honour the Speaker had ruled in the first instance when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised his objection, and he had said that it was near the borderline I would not have said a word this afternoon. If you at any time rule on me and I know that you are wrong, I will be satisfied. I will be satisfied, but afterwards I will tell you that you were unfair to me. I can remember the time when the same Speaker ruled on me and ruled wrongly. I sat down but afterwards I told him that he was unfair to me.
4.25 p.m.

What makes me feel happy this afternoon is to know that I have company now. Last year I did not have company. Last year they jumped up all the time on points of order. I had to take on every Minister over on the other side last year, but with all that I never slipped up.

This is a serious thing and I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy not to let it happen again. The words of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition might not have been appealing to him and might have caused him to feel like flying over the handle, but he must remember that we are in Parliament.

Sir, I am not saying anything more now on the matter because I have some licks to share on the amendment. I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to be more calm and not to allow anything like that to happen again.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not suppose that anybody read the motion as it now stands, but if they did, they would, I think, be reminded of a famous character who was approaching his seventieth birthday and who as he rode down the stream of life was given to escapades and political exercises of gross impropriety. It was asked of this old gentleman in this novel with what great cause is he negotiating the currents and the reply of another character in the novel was, with the great cause of cheering us all up.

I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has really cheered us up today because he has made the kind of speech which allows you to understand quite clearly what nonsense really is, and I am ashamed that he was so ably supported from that side. I am sure when the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph listened to him they must have said as was said in Macbeth:

"Who would have thought the old man
To have had so much blood in him."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have to understand certain modes of speaking of the hon. members opposite. They are like some travellers faced with a dreary stretch of road. The mere fact that it is dreary causes them to think that they can skip over the smooth parts of it, and that attempt from time to time makes it appear as if they are really travelling when in fact they have not started.

It would be even thought that this motion which they introduced has only the import and the scope which they want it to have, but I cannot start as they started. You have to start from the beginning. You have to set the records straight. How did this incident ever occur? I must take the House back from the beginning and refresh its mind. The House had been on the point of accepting the report of the Select Committee which had been set up under Mr. Speaker's Chairmanship to deal with the salaries of members of this Chamber and the members of the staff. This Select Committee had reported, and while the report was about to be presented and disposed of, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition unknown to several of his colleagues introduced a Minority Report. Even if they knew about it, they did not approve of it. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas was heard to say that while he supported the so-called Minority Report, he only saw it not more than five minutes before it was presented to the House.

While the debate on the Report of this Committee was going on, there were notable absentees from that side of the House. The hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. James were absent. Their absence, as I know, was due to the fact that they dissociated themselves from the stand taken by the Leader of their Party and felt that they would have embarrassed him when he was making his speech. If I am misrepresenting their position, I am prepared to give way and let them get up and set the record straight. I am saying that the senior member for St. Joseph, the senior member for St. Peter and the junior member for St. James could not, or did not, take part because they felt that it would have been embarrassing to be

present. As a matter of fact, when the Minister of Agriculture was speaking in the course of the debate, he challenged the Hon. Leader of the Opposition by saying that if he could get the unanimous support of the members of his Party for the stand he is taking that the Government would withdraw the salaries provisions and bring them along the lines which he is suggesting. (*Loud Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to Standing Order 29, Rule 6, which reads thus:-

"While a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, I would like to take this matter stage by stage because hon. members opposite tend to forget what this thing was all about. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition could command unanimity on the part of members on his side we would postpone these proposals. At that time hon. members who were in their places were seriously concerned that the Government was ready to consider the proposals.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The rules of this House say that members should speak relevant to the debate. The motion before the House is:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December 15, 1966, he not only disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker that he should withdraw words that he had spoken and to which objections had been taken but added to his refusal to do so language completely destructive of parliamentary order and respect for the Chair." 4.35 p.m.

The gist of the motion is the language and the conduct of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to the Chair. That is the point at issue. Let the hon. member deal with the language and conduct at issue, not with other irrelevancies.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if you can recall the famous character - he was a House of Commons character - at the turn of the century of whom it was said that before he got up he never knew what he was going to say, when he was speaking he did not know what he was saying, and after he sat down he did not know what he had said? I do not think we need take the hon. senior member for Christ Church too seriously; he does not understand what this is all about.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I have asked for a ruling. I know that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy does not take the Chair seriously, but I am objecting to irrelevancies during his debate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It may well be, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the other side think they can reply and interrupt. I do not mind interruptions at all. Any time the member rises I am going to give way to him, because I am not going to sit down until I have said all I have to say on this motion, and they are not going to like it. That is what the trouble is. There is no reason for the hon. member to disturb me.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the time there were notable absentees from this Chamber during the debate of members' salaries. Some of the absentees were very concerned lest the Government would give way to the pressure which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was trying to mount against the acceptance of the Select Committee's Report. In the course of the debate it became necessary for me to answer certain allegations which he had made previously. Now I may say here at this point that ever since this session opened, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been at pains to make it appear as if he has some personal animosity against me, and that therefore even without pro-

vocation on my part he must always attempt to score debating points and make personal remarks against me. I should like to assure the hon. member that this is all right with me, because he will not say anything in this session that he has not already said in the session of 1956-1958 during the time I was present, and before that the previous session, and all he has repeated now with reference to me I have already answered; so this does not disturb me. Since however, I happen to be responsible for the conduct of Government affairs in this Chamber, I must challenge any statement made by him as Leader of the Opposition against the Government of which I am a member. In the course of his speech, the hon. member made reference to the fact that the Treasury was bare and the Island could not now afford salary increases. All this he had said, and when I got up to reply, I certainly said all of this when taken into account, and paraphrasing my remarks which can be referred to in the official version - that when on the one hand you pretend or insist that you have such a care for the country and the state of its finances, but five or so years previously when a remark was made by a person in his position could have more damaging effect - this was the gist of my thinking - you could not justify an attempt made in 1961 to discredit the Government and a country, and a concern for the finances of the country five years after. This is all it was, and I said and I repeat that all that to me is rank hypocrisy.

Well, now, at that point, the hon. member thinking that he himself had been personally affronted by my remarks rose to protest. If you turn to the *Official Gazette* which records the proceedings on that day, you will see that as soon as objection took place, Mr. Speaker asked me whether I was disposed to withdraw the statement, and I answered the Speaker as is written here - "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." I make no apology for that. I cannot now at this moment tell you what should or should not have happened. All I can say is that what happened is recorded here. There was not, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to insist, any long and embarrassing hiatus. The Report of the House as the records show, gives the ten minute intervals when the Reporters of this House change duties. But what the hon. member is really worried about is this: he does not like the idea of having it said that he left the House in protest against the Speaker's ruling. Well, there is a sense in which he would be right. There was no ruling; but there is another sense in which he would be wrong. All over this Island people have the impression that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, disgusted with the refusal of the Chair to discipline me as he thinks I should be disciplined, rose in a bluster and protest and carried off his flock with him. No such thing happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker. During the hiatus as he calls it, the Hon. Minister of Trade happened to be outside this Chamber, and in the course of being outside of the Chamber took a telephone message from the wife of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to the effect that he was wanted on the phone. This message was duly sent to him. He rose immediately as he should to answer the telephone, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, the hon. senior member for St. James, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter, neither of whom I submit, knew the real reason for the hon. member having to leave the room, rose and left the room.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, whenever the hon. member misrepresents me in this Chamber, I will put the record straight. I say this is a foul misrepresentation by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. It is absolutely incorrect. After His Honour the Speaker made the ruling and it became clear, we on this side agreed that we were going to leave the Chamber to show our utter disgust and contempt for the weak-kneed ruling of the Speaker of this Chamber.
4.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we go any further, the hon. member, in the course of his remarks just now, accused me of making a foul representation of his position. The word "foul" is definitely unparliamentary. I take offence at it, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have given some consideration to the expression which has been complained of and I

feel that within that context in my opinion it is not unparliamentary. (*Cheers from the Opposition*)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is quite all right with me. I hope that if in the course of this debate I reply to the hon. member he will scarcely disturb the House and yourself. Before we move off that point, I should just like to say this. Hon. members opposite have since that occasion tried to make virtue out of necessity by pretending that they walked out in righteous indignation. That is an indication of a false motive and I ask Your Honour to call upon the hon. member to withdraw that. He has accused me of insincerity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not consider the expression used by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to be unparliamentary. (*Cheers*)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Of course, as I was saying, the facts are there and they are well known on this side of the House. I would not like them to get away with this idea that they went out of the House because they were dissatisfied with Mr. Speaker's ruling. Much play has been made about their own willingness to uphold the dignity of the Chair and about their concern about Parliamentary rectitude, and all of that. It is most unfortunate that the hon. member who is making this motion should be the person to be most concerned with this. He himself has reminded us that he was suspended from the service of this House. I have the debate before me now; it was the debate on the 18th January, 1938, and it was a debate on an Address which was moved by the then hon. junior member for St. George, Mr. Elder, an Address the purport of which was to recommend a certain course of action with respect to the change of the constitution of the then Legislative Council. Mr. Elder had said in the course of his speech that the particular change was agreeable to the propertied class and all persons capable of thinking. It was this remark made by Mr. Elder to which the then hon. senior member for St. Joseph took exception and which he referred to as a "reckless misstatement". His words are as follows:-

"I have great praise to give to the hon. mover of this Address for the pertinacity with which he has pursued his way of thinking, and even sometimes for the language he has used, because if this were not a parliamentary body I would, perhaps use the little word 'lie' or certainly 'reckless misstatement' as regards the last sentence with which I was dealing."
4.55 p.m.

The Speaker at that time said that the hon. member could not make a remark like that, and if this were not a parliamentary body he could use the word "lie" or "reckless misstatement". The Speaker therefore asked the hon. member to withdraw that remark at once.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph insisted: "I say it was a reckless misstatement."

He was called on to withdraw the remark.

The whole point is this. The hon. member said that when he use the word "misstatement" he was not referring to the hon. member for St. George as a person, but he was referring to the propertied class. All the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was saying was that the word "misstatement" did not apply to the hon. member for St. George then, but that he was speaking of the propertied class.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Speaker on this occasion held a different view from that of the Speaker in 1938. There was a difference in view of the Speaker in 1938 from the Speaker in 1966, but Speakers can vary. Mr. Speaker in 1938 held the view that no matter what was the contention of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, whether the words "reckless misstatement" were used in respect of a person or in respect a statement, they were still used in respect of a person and, therefore, they were held to be unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion took the view that the words "rank hypocrisy" were used in respect of a statement and hon. members can see that he went to some trou-

ble to find the different views in which the words were used. Mr. Speaker on the occasion of the discussion took the view that the words "rank hypocrisy" referred not to a person, but to what was being said.

Now, no Speaker is necessarily bound by his predecessor; no Speaker is necessarily bound by the arguments or the set of circumstances which may have led up to the ruling given by his predecessor in office in a different case. The point however in this matter and in this case is that they claim that His Honour the Speaker made a ruling and the hon. member refused to obey it.

We claim that no ruling was given and that the Speaker sought to give the House merely some guidance, because he was asked some guidance as to whether words used in a certain context were or were not unparliamentary and, therefore, to move a motion censuring the Speaker for alleged giving and reversing a ruling is not only nonsensical, but a distortion of the facts. Since no ruling was given, there could be no reversal of the ruling.

What I want to refer to is something else. I do not know how it is possible to take certain things out of the context, and that is why I am pointing to the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is probably, and certainly one of the hon. members in this Chamber, who would testify to how firm an allegiance the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has to parliamentary traditions. If you look at the debate which took place in this Chamber in 1956, you will see when that extraordinary debate took place in this Chamber on that day it was caused by the fact that the then Hon. Leader of the House had discovered after the dissolution of the House that the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who at the time of the dissolution was Speaker, was not then suitable enough to take the Chair of the House.

I expect, of course, that the hon. senior for St. Peter would now say something in defence of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. However, he was ably represented against his now Leader, and then Leader, by speakers on this side of the House. This was the occasion when the then Governor was kept waiting for four or five hours in the Other Chamber by the tense atmosphere in this House and the contention of the Opposition then was this: how can you say that you are upholding British traditions when you are breaking them so relentlessly today by proposing to make somebody else Speaker although the last Speaker is here today and you have not found any fault with him? The burden of our contention on that day was that you are making such a great departure from accepted parliamentary traditions to remove a Speaker without notice, without coming to the House and without the courtesy of letting the hon. member who was the former Speaker know the reason why you did not consider that he should hold office again.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your guidance, I want to let the hon. member who is on his feet know that two wrongs do not make a right. And furthermore, Standing Order No. 26(2) says: "A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Now, Sir, if the hon. member is hoping that by saying that on one occasion I was any victim or that I suffered at the hands of any Member of Parliament and that he defended me on that occasion, that is the speaker's injection. When I see what is right, I see what is right whether there is an hon. member on my right or any hon. member on my left, and on this occasion, Sir, with what I have already spoken today, I am convinced that I have spoken what any normal person possessed of sanity.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member is out of order by disregarding Standing Order No. 26(2).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said the hon. member has made his point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can well understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how awkward and embarrassing it is for the hon. member when I recall this to the House. It was a terrible occasion and the sympathy.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, after Your Honour has heard me refer to the Rule, will you allow the hon. member to continue being irrelevant? I refer Your Honour to Standing Order No. 26(2) since the hon. member has derogated away from the subject of this debate. I appeal to Your Honour that what is before the House is before us, and what is not before us we are protected from by this Standing Order, and you are the guardian of these Rules.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not for me, of course, to give any opinion on this matter. I merely say that this is a debate the purpose of which is to censure Mr. Speaker, and I can only reply to the other side by using arguments which tend to show that there are certain hon. members who have always, at least before this occasion, tried to drag down the dignity of the Chair in ways in which they are doing it now.

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to detain the House on this point. I can well understand the hon. member's embarrassment now when he hears mention of this, because it was a disgraceful occurrence, and the hon. member sitting next to him, the hon. junior member for St. James, was one of them that voted against him. The hon. member who is now in this place was another hon. member who had at that time voted against him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, how long will you continue to allow the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to break Standing Order No. 26 which reads: "A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto"? How long will we have to listen to irrelevant matter? How long will he be allowed to stray? That is the question I pose to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all sincerity and respect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair rules that the observations being made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy are not only relevant but material.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make my position absolutely clear. The hon. senior member for St. Peter may have been labouring under the misapprehension that I am raising this matter in order to embarrass him. Nothing is further from my mind.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, the hon. member has said that I may be embarrassed. Now he is saying he is not saying it for my embarrassment. He is saying one thing now and another thing another time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The whole point is this: I did say he may be embarrassed. I have not said it to embarrass him; I am saying it because I want to show this House that the Mover of this motion has a tradition which has developed through his parliamentary career of crossing swords with Speakers, and therefore when you take into account the fact that as far back as 1938 he himself had a clash in which he was suspended, then in 1956 he had more than a clash. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he removed the Chair from the hon. member in very humiliating circumstances; again in 1957 the hon. member had a clash here with Dr. Cummins who was Speaker; with respect to the present Speaker now the hon. member would be in some difficulty to show why he has adopted this attitude towards the present Speaker. It is amazing how these things knit themselves together. In 1948 the hon. senior member for St. Peter became Speaker of this House because of a refusal of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to take the Chair, and if you look at the debates of 1948 and see the lavish praises which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph heaped upon the hon. senior member for St. Lucy then, you would not think that it is the same hon. member. Incidentally the reason why the amendment is so framed, although we are not dealing with this, is because the motion itself is relevant to the parliamentary career of the hon. member under attack.

In 1948 they wanted the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to be Speaker. He expressed regret, and turned then on the refusal of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. In 1956 he discards the hon. senior member for St. Peter who had been Speaker for eight years, and whom in 1951 he praised as the upholder of traditions, but from 1951 to 1956 something happened which in the mind of the same hon. junior member for St. Joseph caused the hon. senior member for St. Peter to cease to be the upholder of parliamentary traditions, and without warning and without telling the hon. member himself, he did not recommend him for the Chair. Now you see, therefore, that because of this considerable inconsistency with regard to the Chair, praising Speakers one time, damning them another time, dragging the Chair from under them a third time, the hon. member has established a pattern of inconsistency; therefore we are not to take this motion as seriously as they would have us take it.

It was only on 17th November last that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph seconded my motion that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy do take the Chair as Speaker. What did the hon. member say - that under the circumstances there was no better choice. When you say in the circumstances there is no better choice, within the context of a deliberative Assembly, you can only mean that the hon. member whose nomination you second is by far the fittest member in the whole Assembly to be Speaker. The hon. member then went on to mumble something about how he was misreported in a newspaper.

5.15 p.m.

That had reference to a case which engaged the Supreme Court of this Island sometime in April last year, and that case was, as far as I recall, a libel suit which was brought against the Advocate Company by Mr. Speaker; it was because there had appeared, I think on the fourth or fifth October, 1965, in the Advocate a report of a public meeting which the Barbados Labour Party had held at Mayers Corner a night or two before. In that Report as published, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, not then a member of this Chamber, said that the Speaker should not be taking sides and should not be partial. That is what was reported. It is unfortunate, of course, that the hon. member himself was not directly involved in the Court proceedings and that the Court proceedings were only held vis-a-vis Mr. Speaker; but the Advocate paid the penalty for this because it reported a meeting at which the hon. member spoke and at which he was said to have used certain words reflecting on the integrity and character of the Speaker of this House. We have to outline this matter very carefully. It would be wrong to suppose that this motion exactly stands by itself arising out of a domestic misunderstanding in this House. It is nothing of the kind; this motion is an attempt to weaken or destroy parliamentary institutions in this House by making it appear that the Speaker of this House is incapable of carrying out his duties as Speaker, and the person himself has already been involved in an attack on the Speaker's conduct of affairs in this House. If the mover of this motion was somehow different from the person who had spoken at a public meeting on the 4th October, 1965, that conclusion could not have been drawn; but when it is the same person, when the hon. member invites a vote of censure on the Speaker of this House he is.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker. On a point of order. If there is one thing which is most emphatically clear, it is that you cannot apply evil motives to an hon. member. The hon. member can say what he has said outside the privilege of this House and he will see what will happen! Standing Order 26(7) on page 35 of the Standing Orders of this House says this:

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

The hon. member is saying that I am hitting back to something which was done - a prosecution against me which the prosecution did not go on with. It failed. That is a preposterous statement. He says I am casting a reflection on the Speaker and that is the worst of improper motives

to impute to an hon. member. I ask Your Honour to call on the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that is troubling the hon. member, I will withdraw it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not accept that. It is not troubling me at all. It is against the Standing Orders of this House and the hon. member has to withdraw it without any modifications. He has to withdraw it because it imputes improper motives to make that statement, not because it disturbed me.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as it is disturbing the hon. member, I will withdraw it. The hon. member talks about imputing improper motives. The trouble with this hon. member is that he talks and forgets. What a person says about himself is probably the surest indication of what he is thinking. The hon. member opposite has said on a public platform that he would join the Devil in hell to get the Democratic Labour Party out of power.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is absolutely untrue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never said that. I have never used any expression like that. That is a deliberate untruth manufactured in the head of the hon. member, and I will call upon him to withdraw that. If the hon. member has courage enough to shelter under the privileges of the House of Assembly, I challenge him to say it outside.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He also said that he would call upon the white people of this island to get the Democratic Labour Party out of power.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I object to that expression which the hon. member has just said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As far as my recollection goes, I think that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy began by saying that it is said that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that on a public platform. My recollection is that he said "it is said". He did not make a statement of fact, and therefore I see nothing which the hon. member should be called upon to withdraw.

5.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can now quite understand the hon. member's agitation. The hon. member is reported to have said that he would join with the Devil in hell to keep his Party in power.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I am still on the point wherein I am examining the context in which this matter was made, and I was trying to show that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph throughout his parliamentary career was always known to be crossing swords with Speakers. The hon. member was, as is well known, for some years Prime Minister in the now defunct West Indies Federation, and by that he was a member of the then Federal House of Representatives, and occasionally as members of a legislative body, there were differences of opinion between him and the Speaker. On one famous occasion, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition told the Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives that he had come from a second rate parish in Barbados and when the then Hon. Speaker said that he had been born in Christ Church and not in St. Lucy, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition retracted his remarks.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not asking the hon. member to withdraw anything because he has refused to do so. However, I would say emphatically that some people cannot speak the truth even by accident. It is not true to say that I crossed swords with the late Speaker of the House of Representatives. Mr. Ward and I were friends from school days and I know, Sir, that he was born in St. James; therefore, I could not say something different from what I know was true.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Then, if I know that Mr. Ward was born in Christ Church, the hon. member is reflecting on the parish in which Mr. Ward was born. However, that is

not a great point. All that it serves to establish is that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has from time to time crossed swords with various Speakers. He had never for some reason known to himself taken the guidance given from the Chair when it was not in his favour.

Now, obviously, since the motion is couched in terms in which it is couched, no matter what they say on that side, this is nothing else but an attack on the Speaker. Now, it is true to say that at the same time they have turned it into an attack on myself, and I think that is quite in order because I can defend myself. However, at the moment, I am concerned with rebutting the charges against Mr. Speaker.

Again, before you say that I would be guilty of anything reprehensible, you have to show why some people do certain things; why they take a line in one debate; why they say that so-and-so represents so-and-so and why they take the line opposite in another debate. I think that every member would say that this is the concern of every member. To suggest, therefore, that because Mr. Speaker and I represent the same constituency that this kind of consideration would influence what he had to say on the particular matter, is a gross misrepresentation of the whole situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall show whether it is that the Speaker was called upon to make a ruling and he made a ruling and then reversed it, or that he was called upon to make a ruling and did not make it, or further, that he was not called upon to make a ruling and, therefore, he saw no reason for him to make a ruling. It is the third which I suggest had taken place. It is certainly not true to say that he was called upon to give a ruling and reversed it. What he did was to give some guidance.

It is open for me to say anything that I want to say in the course of a debate. I said that I did not choose to obey you. I did not say that I did not intend to listen to you. I said on that occasion 'that I would be guilty of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you'. I said those words, and it is not that the Speaker was giving me an order. I was trying to ward off a situation.

Now, did it happen that Mr. Speaker called upon me to withdraw, that is to say, under the Standing Orders he called upon me to withdraw remarks which were offensive and unparliamentary? If that were so, I would say, certainly, I would have withdrawn it. But the fact is that Mr. Speaker did not call upon me to withdraw any remark. Mr. Speaker interrupted the Leader of the Opposition who had not finished his remarks and said: "Before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition proceeds, I will ask whether the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is disposed to withdraw the words 'rank hypocrisy', the last words of that sentence, and to which I gather, exception is being taken."

5.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker interrupted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who had not yet finished his remarks and asked "Before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition continues, is the Hon. Leader of the House disposed to withdraw the remarks?" Well, I was not disposed, and I said so in stronger terms than were perhaps warranted by the question, and I certainly said that I would think myself guilty of rank hypocrisy if I were to obey him. This is as much as saying "No, Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to withdraw." I do not know why hon. members opposite are making so much of a very simple point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this motion need not detain us, and because of its character based on supposed events which did not take place, hon. members on this side nevertheless feel that the motion improperly worded as it has been, badly argued as it has been, is nevertheless a serious slur on the character and integrity of Mr. Speaker. Therefore we find it unacceptable to us. This side has therefore prepared an amendment which will be dealt with in due course. It stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George. It, therefore, only remains for me to say that such hon. members opposite as have already spoken have not supported their case, have based their case on what did not take place, because - make no mistake about this, Mr. Deputy Speaker -

the substance of this motion is that Mr. Speaker made a ruling and then reversed that ruling. If it turns out that Mr. Speaker did not make a ruling and therefore could not have reversed it, the whole gravamen of their case disappears, and this is what they are saying, no matter how much rhetoric is used on that side of the House. The whole purpose of censuring Mr. Speaker, is that in their view he has been weak and vacillating, because having made a ruling, instead of sticking to it, he shifted his ground. Our case is that no ruling was made and consequently no ruling was revoked, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition took objection to certain remarks of mine, Mr. Speaker invited me to withdraw those remarks, did not call upon me as would normally be expected if he himself had felt that they were of a serious nature, I was not disposed to obey his invitation, and my view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I ought to point out, is that in the House of Commons and in other Parliaments it is quite common for Mr. Speaker on some occasions to ask an hon. member when objection is taken to a remark whether he is disposed to withdraw it and to admonish the hon. member to use a different phrase or different words. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think, had said at the end of his remarks on this occasion that it would be better if a particular word was not used. So it is not true to argue that when a Speaker asks whether a member is disposed to withdraw a remark, Mr. Speaker is necessarily insisting on withdrawal.

As I said, many Speakers in many Commonwealth Parliaments - and I dare say in Parliaments outside the Commonwealth - do use this term or phrase when they feel that tempers are likely to rise in a deliberative Assembly in an attempt to head off what could be a serious clash inside the Chamber by merely saying to the hon. member "Will you use another phrase," "Will you use another word," "Are you disposed to withdraw that remark, because the hon. member seems to have taken offence at it?" This is one way that Mr. Speaker can use to get the co-operation of both sides of the House; but make no mistake about it, no Speaker would allow to go unpunished a deliberate flouting of the Chair's authority if he had insisted that an hon. member withdraw a particular remark which was adjudged by him to be absolutely unparliamentary. Our determination of that incident may be said to be that the Speaker was anxious to head off what could possibly be a long and perhaps unseemly clash on both sides of the House, and to intervene to ask me whether I was disposed to use another word or to withdraw the remark as the case may be. I said I was not disposed in the language which they interpret to mean something else, because my actual words were "if I were to obey you." It is something more technical they are indulging in when they are trying to tell me how I should answer the Chair in a matter in which I am involved. I answered the Chair as the circumstances in my view then warranted, and you can only read into those circumstances what the circumstances themselves demonstrate.

Mr. Speaker, since he has been Speaker, has a few times called on me to withdraw offensive remarks to which other people took exception, and he had made it unmistakably clear that he had left me to withdraw the remarks, and I think that the integrity and fairness of Mr. Speaker is such that he would leave no hon. member in doubt as to what he meant, and that Mr. Speaker is not the kind of person who if he were insisting on a clear and unequivocal withdrawal would say: "Is the hon. member disposed or inclined?" He would say: "The remark is unparliamentary and offensive; the hon. member must withdraw." This is the experience we have had, Mr. Deputy Speaker; it is the experience of all hon. members on both sides of the House, even if some hon. members because of this debate do not wish to admit it.

5.45 p.m.

It is therefore a very serious thing to impugn the character and integrity of Mr. Speaker by attempting to censure him for something which he has not done, which the facts of the case show that not only he has not done it but that in setting out the terms of the motion hon. members opposite have not only misinterpreted but they have misunderstood the incident in which some of them were involved, because hon. members, particularly two of them

who spoke this afternoon, were not themselves parties to the incident because they were away from the Chamber for which, I think, were good and sufficient reasons. This side, therefore, will later move its amendment, but I have merely spoken in order to let it be known that we do not accept this motion. The case is rather different from the one they want to make out; and if a Minority Party in a Parliament wishes to destroy the Speaker, it is the wish of the Majority party to protect him and to see that it does not reflect on the good sense of an Opposition Party if it can find fault with the occupant of the Chair within two months when it has acceded, or given unanimity, to the choice. If the Opposition wants to justify the removal of Mr. Speaker from the Chair - Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not let them mislead the House. If this motion were carried, we should have to inform His Excellency the Governor-General immediately that Mr. Speaker has resigned, that the House has lost its confidence in him and to ask for leave to choose a new Speaker. This is what it involves, because no Speaker could remain in the Chair with any sense of decency after a vote of censure has been passed on him. On the facts which have been brought to our attention, and as we have experienced, we cannot support the contention on the opposite side and will not entertain any invitation from the hon. members opposite to censure Mr. Speaker.

The House is therefore going to be divided because we are going to move an amendment. They will see how seriously we regard their motion by the terms in which we are seeking to amend it. I want to make it clear that if this motion is carried, Mr. Speaker must, in decency, resign from the Chair. Therefore hon. members on the opposite side must be well aware of the seriousness of the step which they are taking and they must not be surprised if there is disagreement from this side. The reasons which they have given are not to be found in the text of the motion. The text of the motion makes reference to things which as far as the record goes, have not taken place.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down. I looked forward to hearing him. I anticipated fireworks. I think of the midnight oil which the hon. member was burning even at 1 o'clock this morning at Roebuck Street on this very issue, and I sat listening anxiously to see if there were any points which the hon. member would make, which would be telling points, points which are deserving of serious consideration, points which we have not thought of. I can remember when I was first in the University at Oxford reading the Presidential Speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I can even remember reading his propaganda, and I would not ascribe to him that it was he who said that his father was the Speaker of the House of Assembly for 20 years, but I remember reading it and being amused by the falsehood it reflected; and whoever was responsible for it, Barbadians still have some wit and cleverness in making their way in the world.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is, of course, the son of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and I would normally expect him to be well versed in these techniques of misrepresentation himself. However, he is referring to something which although he says was associated with me, was based on an interview which I never gave to a newspaper. I would just like him to know that I have heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph with this already. The hon. member is not saying anything new; he tried to prevent me from getting into this House on the basis of what he has said. It is a question of the father having eaten sour grapes and the child's teeth having been set on edge. This is nothing fresh; let the hon. member come with something fresh.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not the merest semblance of a point of order, but the hon. member can do that unconsciously. Perhaps he has taken this opportunity of stating that he had nothing to do with the story of the *Oxford Mail* which described the hon. member as having descended from a long line of African Princes which had property in St. James where the first settlers landed. The hon. member has given an explanation and I re-

gret anything which I have said which has discredited the authorship of the article. I was not there, but I had the opportunity of reading the article by Stanley Parker. One of the first things he asked me was if I knew my friend. We spent many happy nights together fire-watching on the roof of the Oxford Union. There are members of the hon. member's own Party who would associate Stanley Parker with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.
5.5 p.m.

As I listened to the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I had the sort of feeling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which you might get if you were watching a hen laying an egg and then sitting on a brood. You hear her making a fuss when she is going to lay and after sitting, she gets up with the most hopeless lot of addled eggs which you know about. The hon. member's speech was the kind of speech that shows us what irrelevance is. Your Honour, his speech was not only irrelevant to the matter under discussion, but his speech was bound up on the theme of an affair which took place in this Chamber 29 years ago. The substance of the hon. member's speech was on the present mover of this Resolution. In that speech we had the character of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, his relationship with a former Speaker, Mr. Pile, and with Mr. Charlie Elder. Then we had his relationship with the former Senator Ward. That was the great burden of the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

The first barrage which he sought to lay down was to take the entire debate leading up to "rank hypocrisy" and dissect it and derive motives from it.

He quoted me specifically when he said that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas came in and said that he read the Minority Report not more than five minutes before. He may not have read Page 17 of this report on that debate, about six lines from the bottom where I said: "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 the House and seen the Minority Report at this time. It was perhaps unfortunate that I did not see the Minority Report earlier."

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy made a cogent and certainly a strong point for the Opposition when he said that the Opposition is concentrating on one point. The Opposition is concentrating on the biggest and only point of the debate because we feel it is the only point of the issue before the House; therefore, we make no apology for concentrating on that point.

We are not here to go over the whole debate; we are here to debate whether the expression "rank hypocrisy" as was used by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was unparliamentary and whether the Speaker's conduct was proper on that occasion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy went on to reiterate the personal pronoun "I". He said, "I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is attacking me because he has something against me." Since we must bear in mind that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was suggesting to us that we have to get the modes of people to find out why certain people do certain things, we on this side are not afraid of single analysis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, speeches were read of what led up to the incident. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy explained how he came to say those words and to show how other people talked as they did at the time. I was surprised that he did not read from Page 18, I rather expected to hear this in the debate:

"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 left this House in 1958 I was not spending my

time in selling rice or corned beef for cooking and distributing chicken backs."

There was a great deal said in that debate, I was quoting from Hansard. However, the essence of the debate was; were the words "rank hypocrisy" unparliamentary under the circumstances in which they were used and was the conduct of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy satisfactory or, in your view, an abuse of the Chair.

There were certain misrepresentations - I would call them misrepresentations advisedly - because if a man has not heard something, he cannot give evidence on it. I understand the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph went out of the Chamber to take a telephone message, and as he got up the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and the hon. junior member for St. James walked out behind him.

I have no doubt myself that they were walking out protesting against the ruling of the Speaker. He left the House and went to the Members Lobby, but he did not go to the telephone.
6.05 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, on that occasion I did receive a message from Lady Adams asking to call the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I sent that message by the Marshal of the House whom I had to call on two occasions, because he delayed in going over to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he did so. That was on the occasion when the Speaker and Deputy Speaker were conversing as to whether or not the words were unparliamentary. The decision was taken and the Leader of the Opposition left and went to the telephone.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the hon. member resumes.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, either Your Honour rules or I sit down. No third person can rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas caught my eye first.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now I regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. junior member for St. Michael has laid his support in the circumstances in which he has laid it. He may find himself in a harangue with the Marshal of the House. He may find that he says one thing and the Marshal another when he says that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph went to the telephone. He is clearly deposing because he was in the House. He is sitting next to the hon. junior member for Christ Church who can give him some legal advice as to what he can say from what he sees or what he has not seen, of what he can speak of his own knowledge; but that is by the way. I can say I saw the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and he did not go to the telephone, as I walked out of the House behind him. What happened in the walk out, I submit, is neither here nor there.

I recall the incident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I can remember very well indeed the words that were used, and I can confess that my memory does not record what it sees in the official report. I well remember the hon. junior member for my own constituency who is an accomplished heckler on the floor of the House, when the ruling was made.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I take offence to the hon. member calling me an accomplished heckler, and I am asking that he withdraw it. But before you ask him to withdraw it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is something I should like to draw to the attention of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member on a point of order?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I understand it, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas asked me to take some action in respect of a complaint he made. Am I now to hear him on a point of order before I give a decision?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You will have to rule if you want to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I hate to be interrupted by some hon. members in here who seem to think they are in a Law Court, where they can put it over the Magistrates; but they cannot put it over me or anybody on this side. I made a point of order in drawing to your attention something that was said about me which was very insulting, and I said that before you gave your ruling I wanted to draw something which took place in this House prior to my getting up to draw your attention to it. The matter I want to draw to your attention is that on page 11 of the debate of 15th December...

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, if you look at the right hand side.....

Mr. St. JOHN: The hon. member cannot make a speech on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose and both hon. members took their seats.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is not making a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members sit?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, since your ruling has been interrupted, I take it that there is no objection.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I think that....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please sit? I am referring to Standing Order No. 28 (a) which deals with rising on a point of order. It reads as follows:

"No Member shall interrupt another Member except (a) by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chair for decision."

If the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is addressing the Chair on a point of order, will he please address it only on a point of order and not make a speech?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have not attempted to make a speech, with all due respect to you. If you look at page 11 you would see where the hon. member said he did not see the report.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is merely interrupting my speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas please take his seat? The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is speaking on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On page 1, on the right hand side, and in the third paragraph, you will see:

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

Mr. 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."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order, and I am asking you to keep order. You speak on a point of order when a member has broken some rule; on a point of explanation you can say you never said that, and on a point of elucidation you can explain something you said. You must rule on what is a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the hon. senior member for St. Thomas made reference to 'when he saw the Minority Report,' I thought some hon. member who had already spoken would have got up and clarified the situation. I do not think the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is in order to make reference to a matter which should be clarified under a point of elucidation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged to Your Honour for your ruling.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You will remember that before I drew.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas was speaking.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, without wishing to carry this matter any further, I would respectfully draw your attention to Rule 28 on which Your Honour has just given a ruling. It reads:

"No Member shall interrupt another Member except by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and 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; or to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech....."
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I am correct in saying that the hon. junior member for my own constituency has risen for some seven or eight times and has not made any point of order. In these circumstances, I respectfully ask Your Honour to consider Standing Order No. 36 (3) which says this:-

"Whenever a Member shall have been named by the Speaker or the Chairman, immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair....."

It goes on to say what happens when the member persistently and wilfully obstructs the business of the House by abusing the Rules of the House. I may assist the hon. member by reminding him that when mention was made of my remark about five minutes to five, I repeated it and explained it and it does not need the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who was either sleeping or short of understanding to add to it any further. That is so especially when this sort of thing is done outside the Rules of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has referred to the incident of 1938 when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was suspended from this House some months after the disturbances had taken place, and when tension was at a higher level than it has been either before or since then. He was referring to a statement made by Mr. Elder, the then hon. junior member for St. George, and he referred to that statement as a "reckless misstatement". The entire speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was short of logic because the hon. member was saying that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was suspended from the House for refusing to take back a statement, but in the year 1966 a different series of criteria should apply. The criteria which should apply are these: In the year 1938 the hon. junior member for St. Joseph used the expression "reckless misstatement" in relation to an earlier statement, not made by Mr. Elder of himself or by any individual member of himself but of a propertied class. Mr. Elder was speaking for the propertied class and as I understand it, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was discrediting a remark as to their views as a "reckless misstatement". There is all the difference between those two things. How can you say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, a man on whom the people have heaped honour, is guilty of rank hypocrisy when he talks about patriotism? I say that there is a difference between attacking members outside the House of Assembly and attacking a member's patriotism. When you

say that a man is patriotic and then you say that there is rank hypocrisy, there is this ineluctable conclusion that you are suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition is a man whose attention to patriotism is questioned. Well, Sir, if this is not an attack on the sincerity of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, then no remark every made could amount to that.

The hon. member's speech was analysed very carefully by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. He said what was in his mind, but what was in his mind is not what appears on paper. He was speaking about the report in relation to members' salaries. That is what he was speaking about and this is what he said:-

"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 remarks 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 were a crowd of wild people and rascals." (*Asides*)

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy was not there, but no doubt I will be told that this is reported and therefore it is not the correct thing. The hon. member went on to say this:-

"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."

There was no suggestion in that speech that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was addressing his mind to the question of the members' salaries. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy said: "Ordinarily, I would not wish to have made the sort of speech I have to make now." And we take that to mean that he was not dealing with a speech which was before the House. The hon. member did not say one word about members' salaries, but he took the opportunity of impugning the patriotism of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.
6.25 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are certain expressions which have caused the Chair of the House of Commons to deal with them. These are: "blackguard, blether, cad, gross calumny, perksniffing, cant, corrupt, coward, criminal, dishonest, guttersnipe, hooligan, hypocrite."

These are some of the expressions which have caused the Speaker of the House of Commons to deal with them, but there are expressions which are something worse, "hypocrite" is not the only unparliamentary expression. It has been so ever since. Commonsense tells us that the House of Assembly is not the place where the expression "rank hypocrite" is to be part of our currency. If we want this House to be a place where we meet, "rank hypocrisy" should not become an expression which can be used; but, it is my view, by the ruling of the Speaker, that that would be the case, because he said that when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy used those words, the way in which he used them was not in reference to any hon. member. What would be the case if I called that rank gross hypocrisy? What would be the case if I told the Speaker that?

We feel that this is not something to be said in this Chamber. It is unparliamentary in books which were writ-

ten for our guidance. Again I would say that it must not be thought that the catalogue of unparliamentary words is exhausted by the 58 words listed. In earlier Editions of "May's", perhaps, even other authorities, the word "hypocrite" has always been held to be unparliamentary.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what do the terms of this Resolution complain of? It can be said that one of the provisions was that when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy made use of that expression, he disobeyed a ruling of the Speaker.

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy in his speech talks about the hon. junior member for St. Joseph talking about the Treasury being bare and could not afford salary increases.

Now, the hon. member is very fond of quotations and, perhaps, he will recall the words of Mr. Walpole when he was a representative in Parliament. "He said: - 'Throughout the ages when he is in power to do something, he does not exercise that power responsibly and he seeks to force through a constitution which is in the eyes of many members of commonsense intolerable when he seeks to do that.'"

We suggest that this is an exercise of power without responsibility. This is an exercise of power of the majority to override not only the rights of the minority but the very rights of the rules of this House. The rules are made to protect us from that side of the House; these rules are made so that the Government's business will be carried out expeditiously. The rules for refraining members from using unparliamentary expressions are not done just for so; they are done so that the Government can govern the Opposition without having to spend time in Parliament on censure motions and serious motions and serious motions as this before the House which has been forced on us by what has happened by this unfortunate incident.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sat and I listened to the various attempts made to drive a wedge between the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Peter and his colleagues. I do not think that I have seen in the Resolution any reference whatsoever to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.
6.35 p.m.

The only persons whose names appear in the Resolution are those of the Mover, the Leader of the House and the Speaker, and yet you hear that in 1956 His Excellency had to wait for four hours while a Speaker was elected, and Your Honour has ruled that it is a material issue as far as this debate is concerned. I bow to Your Honour's ruling and will attempt to take into account every time that it is material. I will endeavour to take into account what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said took place in 1956, and will endeavour to let it guide me when the amendment to this motion is put in due course. But perhaps more to the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy then attempted to impute improper motives to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in suggesting that the entire conduct of the Leader of the Opposition vis-a-vis Speakers of this House was well known. As I see it, there is no amendment criticising the activities of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, nevertheless it was discussed and talked about, and the expression "policeman" came inescapably to my mind. The past has been drained, it has been gone through with a fine-toothed comb and what do we find? A suspension in 1938; an argument over an election in 1956; a statement which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has corrected as having taken place in another Assembly.

In all the long and honourable career of the Leader of the Opposition from 1934 to 1962 continuously in Parliament and now once again in Parliament, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not believe that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has ever put his hand on that Mace which stands before Your Honour. I do not believe he has ever been guilty of anything more gross a disrespect to this Honourable House as to lay his hands on the Mace. I do not believe there is another hon. member who would do that beside the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. Let him speak first;

let him cast the first stone who hath no fault in himself. Let him first cast out the beam, the mud, the Mace from his own eyes before he attempts to attack any other hon. member of this House and of other Honourable Houses. The Leader of the Opposition may have dragged the Chair figuratively from under certain persons; he has never dragged the Mace either literally or figuratively from anywhere to anywhere, and as far as we are concerned if someone is going to be attacked for his previous conduct in relation to the Rules, the traditions, the officers and the dignity and ceremony of this House, it will not be the Leader of the Opposition; it will be the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. He has risen to lead the House whose Mace he laid hands on, and he should be glad of that. We only ask who has done more to weaken Parliamentary institutions between the protagonists and antagonists in this particular struggle? The hon. junior member for St. Lucy does not dare say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made remarks derogatory of His Honour the Speaker at Mayers Corner. But talk about the devil, he said that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said he would join hands with the devil in hell to get this Party out of power. I myself heard the hon. member for St. Joseph quote Mr. Churchill when he said he would join with the devil in the fight against Hitler - not once, but many times. I would advise the hon. junior member for St. Lucy before he repeats other people's misreports and misquotations to go out and listen before he dares to say what was said and what was not said on any particular occasion.

I know there have been occasions when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has listened to speeches made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on public platforms. There have been occasions when he is reported as having said to a former member of this House that he had never been so humiliated in his life as after having heard a member speak at Pie Corner in 1964, and when he read the same article to which he made reference at the start of his speech. He is reported in tears to have confessed his humiliation to the former senior member for St. John who sat in this House for eight years from 1948 to 1956. If the hon. member wants to quote the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, let him listen and quote correctly in these circumstances.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been suggested that the motion as it stands before the House is based on events which did not happen. It is suggested therefore that the foundation is destroyed and that the motion cannot stand; but Mr. Deputy Speaker, I read the motion which is before the House, and I am sure I am reading it correctly. It reads as follows:-

"To move the passing of a Resolution deploring the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December 15, 1966, he disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker and further that His Honour the Speaker was himself guilty of conduct unbecoming the dignity of the Chair, and is deserving of the gravest possible censure."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is another way of bringing before this Honourable House the attack upon the ruling by His Honour the Speaker - and His Honour the Speaker did give a ruling that day; the ruling is set out on page 19 that "rank hypocrisy" is not unparliamentary - and if there is another way of criticising this action than by bringing a Resolution which is in two parts covering both eventualities, I will be glad to hear about it. It is on these grounds that I urge all hon. members to support this motion. We are not, as it is suggested, attacking the character over-all of His Honour the Speaker. This motion is limited to December 15, 1966. We were unanimous on November 15, as one hon. member has already said. It was not until the slip; there was a fall, but it does not mean that His Honour the Speaker will not get up from the fall refreshed, with renewed vigour, to deal with such remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

The moving of such a motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is well known to be considered in the House of Commons. It

is very well to be considered in itself, because it is known that these matters become Party matters and there is no hope of carrying out the act, because the censure motion remains there if carried or not, and at some stage in the future hon. members and members of the public will say, in 1967 a motion of censure was moved on the Chair, what happened to it and what was the cause! We are aware of our responsibility in that regard, and it was with sober consideration that this motion was moved, and this motion will be supported by me. We cannot, Mr. Deputy Speaker, believe that in this Parliament "rank hypocrisy" is an expression which hon. members are glad to welcome into the daily currency of debate in this ancient Chamber.
6.45 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel it incumbent on me to speak on this matter so that I will make my position clear. The motion which is before us is nothing to do with 1938, 1956, Mayers' Corner or any other corner. What I have read here is that on a specific occasion, notably the 15th December, 1966, "this House considers that His Honour in reversing a ruling which he had given with respect to language used by the Leader of the House with the result of freeing him from the punishment which the Standing Orders provided for a member guilty of gross disorderly conduct or of disregarding the authority of the Chair was himself guilty of conduct unbecoming the dignity of the Chair and is deserving of the gravest possible censure." I may say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I was present on the occasion. When His Honour the Speaker got to the point when he said: "My ruling is that although this phrase may be perilously close to the borderline", I began to gather my papers in my bag and I left immediately when I got them in that bag. (*Cheers*). That might not have been reported by the Press, but I am in the position where I do not have to be determined either by smiles from the right or by frowns from the left. I act as my conscience bids me.

Now, Sir, I have always regarded the office of Speaker as embodying the very spirit of the Constitution, and I use the quotation as quotations have been bandied about this afternoon. We have been very fortunate in having as Speaker of this House one who has fulfilled the rare requirements seldom found in one man, being able to act wisely and firmly and impartially and to have a sense of humour which he has always displayed; but I feel that on this occasion he fell inadvertently into error. Those are the words which, I think, are used by all Speakers when they are claiming the rights and privileges of the House; if the House should fall inadvertently into error, the blame should be attributed to them. I do feel, Sir, that His Honour the Speaker has fallen inadvertently into error on this occasion and he has not been the only person to fall into error. My clear recollection was that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said that he would be guilty of rank hypocrisy if he obeyed the Speaker's ruling. I exist on my memory. What is written here are not the exact words spoken by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. He said: "If I obeyed Your Honour's Ruling." I have not consulted any of the members of the Opposition present. Whoever fell into the error in the Report of this Debate, I am saying that these were not the actual words used on that occasion. When I heard His Honour the Speaker say: "Although this phrase may be perilously close to the borderline", I had to leave the Chamber on the vacillating decision of the Speaker of the Chamber. For the Speaker, I hold the highest respect. Indeed he is a friend of mine; but if he is wrong, I will not sit here and say nothing. I have always upheld the dignity of the Chair and I feel that it should be upheld by everyone in this Honourable Assembly. Mention has been made of the Speaker's many qualities. The only thing which has not been mentioned of him is that he habitually writes in green ink; but what happened on the 15th December, 1966, is that he inadvertently fell into error. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is only your opinion) Well, that is my opinion.

As I said, Sir, I am unique in my position in this House. I can express my opinion freely on any conscience vote or any vote at all. The position of the Speaker is one which has been hardy won and should be maintained at all costs. From the days of Mr. Speaker Lenthall in 1642 who said that he had not eyes to see or tongue to speak in this place save

that the House directed him whose servant he was, until the days of Mr. Speaker Shaw-Lefevre in 1839 who was the first Speaker after the Reform Act was passed, there was strict impartiality from such Chambers as this and this very high standard should be maintained. This Assembly in this small Island has agreed to its certain dignities which should not lightly be lost. We are fortunate in that our Speaker embodies the conscience of the House and he has shown that he is perfectly capable of maintaining the dignity, and with his bonhomie and good humour he should be able to throw oil on the troubled waters; but he has gone too far on this occasion to vacillate and even to draw a distinction between a common noun and an abstract term.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is my feeling in this matter and it would be impossible for me to sit quietly here and hear all of these references made to matters which are not before this House and not a discussion on the specific issue that our Speaker, whom we respect and for whom all of us have considerable affection, did on this occasion, act in a way which was unbecoming the dignity of the Chair.
6.55 p.m.

I rise to support the vote of censure and let it be known that I took up my papers together with the other members on my right and left this Chamber as a mark of protest against the week and vacillating action of the Speaker.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendment to this censure motion brought against the hon. Speaker of this House stands in my name and I ask permission of this House that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew deal with the amendment. I reserve the right to speak if I so care.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not realise that the hon. junior member for St. George was going to speak on the amendment, but I was going to deal with the motion. Of course, I do not think that he is in order to do what he is doing now.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I intimated to you that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would take charge of the amendment. Is that permission granted?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am objecting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to what the hon. member is doing. All that we have before us is my motion. I have the right to reply to that. I have the right to reply now and to speak on the amendment when the amendment has been put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George has asked leave to allow the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to deal with the amendment. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have the right to reply at the end of the debate. Leave is granted the hon. junior member for St. George.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to move the amendment to the motion moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

It reads as follows:

Delete all the words appearing after "this House" and substitute therefor the following words:

"notes with pleasure that the honourable senior Member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein;

recalls that during this thirty-year period the same honourable member has at different times served as Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, and as Speaker since 1961;

recalls further that the same honourable member has been elected Speaker with the consent of the whole House on two occasions, the latter as recently as November, 1966;

records herein profound appreciation of the honourable member's long and distinguished Parliamentary service;

congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership; and again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the text of this Resolution be suitably engrossed on parchment and handed over to Mr. Speaker as a tribute from this Honourable House."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of us perhaps might have been very young in 1937; some of us might have been too young to recall the democratic age of 1937 and those people who.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to this amendment as read being considered by this House and I invite hon. members to share my feelings and that they agree that this amendment as read out is out of order. I know all hon. members are human beings, and I ask that they act according to their consciences and have sufficient courage to do the right thing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment to the motion before the House. The hon. member has the right of reply and he is now making a speech.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: There is no motion before the House.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member can only be doting. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph gets up and says that there is no motion before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask hon. members on both sides to take their seats.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: When the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said "doting", I objected to it. That is offensive and it is against the rules.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member thinks it is offensive I agree to withdraw the remark, but I still agree that he is doting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I have said before, I do not intend to tolerate that kind of behaviour. Will the hon. senior member for St. Andrew withdraw that remark immediately and unreservedly?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I withdraw that remark. However he is not as young as he would have us believe when he says that there is no motion before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Andrew please speak on the motion before us?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: There is one motion before the House - the motion moved by me earlier in the day. The hon. member has the right to do what he is doing too, but I have the right to object and say that it is out of order. I object and I am giving my reason. I am saying that it is out of order.
7.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Andrew please sit? The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is on the floor.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have said, and I am going to preface what I am going to say now by what I said on my return to the House last year, that no member of the Opposition that I can see has any desire whatever.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to be speaking on a point of order?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am speaking on a point of order to say that the amendment is out of order - and that is what I am speaking on - on the grounds that it is irrelevant.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendment is not yet seconded; so how can the hon. member say it is out of order? I am now moving the amendment.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What has the hon. member interrupted me for? I am on my feet and I did not give way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member whilst on his feet is out of order, and he is on a point of interruption.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members please sit? The hon. senior member for St. Andrew is moving an amendment, but it has not yet been seconded; therefore I do not think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has any right to rise on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the guidance of the House, is the hon. member to finish his speech then for one to object to the fact that it is out of order? I have to ask that question.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the interruption is over, may I continue to speak?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the Speaker of this Honourable House, has been serving this country as a representative for the parish of St. Lucy with the greatest amount of sincerity from all the records one can find in the Hansard of this House, and from the record of his career as a politician and parliamentarian has served this country by making the type of contribution that is without any sort of blemish. He has placed himself by being returned on each occasion on which he sought the suffrage of the people of St. Lucy and the people of this country. The people were so much satisfied with the representation which they have had and the dignity with which he has served his people that they have placed him in the ranks of people like Sir Frederick Clarke and Mr. H. W. Reece who had served this country as legislators for over thirty years. Obviously one can only make such a long and unbroken contribution in a Legislature if he had upheld the dignity which is expected of him in this Chamber, and only if he had done well to the people.

This is not the first time that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has held office as Speaker of this Honourable House. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph praised the hon. senior member for St. Lucy on the 17th November when this Session began when he seconded the motion for the hon. member to be made Speaker for this Session. He praised him to high Heaven. There was no better person in this Chamber at that time who could be appointed Speaker than the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I have listened to the Debates of this Chamber for several years, and hon. members on this side of the Chamber will corroborate my statement that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has gained the love and affection and respect not only of his constituents but also of all hon. members who have sat in this Chamber with him. He is one whose temperament is never shaken; he is one who is very cool, calm, level-headed, affable and adaptable; he is one who can get on with people. It is for those reasons that he has been given the respect of the entire House.

Let us say, as the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has said, that there was an inadvertent error on the part of the Speaker. Let us say that this is a case for argument. After looking at the long history of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and examining carefully the contribution which he has made to this country and the record he has established as Speaker of this House for five years, one can only conclude that his service has been exemplary. The Hon. Mover of this Motion praised the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to high Heaven less than two months before this Resolution was tabled in this House. The same lips that praised him are the same lips just two months after that are blasting him. The same lips, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that

praised Jesus Christ and kissed him were the lips that betrayed him. You have a classic example of it here today. I do not want to say that we have any Judases in our ranks. Far be it from me to say so although I feel it personally deep within me.

7.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that rather than move a vote of censure on the Speaker of this House, the fact that he has served us so uprightly and honestly and sincerely, should make us all join our appreciation of his work. I am referring now to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; instead of moving a vote of censure on the Honourable Speaker, I would have expected him to come here today and say: "Let us move a vote of appreciation for the work of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and for the dignity with which he has held the office of Speaker of this House." It is only last week that those people talked about partiality; it is only last week on three occasions that the Honourable Speaker rather than being partial to the Party or appear to be partial to the Party of which he is a member, ruled against the members of his own Party in this Branch of the Legislature in favour of the Party on the other side. That is not the only occasion when His Honour ruled in favour of the Opposition. (A MEMBER: He knew what was hanging over his head.) It is not a question of anything hanging over his head; His Honour knows that he is liked by all in here, but deep down in some members there is envy, malice and all the attributes we can use. His Honour knows therefore that in order to retain the good name which he has gained for himself through the good work which he has done over the past 30 years, he would have to rule impartially; and in respect of what he has done for the last five years, there is not one occasion on which any hon. member has had the opportunity or effrontery to get up in this House and question his ruling.

No man is infallible, as the hon. junior member for the City was trying to point out. I am no authority on law; I am no authority on "May's" Parliamentary Procedure; I go by the ruling of the Chair. You have noticed that only ten minutes ago; therefore I cannot argue about the merits or demerits of the Speaker's advice which is here on page 19 of the debate of the 15th December, 1966. I accepted the advice of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the Honourable Speaker; I accepted it in good faith. I do not know whether the advice was sound or not; it came from the Chair and I accepted it. I do not see any reason why hon. members on the other side, if there was no point of viciousness in the minds of some persons whether in this Chamber or outside of it, where there was a ruling not in favour of a particular Party or where there was a ruling out of favour or against the feelings of a particular group of people, if for this once in the history of five years as Speaker of this House, in their opinion, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy made what they consider to be an error, would want to crucify him. Well, Sir, the greatest people do that; lawyers in Law Courts make errors, but this does not mean that because there might have been one error made in five years a person should be crucified. I am not saying that there was an error; I am taking my argument from what the hon. junior member for the City has said. But even if that were so, it does not mean that His Honour the Speaker must be crucified because no one is infallible. Hon. members on the other side make errors too, but should they be crucified for that? As the hon. junior member for St. Andrew would say, words of consolation would help. Therefore, Sir, in this exercise I feel that it would be justifiable for hon. members or for this House to go on record as congratulating the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and expressing their great appreciation of the work which has been done and the contribution which His Honour has made to this country in general and to this Chamber in particular for the past 30 years and wishing His Honour a further unbroken service of 30 years in the Legislature. In these circumstances, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this amendment be accepted by this House.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, Standing Order No. 21 of the Standing Orders of this House says this:-

"When any motion or Bill is under consideration in the House or a Committee thereof, an amendment may be proposed to such motion or Bill if it is relevant to the question or matter then under discussion; provided that no amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, if a question has been proposed from the Chair upon such amendment.

An amendment may be proposed to any amendment if it is relevant thereto."

7.35 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has just proposed an amendment to the matter which is under consideration. It is at this stage that I object on the ground that the amendment is not relevant to the motion that is now under discussion before the House and I ask Your Honour to give a ruling.

There is another thing. Standing Order No. 22 reads thus:-

"A question upon a motion or amendment to a Bill shall not be proposed by the Speaker or the Chairman unless such motion or amendment has been seconded, and no record of any such motion, if not seconded, shall be made in the Minutes."

There are two completely different things. No amendment may be proposed to a motion unless it is relevant. Then the Chair cannot put it to the House unless it is seconded. The point is that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew having proposed the amendment, we say that it is irrelevant before the House and we call for a ruling from the Chair on this specific point.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second the amendment.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The proposition which I have put before you is in respect of Rule 21 which is that no amendment can be proposed unless it is relevant. We are saying that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has proposed an amendment which is irrelevant. The phrase which he used is: "I move this amendment." It is at this stage that we are objecting. Later on if the motion is seconded, then at the usual stage, we propose to object.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph raised objection by referring to Order No. 21 of the Standing Orders. He also made reference to the 16th Edition of May's and that is the edition to which I have made several references during the last few days. He also made reference to the 13th Edition of May's. Unfortunately that copy is not in the Library of this House, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did refer to the particular passage in the 13th Edition.

Taking Standing Order No. 21 and the 13th and 16th Edition of May's into consideration, I rule that the amendment is relevant.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding this amendment, I would like to express my sincere feelings on behalf of His Honour the Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, who has always rendered efficient service as a member of this honourable and ancient House of Assembly.

The hon. Speaker has contributed to the progress of this Island, and when we remember that years ago you must have certain qualifications to vote and even to come forward as a member of this Hon. House, and it was he when Adult Suffrage was introduced who contributed in those days, in those trying days when the majority of members of this House of Assembly were arch conservatives, Mr. Speaker, by his contribution has caused many a man like us to be representing the people of this island; therefore at this particular moment when we have become an independent nation and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy as

Speaker of this Honourable House has served us so well for thirty years, I feel it is my bounden duty to second this amendment from the depth of my heart.

Sir, I do so with sincerity. I do so because I realise that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has always done his best to satisfy not only hon. members of this ancient House, but I would say his constituents and the people of Barbados. We in this House should be proud of the yeoman service which he has rendered and I wish him success and good health. May he be spared to carry on and preside over our destiny for thirty years longer.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, speaking on the amendment, I have been at extreme difficulty to understand the purpose of this hypocritical amendment. The facts are that if it were not a hypocritical Resolution it would have been moved in an atmosphere when every side of the House would have been able to make glowing contributions to it, when the conditions under which it was moved would have been conducive to unanimity on the part of both sides. If we had not brought a vote of censure in here, the other side would not have moved this Resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that many hon. members on that side who are going to speak on this Resolution in glowing terms, when they speak would be speaking with their tongues in their cheeks and what is uttered from their lips is not from their heart; otherwise they would not set in motion this Resolution because they know the circumstances under which this Resolution is brought cannot be conducive to members on this side supporting such an amendment because it has nothing to do with what occurred on the 15th December, 1966.

I want to make our position perfectly clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker.
7.35 p.m.

That is the whole proposition we are putting forward, and we want to make our position positively clear. When the occasion comes to deal, as one may say, with a panoramic view of His Honour the Speaker from the time he entered the Chamber, we will pay our tribute; but on this occasion our eyes are mirrored upon one day and upon the conduct of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy on that day alone, and we say that on that day, the 15th December, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was guilty of the grossest contempt, and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was guilty of failure to rise on that particular day in his long career of 30 years, and at least on that one occasion he was guilty, as the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has said, of vacillation and failure to rule.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the Table are not in any doubt whatever that on the 15th December, something occurred in this Chamber, and that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was the No. 1 offender; and I tell you, Sir, that if on that day His Honour the Speaker of this House had named him the champion offender that we have found him to be, today after listening to what he had to say on the motion which is before the House, I would not have known him to be the weakling he is as a defender. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is merely corn beef, rice and chicken backs that has caused all of us to be here today for this entire day. I tell you, Sir, that one has just got to read from Hansard page 19, the last paragraph at the bottom left-hand corner, and one will see that when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy rose to speak, he rose fully conscious of all that he intended to do and to say. Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in his opinion nothing really happened that day, but there is one thing I want to say and I want to make it abundantly clear. I happened to be one of those Opposition members who walked out of this Chamber in disgust at the conduct of the Speaker of this Assembly on that occasion. I do not mind what any hon. member from the other side might say caused the walk-out. I want to make my position clear, and I am to say that what happened on that occasion caused me to begin to feel nervous in this Chamber, because I did not as a very junior member come in here to expect to find such behaviour neither on the part of the Speaker nor by any hon. member, and more so the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

This is what I have to say. When the hon. junior member for St. Lucy committed his first offence, he went on and committed a second offence, and my recollection of what he said on that occasion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed your ruling now." It may be that he used the word "now" to explain that he would have been willing to obey on a different occasion, but he specifically stated "if I obeyed your ruling now". That gives us to understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a man of his knowledge, knowledge such as we have always prided him with, was in clear consciousness of all that was going on, and it was he above every person else who was satisfied that he had been given an order by His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, junior members coming into this Chamber must look to their seniors for guidance, but from what I saw on the 15th December with respect to His Honour the Speaker and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I thought best that I should guide myself from henceforth.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad that I have this occasion of addressing you in the Chair of this Honourable Chamber, because there comes back to me those days when you and I happened to be ploughing the field together in another sphere of activity, and I am glad that we are both here today, and I say again that I am indeed glad to have an opportunity to address you in your present capacity.
7.45 p.m.

We are appealing to hon. members on that side of the Table. We do not want to run against the Speaker of this House or the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. We are just asking them to look back at the 15th December, 1966, and refresh their minds as to what took place on that date, and I know that each and every member on this side of the Table has a living conscience. I quite appreciate the fact that with this debate taking place today, there are other measures which we had hoped would have come before this Chamber for debate and I am conscious of the fact that even some of those hon. members might have had what is likely to come home to them in their pockets from what might have been discussed otherwise, but I will not on this occasion prevent them from making themselves part and parcel of an honourable and dignified undertaking. That is to say, I have a conscience that some of them will vote on this matter to let His Honour the Speaker know that they are satisfied that he erred on this occasion and that by censuring him for that once it might lay a good foundation. We are sure it would lay that foundation whether it be 30 years or 60 years of his Speakership as the hon. senior member for St. Philip has hoped for.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to the amendment, Your Honour has ruled that it is not irrelevant. Well, Sir, it might not be irrelevant since you have so ruled, but on this side of the House nobody at all wants to say that somebody has not been occasioned some pleasure that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy first entered this House on 26th January, 1937. Nobody is against that. I am quite sure that not one of us on this side of the Table has wasted his precious time to check what has been presented to us here in order to find out whether they are the facts or not. We accept it. But let me ask you this: Mr. Deputy Speaker, are we to understand that if His Honour the Speaker or any other hon. member of this Chamber does right for 364 days of the year and you tell him that he has done rightly or that he is doing well, are we to understand that on the 365th day, if he has done wrongly, we should not tell him so? Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is what we are faced with. It is quite all right for hon. members to be thinking in terms of Party. It is the dignity of this Honourable House that we are engaged in debating here today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may say this. We are confining ourselves to all that went on on the 15th day of December, 1966, and I maintain that since His Honour the Speaker did not see fit to set me, as a junior member of this House, an example which I could follow on that occasion, since that is so, His Honour the Speaker deserves every bit of censure that the Hon. Mover of this Resolution has proposed. Sir, we want to say that if hon. members of the Government Party, the backbenchers, were to vote today to censure His

Honour the Speaker for his conduct on the 15th day of December, 1966, we want him to understand that we are not taking it for granted that for the rest of his life he will be incapable of presiding over the affairs of an Honourable Chamber if not this one. We are concerned that each hon. member should examine himself first and forget that it is the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is involved in this debate. For that matter, I think we should forget who is the holder of the office of Speaker and we should place the dignity of the House first and foremost and let us see where we can get in this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking now on the amendment, I feel that hon. members on this side of the House if they really had any intention of making fun at His Honour the Speaker, they would have chosen an entirely different occasion for doing a thing of that sort. It is not a question of making fun at His Honour the Speaker; if it were a question of making fun at the Speaker, we would not associate ourselves with anything like that. Unfortunately, on this occasion, we cannot be a party to what this amendment seeks to set out. What we are saying is this: we are saying that it appears to us that this amendment does not appear to have any relation whatever to the motion of censure on the Speaker as has been proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and we are asking that this matter be examined, as it should be, by all concerned. If we were to go into this matter carefully even at this late hour, - if we were to realise that the upholding of the dignity of this Chamber is worth much more than the name of any hon. member of it - we would also realise that the dignity of this Chamber is worth more than any offender against the Standing Orders of the Chamber. 7.55 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I had been requested to attend today's meeting to speak on a Resolution for the purpose of expressing eulogy to the present holder of the office of Speaker I would have come prepared to do so, but to speak on an amendment to a motion of censure moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am a bit out of order. If I had to shower praises on the eve of the anniversary of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy since he is now approaching his thirtieth year as a member of this House I, Sir, like any hon. member would be most willing to extend my warmest congratulation; but I am afraid, this is not the time for that.

When I read the text of the Resolution purporting to be an academic substantive motion to deal with the vote before the House, I discovered that it was nothing of the sort. I have not come here today to deal with a Resolution showering praise on the present occupant of the Chair; therefore I cannot associate myself with the burden of this amended motion after reading the sub-paragraphs. And I read:

"Delete all the words appearing after 'this House' and substitute therefor the following words:

"notes with extreme pleasure that the honourable senior Member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein."

I do not think I have to read it, but I do not think anyone in this House would dare tell me that a paragraph which reads thus:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House notes with extreme pleasure that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein." bears any relation to the motion which is under consideration. No man, I do not care who he be, could make me believe that this paragraph has any bearing to the motion moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. That is asking me too much.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to draw to the hon. member's attention that I have already ruled that it is relevant.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Your ruling has not changed my feelings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are talking to someone who knows what to say, and when to say it. Apart from your august ruling - I am a man, *homo sapiens* - something within me tells me something different from your ruling. I want to make it clear that I am not questioning your ruling. I know better than that.

Again, Sir, without question this Resolution further reads: "recalls that during this thirty-year period the same honourable member has at different times served as Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, and as Speaker, since 1961;"

"recalls further that the same honourable member has been elected Speaker with the consent of the whole House on two occasions, the latter as recently as November, 1966;"

"records herein profound appreciation of the honourable member's long and distinguished Parliamentary service;

"congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership; and again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair."

That inward feeling of mine leads me to believe that has nothing to do with the terms of the Resolution as moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I do not stop there; I go further. The last paragraph reads:

"congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership."

I stop there. In the name of goodness, tell me if that has anything to do with the substantive Resolution.

Again, Sir, if I had been asked to come here to eulogise the present holder of Speaker of this House of Assembly, I would have come prepared to enter into a debate of that kind, and no discordant note I would strike. It would be that I rejoice with the individual on the occasion. On no occasion would I ever try to embarrass the Hon. Speaker. He has been embarrassed by this debate.

I have not come to this Chamber today to shower praises on the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, but I hope that his anniversary celebration will be a thing of reality and of my participating in them. I hope nothing will preclude my good judgment when I consider how I should speak on this substantive motion which is before the House. 8.05 p.m.

That is what I came here to say on the second occasion and I have said it.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have really got up to move the suspension of this Sitting.

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, Wednesday, 25th January, 1967.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to make an amendment to the motion because I do not think that 9 o'clock tomorrow morning can suit most hon. members on this side. I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to consider that we were here practically the whole day and part of the night, and we have something to do during the morning. I am quite willing to come here at noon tomorrow, and I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the House could be so unreasonable, because members on the other side may have time on their hands and be able to come at 7 o'clock in the morning and call on us to do the same. We on this side are willing to accommodate the

Leader of the House because we know they have business to do, and we are willing to help them speed it up; but surely 9 o'clock is too early. There is work that may have lagged from today, and you yourself may have something to do tomorrow morning. The Ministers may have their Permanent Secretaries to do their jobs for them, but we have not; so we are appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to be more considerate.

For these reasons I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to second that. Even if I have to be in here every single day, it is a simple right and courtesy to consult with the Opposition when these things are to be fixed. It is the first time in thirty odd years that I have seen this sort of thing happen, just to ignore the other side. The whole essence of democracy is that everybody has his views, but when it comes to matter of fixing the time for meeting, the Opposition has an absolute right to be consulted.

The question that this House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the negative.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should be obliged if you would assist me. I have heard two motions moved for the suspension of the House; neither has been carried; so the business of the House stands, which is the Censure Motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please sit.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 9.00 o'clock on Wednesday, 25th January, 1967, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 11.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. J. M. ADAMS; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. SMITH; Mr. St. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 9.
8.18 p.m.

On resumption,

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken since none of the Opposition members is present.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Order of the day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I note that there is no Official Reporter present in the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Sitting be suspended for ten minutes.

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

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

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: Prior to the suspension, Government Business had been decided upon as being instantly taken. The third Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Before the suspension I did move that Government Business be taken in view of the fact that hon. members of the Opposition were not present. During the suspension, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition came into the House and I presume he is outside the precincts of the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact as was suggested by the Hon. Leader of the House that the House revert to Private Member's Business, will the hon. member make a motion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House revert to Private Members Business.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that when the Sitting was suspended yesterday, Order No. 3 of Private Members' Business was yet under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I came into this Honourable Chamber, I came here to uphold the high traditions of this Honourable House and to accept the decisions of the Chair. I am still prepared to accept the decisions from the Chair.

Unfortunately, the 15th of December of last year within my mind could be called Black Tuesday when His Honour the Speaker.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The 15th December was actually a Thursday and not a Tuesday.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I came into this Chamber I came in here to accept the rulings given by the Chair, but I feel in my mind - whether it was a Tuesday or Thursday - that that day should be called Black Tuesday or Black Thursday. But I think the point which I am about to make was as regards the circumstances. We feel that this House has been over the years proud of its traditions, and I never expected to see anything of the sort; but it was forcibly drawn to my attention that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy made it abundantly clear to His Honour the Speaker that if he obeyed His Honour's Ruling, he would be guilty of rank hypocrisy.
9.25 a.m.

To my mind this was not only disobeying the Speaker's Ruling, but I would consider it gross insolence to this House. Standing Order No. 36(2) says: "The Speaker or the Chairman shall order Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of that day's sitting, and the Marshal shall act on such orders as he may receive from the Chair in pursuance of this Order." I personally feel that the authentic thing that should have been done on that occasion was to ask the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw from the sitting of this House, but we were told in the Speaker's Ruling that he was pretty close to the borderline. I do not feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was close to the borderline; I feel that His Honour the Speaker was the person out of the crease, and that is why we are here this morning again to more or less reprimand His Honour the Speaker.

With respect to the amendment which was brought in by the hon. junior member for St. George, in doing a bit of homework last week I discovered that in the House of Com-

mons this is considered a wrecking amendment primarily for the purpose of destroying all the facts which surround the immediate motion - to laud the Speaker for his years' service. I am not in a position to shower any blessings upon him or to laud him, but I am sure there are other hon. members on this side who are more closely associated with him both in his legal profession and in the political arena who can do it much better than I can.

The amendment brought by the hon. junior member for St. George has absolutely nothing to do with the day with which we are dealing now, and that is 15th December, 1966. My recollection was that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy made it quite clear to His Honour the Speaker that he would not obey his Ruling, which is like saying; "I am not prepared to do what you say though you are the boss;" and I feel the boss's only decision should be to dismiss his employee. That is what should have happened with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy and his colleague are responsible for whatever embarrassment may be brought about during the life of this Parliament. What would it be worth for the hon. member, who, I am told, is a very eloquent speaker, to say "I withdraw"? He has a choice of language, and that is all it wanted; but rather than that he has to use his dogmatic attitude, because it would hurt him if he had to withdraw that remark because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had objected to it. That is the whole crux of the matter, and absolutely nothing else. It is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Some of them get across that Table and say he is old, but I am happy to be around a grand old man and the father of Barbadian democracy; that is what I am proud of. He has contributed and is still contributing unlike the hon. junior member for St. Thomas whose only contribution to Parliament since I have been here is to get there and use some insulting remarks across the floor to other members. That is all he has contributed so far in here, but he would never grow as old as the Leader of the Opposition in politics, and neither, I believe, would he grow as old politically as the Speaker of this House. He also can see the writing on the wall. Let them ride high; one of these days the tide is going to turn.

The Hon. Prime Minister, Sir, on that day argued in here that the Leader of the Opposition was out of order. All these things you had just because of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He is their poison. Looking across the Table at him is their biggest problem.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I hate to obstruct the hon. senior member for St. James, but I think it is unparliamentary and offensive to refer to an hon. member, even an hon. member on that side, as being the poison of hon. members. It is not fair to the hon. Leader of the Opposition; it is offensive to him and it is unparliamentary, and the hon. member should be asked to withdraw it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, when offensive words are used, objection must be taken by the person who has been insulted and offended. I can almost call the Leader of the House the chief interrupter of this House. I have not taken any objection, and it is for Your Honour, if any unparliamentary language is used, promptly to call on the member without waiting for an objection. But you must put an end to those getting up and saying "on a point of order". I have risen on a point of order, and the point of order is that the hon. member has interrupted when it should be for me or for you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to object to any remarks that may be made by any hon. member. This constant jumping up shows no respect for the Chair, because the hon. member is quite conscious of the fact that it is not a point of order he has risen on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, again on a point of order, if an hon. member in the course of a speech says that.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is this a point of order to get up and make a speech in reply to my point of order? He has not risen on a point of order. He is just making a speech

saying that what I have said is not true. It is for you, Sir, in the Chair, to put an end to this. It does not do any good to the name of the House and for respect for the Chair. This has got to stop.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it must be unparliamentary for an hon. member to refer to an hon. member as being poison to other hon. members. If this is not an unparliamentary remark, we all have to revise our ideas of what Parliament is. The hon. senior member for St. James has said with respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he is poison to other hon. members. This must be an offensive remark. If the Leader of the Opposition does not feel offended about it, other members do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I rule that the expression used by the hon. senior member for St. James is not unparliamentary. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would appear as if coming in this position of the batting order I can push to mid-on and run one, because I was under the impression that when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy rose on a point of order he was correct; but there is nothing to worry about. I have knocked off the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture.
9.35 a.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my little contribution to this motion, that His Honour the Speaker either by accident or by design, erred. We are not here to track him down; we are not here to say that he is not capable of carrying out his functions that he has been elected to carry out; but we are here to ask him to see to it that in the future he should be very careful. We are not here to bring in what took place at Mayer's Corner or at the District "C" Police Magistrate's Court or what happened in 1951 or 1952. We are here to discuss what happened on the 15th December, 1966. What happened on that date was that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy used what we consider as offensive remarks, and out of disgust we, on this side, withdrew from the House. As to the announcement by the hon. junior member for St. Michael about a telephone message, I cannot imagine that the hon. member could sink to such a low level as to continue with that fabrication.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I am asking Your Honour to call on the hon. member to withdraw that remark about the hon. junior member for St. Michael sinking to such a low level as to continue with that fabrication.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. James please withdraw that remark?

Mr. CRAIG: I unhesitatingly withdraw that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, May I ask if it is in order for some hon. member to object to something on behalf of another hon. member? If the hon. junior member for St. Michael feels offended at his name being called, he should ask you to ask the hon. member to withdraw it; but for the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to set up himself as the Chief spokesman for his colleague is contrary to all practice and rules which exist in any Parliament.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would not expect the hon. member to be able to see quite so far, but Your Honour will observe that the hon. junior member for St. Michael is not now in his place. Is the hon. member saying that we should allow him to be offended and not defend him in his absence?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Even before the hon. member asked the hon. member to withdraw it, His Honour should take notice of it and ask the hon. member to withdraw it. That is in "May" and the Standing Orders; why does not the hon. member read it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I called on the hon. member to withdraw it. The reason for the request to withdraw is in Standing Order 26 (5) which reads as follows:-

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

Will the hon. senior member for St. James please continue his speech?

Mr. CRAIG: Why we withdrew from this House was because of disgust, because we felt within ourselves that the Speaker's Ruling was wrong. We have nevertheless tried our best since then to uphold the high traditions of Parliament. I am quite sure that when His Honour the Speaker gave his Ruling or asked the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw the remarks he had made, the hon. member made it abundantly clear that should he immediately withdraw them he would be guilty of rank hypocrisy. I do not think that His Honour's Ruling would be a standard set for any parliamentarians to contribute the very best that is in them and to have respect for the Chair, which we feel that His Honour the Speaker is entitled to have from us. I have no intention of prolonging something which I considered earlier to be a matter for the legal men who would have "May's" at their disposal and for the older parliamentarians to debate; but I could not sit here without adding my contribution as a young member of this House, to what I observe in my first month here. I would like to finish on this note, that as long as I serve in this Chamber, I shall at all times set about to pay the Chair the respect which I know it is worthy of. I do hope that His Honour the Speaker will set a standard in the near future.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking on the amendment, I have realised that in the opening remarks of this debate, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition started immediately to try to prove the irrelevancy of the amendment to his Resolution, but I cannot see it possible, if the hon. member has brought a motion of censure against the Speaker, that the facts which have been outlined here in this amendment could be irrelevant.
9.45 a.m.

As I see it, the Opposition is trying their very best to put a blemish on the record of the Honourable Speaker of this House. As I check the time, within the next twenty-four hours the Honourable Speaker would have served in this Chamber for thirty years continually, and I think that is a very great achievement. For the Opposition to come in here to try to blemish his record, first because he made it quite clear on the 15th December, 1966, the date on which this incident took place, he did not rule in their favour, that is why they have brought this motion of censure against him.

The motion for censure on the Honourable Speaker has been a deliberate attack on him to prove that his record should have some blemish in it. We have heard that from the members of the Opposition who spoke yesterday. One of them made the remark that this amendment appears to be something like an after dinner speech and also an obituary notice on His Honour the Speaker. We have, Sir, an important man as Speaker, and they do not have within their ranks a Speaker of his calibre. I have seen that they have tried their utmost best to make his path somewhat rough.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the thirty years that His Honour the Speaker came in here he was a backbencher such as I am, and now he has risen from a backbencher to the highest position in this House, that of Speaker. He was unanimously elected Speaker in November, 1966, when this House was re-opened. They have tried their best, or are trying their utmost best, to say that this amendment is irrelevant. They feel that it has taken the sting out of the censure motion which they are trying to bring on the Honourable Speaker of this House. The last hon. member who spoke has said that this motion of censure is for the lawyers to decide. I feel it is my duty to speak for His Honour the Speaker because during my time in this Honourable Chamber I have seen him going to the trouble of checking before he gave a decision; but on the 15th December, be-

cause his decision was not what the Opposition would have liked, they have decided to bring this censure motion on him.

With these few remarks I do not see how the censure motion should have been brought against His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be failing in my duty if I did not speak on this motion. It is true to say that something happened on the 15th December, 1966. It is also true that we are now discussing a motion of censure against His Honour the Speaker, and there is only one point which I should try to bring to the attention of hon. members of this House.

The motion before us is that the Hon. Leader of the House disobeyed the Ruling given by Mr. Speaker on the 15th December, 1966, and that His Honour the Speaker should be censured because he reversed his Ruling which he had already given against the Leader of the House.

Now, in my hand is the "Official Gazette" of the 15th December, and I would like to know from hon. members if they regard what the Speaker then said as a Ruling. These were the Speaker's words to the Hon. Leader of the House:-

"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."

I as a layman cannot see how that can be a Ruling from Mr. Speaker. If the entire Opposition decide that that is a Ruling, then I submit that there is no case for the Speaker to answer. I heard quite a lot said yesterday. Members on the other side have said that the words used by the Hon. Leader of the House were unparliamentary and that at no time would it be in order to use the words; but what I would like to say now is that what we are now dealing with is whether a Ruling was made on the 15th December according to the Censure Motion and whether the Speaker did reverse his Ruling to free the Hon. Leader of the House.
9.55 a.m.

We are not now asked to say whether or not the words used were unparliamentary. All that I can see we are asked in this motion is to determine whether a Ruling was made and whether the Speaker reversed his Ruling to free the Hon. Leader of the House, and in no part of this debate can I see a Ruling made by the Speaker asking the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw the words made. In view of that, I submit that there is nothing for either the Hon. Leader of the House or the Speaker to answer. I think I have made my point.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry to think that such a small spark of fire from one member's tongue could cause the whole world to be set on fire. That is what I was thinking all day long. It shocked my modesty to think that such valuable time is being wasted because hon. members do not humble themselves at certain times. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I came into this House eight years ago, I told the Speaker that I would assist him in maintaining order and dignity in this House as long as the people sent me here. I realise, Sir, that there are laws of the earth and laws even in heaven, and all members have a right to be guided by the laws by which they are controlled. I even go further and say you should obey those who are set in authority over you, whether it be in heaven or on earth. If a member finds himself speaking a word out of place, immediately he should withdraw that word, as immediate confession keeps unity of spirit unbroken.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are placed in a position as well as the Speaker. You act like a Captain of a ship who has a compass and a barometer - the compass to show him when he is going off the route, and the barometer to show him when there will be a storm, and if the captain neglects the signs of these instruments and allows the storm to come

on him suddenly, surely the ship may sink. I always give the warning not to allow anyone to go too far off the latitude, and you should not only watch the latitude, but also the longitude. That is the only possible way in which you can control those over whom you are put in control. When the word "hypocrisy" was used, I sat and listened carefully, and I read here on Page 19 of this Report where the Speaker says he could make the hon. member withdraw those words "rank hypocrisy"; but in reading he was searching the dictionary to find the real meaning of the word "hypocrisy". In my Parliamentary education, I know that the word "hypocrisy" is a very dangerous word, because a man gives a sign that he is something when he is another; but the Speaker did not get to his final decision. I thought then myself that the Opposition would press the point and ask for the withdrawal, but they walked out. I did not like that. If there is any leniency, it is there it would come. The Speaker has been here for thirty years. Suppose he had been here for fifty years and had made a mistake, I would tell him he made one. I would not be ashamed to tell anyone in here that he made a mistake, because I want to maintain order and the honour of this House. Even in the Law Courts, though there may be fire and swords flashing, yet both sets of lawyers get together and reason. Before this motion of censure was brought to the House, I thought the Leader of the Opposition would have called on the Speaker and reasoned with him. Come let us reason together, and no matter how red your sins may be or how evil, they may be remedied. It does not matter what others think or what others may have to say. I possess a conscience and I would not allow it to slight me. If I offend my little boy at home and I know within my conscience that I have offended him, I say to him that I am sorry and beg his pardon. It bring back the boy's affection for me. 10.05 a.m.

I must humiliate myself to my little child if I want to come back to him, to let him know that I did him evil. Up to now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I still believe in my bosom that there is still time for reason. We have to honour the Opposition side of this House, (*Cheers*) and they have to respect us too. Both sides have to show that respect for one another. I trust that in the future, if I remain in this House, there will be a better example set even from this day forward, that every one of us will do our duty and not be ashamed to do it. When we hear one hon. member speak a word which is out of place and His Honour the Speaker calls on that member to withdraw his words, I feel glad when the hon. member withdraws his words. "To obey is better than sacrifice (*Cheers*) and to harken is better than the fat of rams". The people have sent us here to do their business; they have chosen us from among other people, and they believe that we are the people whom they could trust to send here, and they hate to hear any evil remarks made towards one another in this House. They are hurt if we are not reasoning together.

I would say this; I hope that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues will look into this matter carefully knowing that this applies not only to Barbados but all over the world where you have this behaviour in the House. I trust that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will come to the point of reasoning. His Honour the Speaker has served for a period of thirty years in here. I know him to be a man of good humour, and I would not have to have anything against his dignity, nor would I say that the Opposition is bringing forward something to mar his progress, because I know that we will make a mistake and then what it boils down to is a little error. A spark off the tongue is like a burning spark out of a piece of iron, and we have to get it out before it catches the whole island. Whoever it is, whether it be the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or the Hon. Leader of the House, he should have said "I withdraw those words". We want to live up to the standard which is required of us. We should conduct ourselves in an admirable manner and live up to the standard which is required of us by those who have sent us here. By so doing, we will win the affections of the people and they will be desirous of returning us back to this House because of our conduct. By the truth we shall be known. With those few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I trust that His Honour the Speaker will have yet many more years of service in this House. I also trust that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will have many

more years here. According to our conduct and behaviour we will be able to continue. We do not want to abuse our privilege. I hope we will do good and that our sittings in this House will continue to be in order.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is now my privilege to contribute to this debate. We are now dealing with the amendment to the Motion of censure which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it is as follows:-

Delete all the words appearing after "this House" and substitute therefor the following words:

"notes with extreme pleasure that the honourable Senior Member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein;

recalls that during this thirty-year period the same honourable member has at different times served as Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, and as Speaker since 1961;

recalls further that the same honourable member has been elected Speaker with the consent of the whole House on two occasions, the latter as recently as November, 1966;

records herein profound appreciation of the honourable member's long and distinguished Parliamentary service;

congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership; and again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the text of this Resolution be suitably engrossed on parchment and handed over to Mr. Speaker as a tribute from this Honourable House."

I feel that we will have to discuss both the motion and the amendment. I have heard a lot from the various speakers on this matter. We have this Amendment Section by Section as a eulogy of the Speaker; but, in my humble opinion, when you take this Amendment to replace the motion of censure I do not see that there is any relevance whatsoever to the motion. Therefore I think that a matter like this should have come into this House before. When this motion is before the House - I am not saying that there is nothing in this motion, but what took place on the 15th December, 1966, is the point at issue, whether the Ruling of His Honour the Speaker was correct or not, whether the Hon. Leader of the House obeyed the Speaker's Ruling or not. That is the point at issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard many members read back from Hansard the Debate of the 15th December, 1966, and they have touched on many points. In the first place, I think that the words "hypocrite" and "hypocrisy" are together, just as you associate "stealing" with "thief". If today a lecturer in a school was lecturing to his students, and after he had left the lecture room he heard one of the students say something disrespectful of him, I wonder how that lecturer would feel about that. How would he feel about the students using disrespectful words about him? 10.15 a.m.

Whether the word "hypocrisy" was unparliamentary or not, I think it was unnecessary for the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to have referred to it.

I go a little lower down the page and I read:

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

During that time Mr. Speaker was trying to reach a decision. The Speaker then said:

"I have had the advantage of referring to all available authorities and have considered the exact words as taken down by the Official Reporter. 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 the Report now."

I would not detain you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I go on to part of the next paragraph:

"It is my ruling that inasmuch as the words 'all that' are clearly referable to 'patriotism' and contains 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."

I do feel, Sir, that anyone making a speech should not say: "All that is rank hypocrisy". It has reference to the person who was speaking. Therefore, if the Speaker used the word "disposed", we have to remember that at times we sit here and hear the Speaker using very flowery language. I heard from one of the members that another member said something which is definitely incorrect. I am sorry that at the time I was in a doctor's office.

I feel that the Speaker did use the word "disposed" when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy used that remark. The word "disposed" is rather flowery, but I do feel if the Hon. Speaker did think at the time that the word "hypocrisy" should have been withdrawn, he would not have used any other word but the word "disposed." It is a flowery word and it is used by His Honour the Speaker regularly.

If the Speaker in his Ruling said that the words taken down were not unparliamentary, I do feel that the words "rank hypocrisy" were unparliamentary. I heard certain hon. members recalling the days of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the Opposition. I wish that he were in the Opposition in the days when he, as Leader of the House, made such a glowing and noble speech in Queen's Park.

When you take these things and put them together and we think moreover it was those two words that objection was taken against, and if the Speaker used the flowery words "whether the Leader of the House is disposed to withdraw the words", as an hon. member said just now, it was better that the Speaker did not use that phrase. But hon. members in this Chamber know that whenever the Speaker gets up from his Chair to give a Ruling, irrespective of who you are, you must respect his Ruling. So long as the Speaker is in the Chair and he gives a Ruling, it should be respected. A learned man can use such a shade in his speech that I as a member would not be able to do.

It does not mean that because those words were said in here by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, we should use them. We as members must carry in our conscience that background of Christian culture that has been put in our minds by our parents.

With those few remarks, I do hope that in the future no such shady language would be used in this Hon. Chamber.
10.25 a.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will begin by using some of the words of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew not long ago. "To obey is better than sacrifice!" Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has disobeyed and now is sacrificing the time of this House, sacrificing the dignity

of the Chair, and also the members who are prepared to vote in favour of this Resolution. That is the penalty for disobeying.

Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has made one of the best speeches that he has made on the floor of this House for a very long time. The hon. junior member for St. George on the other hand has made one of the worst for his short time. For one to listen to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew's speech today and then take upon himself to vote to the contrary, one could only think or say that he did not know right from wrong. He was as true as true can be. He may have trodden on someone's corns, but that is when you are doing justice. You have to tread on someone's corns if you want to be fair and just; but when you want to please everybody, that person can be more dangerous than a marl hole. No one can please everybody at the same time. So do not let us get up in here and try to draw a red herring across the trail. The damage has been done; it cannot be repaired, and you are going to make it worse when you go and vote to the contrary. You are going to make the Speaker look like what? When you listen to the various speeches, one can only say that these people are trying to make a puppet of the Speaker.

Before I go any further, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy - and, I think, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew - yesterday said that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had eulogised His Honour the Speaker not long ago for maintaining the dignity of the Chair, but what caused him to do it? It was because the Speaker was doing his job. Could he have any animosity for him then? But the Hon. Leader of the House still said he wanted to show that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has a tradition for crossing swords with Speakers. Now if the hon. member has a tradition for crossing swords, would he eulogise a member who does not belong to his Party and is Speaker at the same time? The Hon. Leader of the House must think he is talking to children, or to people who believe he is what he is not!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, no one is questioning the meritorious service of the Speaker. The Resolution does not refer to the tenure of office or anything else of the Speaker. It refers to what took place on December 15. We have got to learn to realise that the strongest chain is no stronger than its weakest link. Here you have one of the best Speakers in the world for the last three hundred years ruling in and out. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said he has been doing it well, but on this day in question he made a slip. Do you mean to say that if a man lives from his childhood days until his eightieth birthday and never calls one a fool, was always happy and very jovial, but one day he commits murder, are you going to the Court and, wanting to get off this man, tell the jury and the Judge that they must take into consideration that this man has never killed yet? I would not do that! You have got to plead your case and try to get the man off, but you cannot plead foolishness; you cannot try to make a mountain out of a mole hill. That is what hon. members on the other side are telling me today. This amendment is telling us that if you do good for 300 years, you cannot do wrong in a minute. And to show you, Sir, how the hon. members on the other side look at this censure motion, look whom they have put it in the hands of - the baby in politics, one of the last men to come into this House, for him to make a mess of it. Why did they not think of giving it at the same time to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew? I am in sympathy with him. They gave it to him, because he is the tallest and biggest in the Party, to make him look the smallest. In my opinion he has more sense than they do, because he dodged and gave it to somebody else, and they fell for it by giving it to someone else.
10.35 a.m.

The hon. member is not sick. He is not absent, he is still here and why do you take it from him? Why did he allow it to go from him? It is because he knows himself that he would not be able to justify this amendment with a speech introducing it. I really thought that tall and big people - anyhow I see what has happened. Let me go along down the line with this amendment. This amendment asks

us to "note with extreme pleasure that the hon. senior Member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein." Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is a member of the Government Party. I know that someone is going to fly up on a point of order. I am sure it will happen and I am therefore standing by for it. A little time before the last Election they wanted to remove a man from the same Party. Another member also hinted that in order to get rid of him they would move that they were going to run candidates under the age of 50 years. In order to get rid of the same Speaker they said: "Let us get around the Speaker, let us say that we are running candidates under 50". If you are going to talk about hypocrisy, let us go in for it now. If they had not taken second thought by another member you would have seen that a motion of this sort would not have been here today.

I am saying here that when you have one in the person of the Speaker to be a friend, then you have a friend. Let me prove it to you. He does not allow politics to interfere with his friendship; he does not allow Party to do so. If you are his friend, then you are his friend. I can say that for him. It may be that it is this sincerity which causes people to doubt him or to think differently. If he is your friend, he is your friend. He was a member of our Party and what caused him to leave the Party is that he could not say what the others said. He left us to support the same member for St. Lucy. I believe that if His Party were going to run a man in St. Joseph that he felt could move me, as a mark of protest he would leave the Party for Lloyd Smith. That is the type of individual whom we are talking about today. He has no grouse against us. We were running something against his friend, and he left the Party in order to support his friend. I cannot say that there is anything wrong with that. I will not say that any more. I do not live in St. Lucy. I have no vote in St. Lucy, but he has introduced somebody from St. Lucy to tell you what his friend told that person to do in St. Lucy against the Speaker. If we are talking about hypocrisy, let us talk about it now. Here you are throwing all the bouquets on the Speaker, but why do you wait until now to bring forward this? Why did you not wait until the next five years when you may not be sure that he will be returned, to shower these bouquets on him? But the Hon. Leader of the Opposition began to tell you what to do with him; he started to shower his bouquets first. That is what I have heard from members on the opposite side. How is it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition could hate him presumably politically as to try to get rid of him out of the Chair without a cause? What caused the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to praise him at the time? Did he ask him to do it? I say "No", it is a conscience which is living within the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which caused him to do so. In other words, you should render to Caesar the things which are Caesar's.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I still maintain that the Speaker fell down. The hon. junior member for St. George says that this Resolution is to keep him up because he is a big shot, or words to that effect. The hon. member is now young and he is allowing the old birds to teach him how to fly, but I think he had better fly with his own wings. He should not allow anybody to put him in a trap. During this period of thirty years, according to this Amendment, "the same hon. member has at different times served as Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition and as Speaker since 1961." The Resolution has not referred to that. I will tell you, Sir, that if there was anything coming to hurt His Honour the Speaker unjustly from my Party, I would say "No, can't do; excuse me, I will have to leave the Party as a matter of protest". That is not with the Speaker alone; I will not stand for it. I am not moulded to a Party; I am a free man to speak as I feel. If the Hon. Leader of my Party is doing something which I feel is wrong, and I cannot convince him that he is wrong, then I will convince him by leaving the Party. Everything belongs to me at "Fix-it-right", Tweedside Road, portfolio, books and everything else. 10.45 a.m.

Everything at Tweedside Road belongs to me. Because of that, whatever portfolio you have here, I have up there. I

have the Minister of Labour, the Deputy Prime Minister, Permanent Secretaries and everything; so if the hon. senior member for St. Andrew does not have to fear, I do not have to fear. I have no respect for him from now on.

Now, Sir, here it is that they are recalling the thirtieth anniversary of Mr. Speaker, but they are only trying to draw a red herring across the trail; and if I were in the shoes of the Hon. Speaker, I would not have accepted that at this time. If I were the Hon. Speaker, I would not have had one thing to do with it. I would have called on the hon. junior member for St. George and told him "You are a junior and you do not understand this." They must have drawn the Speaker's attention to it. I do not think they were trying to spring a surprise on him, because the Clerk of the House would have to draw it to him.

This is a forced-ripe something. Had it come through the normal channels, you would not have to force it. It is not to say that elections are going to take place next week or around the corner and you want to get through with it. If it is that they are not too sure and they are bringing it, I do not blame them. However, the Speaker would have still retained his seat. Why should the hon. junior member for St. George who has just come in the House have to bring it? If I were the Speaker and had known before, I would have told him not to accept it. If he has got all of this by force, one would have to think that it is not merited. The people are going to say so. If it was brought in the normal channels all of that would have been showered on him. This is a forced-ripe thing and you are bringing it on a motion which is far from it. You are only telling the people how you feel about His Honour the Speaker.

You say, look how serious a thing it is if we win this censure motion! Look what would happen to the Speaker: Look what would be done! I grant him that. Now, where is our Prime Minister today to help him?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph spoke yesterday on the motion before the House, as far as I remember. The hon. member should stick to the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was a Ruling yesterday that the amendment was an amendment to the substantive motion.

Mr. SMITH: Thank you, Sir. "Simple Simon met a pie-man". I said just now that a certain person was not a whole man yet. I have not sat down and it has been proved. If the hon. senior member for St. Andrew knows his stuff and knows what it is all about, he would remember that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has the right to reply to both things; so the two things are bound in one.

If the hon. senior member for St. Andrew wants to shelter the hon. Prime Minister, well, shelter him. He did not shelter you the other day. Does the hon. member see what has happened by sheltering today? This thing has taken up two days. 10.55 a.m.

Now, Sir, as I said, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition drew to this Chamber's attention the seriousness of this Resolution. It is a very serious matter and what will have to be done if the motion goes through, and it is the right, he said, of the Government Party to prevent a minority Opposition from interfering with any hon. member. Now this is so serious; but where is the Head of the Government to help protect the Speaker yesterday and today? That makes me believe that he also wants the Speaker out.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, it has already been pointed out by Mr. Speaker in response to the same kind of question asked by the hon. member on two or three occasions previously that the Prime Minister is not required to be in his place at every sitting of the House. I am the Leader of the House and am here to answer for the Government on all occasions, and so long as we have a majority, the Government's business goes on. The Prime Minister is not required to be in his place, and in no Parliament would the Prime Minister be expected to

be in his place at every sitting throughout each portion of a day.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Perhaps Your Honour will rule on that point of order. I understood the hon. member to say he was rising on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am nothing to do with whether the Prime Minister is supposed to come or go, and I do not believe you are anything to do with that either, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am making my point, and he has encouraged me to raise this point, because he drew to my attention the seriousness of this motion before the House. The Hon. Prime Minister is not supposed to come, but I would bet that if you go into the Lobby or anywhere outside there you will see him. He can do as he likes. The people of this country put the power in his hands to do as he likes; so he can come and go when he likes. It is nothing to me, but it is the people's business and the Speaker's business now. I feel the Speaker should look at it in the same light as I would look at it, and it is that he does not care if the Speaker goes or comes. That is all.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, it must be out of order to say of an hon. member not in his place that he does not care if Mr. Speaker goes or comes. The hon. member is therefore wrong to say this because he is imputing bad intentions and bad motives to the Hon. Prime Minister who is not now in his place, and it cannot be proper for him to say so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph Standing Order No. 26(2): "A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto." I would ask the hon. member to confine his observations to the matter under discussion.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am confining myself to this. I have referred to a politician like myself, and this is politics. I am not dealing with any shop selling fowl backs. I am in a political House dealing with political bodies. If you check it seriously, he wants us to feel you do not know when a member is straying; so make him sit down when he rises again, because it looks as if he wants to expose you too. Watch carefully from now on.

Now, Sir, this amending motion "records herein profound appreciation of the hon. member's long and distinguished Parliamentary service;" Now with regard to the long and distinguished service, nothing in the other motion said anything about that. I am trying to prove my case, because the hon. member said yesterday that we did not have a case. He said the Speaker never ruled, and if I am not mistaken, I think the hon. junior member for St. John said here today that the Speaker did not make a Ruling. He is not in his place, because he is like a little fellow who pelts up in a mango tree and runs.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, again on a point of order, you cannot say this of hon. members at any time, but particularly if they are not in their places. You cannot say to an hon. member that he is like somebody who pelts up in a mango tree and runs, because the imputation is that the hon. member is cowardly, and that having made his speech, he would not like to hear the reply, and there is a Standing Order which is broken when the hon. member does this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to bear in mind Standing Order No. 26 (5) which reads as follows:

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it is offensive and unparliamentary to say a little boy who pelts a rock in a mango tree, then I wonder what the words "rank hypocrisy" would be! You did not make that Ruling, but I just say that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy wants to make the Chair look foolish.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph's attention that I did not give a Ruling.

Mr. SMITH: Now a little boy who pelts a rock up in a tree is offensive, but "rank hypocrisy" is near to the borderline! Now we are not going to get anywhere at this rate. You can clearly see that if this thing continues we are not going to get anywhere or do the people's business. I will do my best to respect the Chair. I can swear that whatever you tell me to do I will obey; but please do not let one who refused to obey try to throw a spanner in the works. One who refused to obey, Sir, should be shunned or passed by in the same manner as if you see one coming down the road who is suffering from small pox.
11.05 a.m.

That is how a disobedient child should be treated. He should be isolated or hurt. Now, Sir, when we as members of this Honourable Chamber get up in here to make ourselves ridiculous - as I was quoting here, they say that it was not a Ruling by Mr. Speaker and the Speaker had to make a Ruling relative to the same motion which is before us. The Speaker in his own words here at paragraph 2 of his Ruling says this: "Accordingly I do not deem the motion to be out of order." A motion which was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which hon. members said yesterday was out of order, was ruled on by the Speaker and these are his words: "Accordingly, I do not deem the motion to be out of order" Whom are we to believe? The majority of members say that it is out of order, and this is what His Honour the Speaker says, and the person whom we have to go by tells us that he does not deem it to be out of order. Now they want us to believe that the Speaker does not know what he is doing when he makes a Ruling. They are contradicting him all the time. I want to show that on this I am not going to say anything. That is my personal opinion on this, and I am at liberty to voice my opinion just as you would voice your opinion. This is not in order, that is my opinion. There is no relevance. The Amendment goes on like this "congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership; and 'again renews its pledges of swerving respect for the 'dignity of the Chair.

" AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the text of this "Resolution be suitably engrossed on parchment and "handed over to Mr. Speaker as a tribute from this Honourable House."

Now, Sir, when the Chair has to be always forced to appeal to hon. members to withdraw unparliamentary words from members of the Chamber, can anyone say that "this House again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair?" When the Speaker has practically to beg an hon. member to help him maintain the dignity of the Chair and that hon. member refuses to do so, can we say that "this House again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair"? Now, Sir, can this Amendment be a perfect and meaningful Resolution telling the House that "this House again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair"? This is what this Resolution before us is pointing out. The hon. member has refused to help His Honour the Speaker to uphold the dignity of the Chair. Could this Amendment be correct? I am saying that it cannot be correct. The damage has been done and we want to repair it; let us repair it in a different way. Do not let us come and try to whitewash it now with sweet, flowery words in a Resolution because the Speaker was told: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." This is pulling a red herring across the trail. I do not mind who says I have sense or not, but my little knowledge is telling me that this is unfair to His Honour the Speaker at this time. This Resolution is making the Speaker to look like nothing now in the eyes of the people who do not know the running of this Chamber. When they read this, the public can say that he is a real puppet Speaker. They can say so because you have thrown it out to them. I would not mind if this came up next week after this debate was over, but at the same time you make this Amendment to the Resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Nobody is trying to harm the Speaker. This is only to let the House and the public know what has been done on the 15th December. The hon. member said that the Speaker did not ask him to withdraw the words. These are the words of His Honour the 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."

11.15 a.m.

Now, Sir, this is the hon. member whom we are talking about today. This is the hon. and learned gentleman who has thirty years experience in this House. This is not one who has just come in here in November, 1966. This is a full-fledged member. What would cause the Speaker to ask the hon. junior member for St. Lucy if he is disposed to withdraw those remarks? If the Speaker did not think to himself that it was something to withdraw, would he waste the valuable time of this Chamber and call on the gentleman who was speaking and ask him to withdraw? No, Sir, I would speak according to my knowledge, but I would like to hear you before a Chief Justice parading on this matter - or even the same Speaker.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the House is telling us something else. Here again you are trying to make the Speaker look like what? Would the Honourable Speaker take upon himself the trouble to ask the hon. member if he is disposed to withdraw those remarks if he did not feel within himself that those remarks were something to withdraw? You would not have done it if you did not feel it was something to withdraw. That is all we are dealing with. This something to withdraw. That is all we are dealing with. This is nothing to do with meritorious service.

I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is what His Honour the Speaker said in reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition:

"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."

You would pardon me, Sir, and I do not expect you to say it from the Chair: but with your experience, with your knowledge of parliamentary procedure, do you think that the Honourable Speaker would have called upon the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw words if he did not think they were unparliamentary? Do not matter how much we love the Hon. Speaker, nobody would think that he would call upon another hon. member like himself to withdraw words if he did not think they should have been withdrawn. All of this has proved to me that it is only because there is this want of power.

I am attacking nobody. We are talking facts. We are bringing down the hammer, regardless of whom it may rest on. With the experience of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and His Honour the Speaker, would either one of them call on another member to withdraw remarks which were not offensive? How comes it then that the motion which was tabled by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is out of order, and this one which was tabled by a junior, one who has just arrived, one who has not got out of the political car, one who is now opening the door, can be in order?

We must learn to face facts and I sincerely hope that we face them without rancour or anything of the sort. It is not true to argue that the Hon. Speaker when he asked the hon. member to withdraw the remarks was not necessarily insisting on his withdrawing the remarks. What kind of thing could that be? Could that thing come from a Minister of Education? Could that come from a former President of the Oxford Union? Would you expect those remarks to come from such a top-notched fellow? This is not a play-play Parliament. I saw some little children the other day playing

House and one of them was in the Chair. Even in the country we have groups who have play-play Parliaments. They are grooming themselves for the time when they may be called to come here to represent the people. This sort of thing could not have happened even in a play-play Parliament. Are you telling me that when the Speaker called on the hon. member to withdraw the remarks, he did not necessarily mean that the hon. member should withdraw? Who can believe that? I believe that all of us in here have some sense. If that were not so, how could we have got in here? To be a good lawyer you must have some sense. You have the hon. member saying that when the Hon. Speaker used those words he did not necessarily mean that the hon. member should withdraw the remarks. He is talking about the two words which the Speaker used. We all know His Honour the Speaker. He always phrases his words differently from most people. Even in His Honour the Speaker putting a question to the House, he phrases it differently from most Speakers and most Chairmen of Committees. Generally, Speakers say "I think the 'Ayes' have it", but my Speaker says "Me-thinks the Ayes have it." His Honour the Speaker has his own way of talking, but it still means the same thing.

11.25 a.m.

If His Honour the Speaker asked the hon. member "if he is disposed", I dare suppose the hon. member might have been looking sick to the Speaker, because the Speaker knew he had committed a grave misdemeanour and broken the rules of the House, and he may have thought he was a little afraid and put it to him in a little soft kid-glove way; but if it were I who had to do it, I would not come with all that fandangle talk. I would say, "Will the hon. member withdraw?" And most Speakers would do that. But it is his way of putting things, and the hon. member is taking advantage of him. What did the Speaker really mean when he said that? Was he making sport? Not in Parliament! This is a dignified place, and we must always be dignified in our language, obey the Chair and do everything that is right to set an example to the other members of the House and to the public.

The Hon. Leader of this House is Minister of Education. Why was he made that? Whoever is responsible for making him that felt that he had the goods to deliver and that he would be the best person to be Minister of Education; so all the hon. member has to do now is not to disappoint who is responsible for making the choice, and set an example in here, outside and everywhere. Instead of that, he is trying to turn us around by telling us that the Speaker did not necessarily mean something. The Speaker made his Ruling in the first instance, and when the Speaker asked the hon. member whether he was disposed to withdraw, he was ruling. I do not know how they would define the word "ruling", but as soon as he had to come in and interrupt, it was his intention to rule then and he did not rule. If you told me so, I would more look into the matter, but he intended and he did it, and the hon. member refused to withdraw. When the Hon. Leader of the House was replying yesterday, he really dropped some warm lashes on the Speaker, and that is what made me feel it is his intention to throw him overboard for good. He tells us that the Speaker was anxious to head off what could possibly have been a long and unseemly clash between both sides of the House. He does not care what he has done. He said it, and those who do not like it can lump it. The Speaker is in the Chair to rule and to prevent clashes from either side of the House, and the Speaker was anxious to get away from doing his duty! After hearing the speech of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. George should get up and withdraw his amendment. He tells us that the Speaker was anxious to head off this thing, and he therefore ruled unfairly or unjustly. He can put any kind of meaning to it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe you must be saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am a lawyer coming up with some legal points, I am putting the facts, and I can only go from what I see in front of me. The Hon. Leader of the House said that the Leader of the Opposition was at pains to make it appear as if he had some personal animosity against him and is always making personal remarks against him; so you can see that he would never have withdrawn that re-

mark. He would have withdrawn it if I were on the floor, but not for the Leader of the Opposition.

I will tell you this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You were not here in the last Session, but if the Leader of the House wanted to make an adjournment or wanted us to come back the next day, he would leave that side of the House and come over here to the Leader of the Opposition, and the Parliamentary Leader of my Party, and if the Parliamentary Leader was not in his seat, he would come to me. That was very nice of him, and that is the way he must do things. He knows his onions. You cannot teach him anything he does not know. He knows how to deliver himself; he is a gentleman; he is not a rowdy; but when he wants to make himself one, you cannot stop him. Nowadays, look at what is happening! He does not come over here to anybody; he is not prepared to say one word to the Leader of the Opposition which means that they are crossing swords politically as two men, but in this Chamber the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition must work together. The Hon. Leader of the House should go to the Leader of the Opposition in his capacity as Leader of the House and vice versa. It would mean that they are talking good together or want to be in one another's bedroom, drawing room or anywhere else. As the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said, we are all doing the people's business when we come here and should live like brothers. If the Hon. member feels that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition does not feel good in mind about him, or the Hon. Leader of the Opposition feels that the Hon. Leader of the House does not, that is something different. If he does not want to talk to the Leader of the Opposition, he can come to me. I can talk with anybody, and myself and the Leader of the House are good friends. If we go outside now I would say "hello Cammie" and he would say "hello Lloyd", and I will tell you that if he had a good word for me he will say it, and if I have a good word to say for him, I will.

11.35 a.m.

You must respect the Opposition; the Opposition is to be respected. We are all members of this Honourable Chamber. The members of the Government did not come in here in an aeroplane or a Rolls Royce and we on a stretcher. They did not land and come in here; we all came in by having to go and beg for votes. We all had to do that in order to get in here. The people sent us here, and therefore why do you want to get on the high horse and look on us as if we have leprosy? It was last year that the Hon. Prime Minister said that he is only recognising one Party in here. That means that he had no use for my little three-man Party. He was not seeing a pin-point more. He thought that we would not have been able to get back in here; he had one who thought like King Ja-Ja; he thought that he was indispensable, but the people of St. Peter knocked him to smithereens; he had gone through the eddoes. You cannot be too high; the electorate of this country will listen and plan and wait for you and they will give it to you when the time comes. That is what will happen.

I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to change that attitude. Yesterday water did not come from my eyes in appealing to him for a later hour today. He would not do it. We are going to get opportunities too; a sleeping dog is not a dead dog. I may tell you Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. member should do his duty as he should. You should see how I had to break the speak limit so as to get here. The hour of nine o'clock was too early for business men because I have to go around and pick up a little berry. Some people's berry trees are always bearing, but I have to look around and wait until the berry turns. I have to pick it while it is green.

The hon. member ended his speech by saying that His Honour the Speaker did not give a Ruling, that he only invited him to say whether he is willing to withdraw the remark. I cannot understand the use of this word "invite". Did the Speaker invite him down St. James? The hon. member took a mean advantage of that gentleman yesterday; the only person who would not look at the Speaker differently is himself. We have elected the Speaker, and do you think that we would elect a nincompoop to that Chair if we knew that? We might do it if we did not know. We would not have voted

for him at all if we knew that he was a nincompoop. The hon. member is always saying "You". I know that you speak to little children and address them as "You". I say it is uncouth to do that. If I did not know that you could fill that Chair as Deputy Speaker, your humble servant would not have to say "Ayes". You would have to stick me with a grabber for me to say so. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy said that only a few weeks ago we elected the Speaker here. The hon. member has used the words "rank hypocrisy" and do you know that those two words can cause a man's life to be taken? In the law Courts sometimes one word causes a man's life. You have the case ready, you call in the last witness and he throws away the case.

The hon. member may feel that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was making a hypocritical speech, but it was not to be said in here. The hon. member said: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you". The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is such a hypocrite that the hon. member would be more than a hypocrite to withdraw those words! That is plain; anybody can understand that. I am not a lawyer, but none of them can throw me away; you would have to show me the ball which struck Nelson. The hon. member might even have said: "Your Honour, would you mind asking the Clerk to tell me what I have to withdraw? I do not recollect that I said anything unparliamentary." But the hon. member knew what he was doing. He said: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." The hon. member felt that the Speaker was wrong; now he is doing some of everything. He went back to the year 1938 to history; he went back yesterday to all he knew that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did, but a thousand wrongs do not make one right. All of those things could not answer for what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." 11.45 a.m.

One thousand wrongs cannot make one right. All that the Hon. Leader of the House brought up yesterday about what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did when he was in this House does not erase those few words: "I myself would be guilty of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you."

The hon. Leader of the House referred the House back to all that time in the past that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was in the House so as to put his case. He went back to the time when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was first a member of this House and all that he did in Parliament he brought up; but that still does not right a wrong. That still does not make me to feel that the Speaker was right at the time when he did not bring down the hammer on the Leader of the House. The strength of a chain is its weakest link. That is so because if a chain had two links and one link broke, every thing would go wrong.

Everything which is referred to in this amendment still does not eradicate what happened on the 15th December, 1966. It is argument that the Speaker make a slip by not doing his duty because in my opinion he did not want his colleague, a member of his Party, to feel that he was in the wrong. That is what happened to the Speaker. The Good Book says that the soul that sinneth must die. The question is, who sinned? Who must die? But in this case it would be no dying because the strength and might are over on the other side to save him. I may say that might cannot triumph forever, but in this case might must triumph over right. They have everything. The majority vote must be carried, but the time will come; and I am sure after this Resolution is disposed with, His Honour the Speaker is going to see to it that nobody gets away with anything like this again. I am sure that everyone of us would have to cross our "t's" and dot our "i's". An old lady once said that there is never a bad happening.

Sir, I am sure that this motion would be carried. It is not that we want to run the Speaker out of the Chair. If tomorrow I had to cast a vote for two people in this House, there are certain people who would expect me to vote for them, but I would have to vote for the Speaker. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition would tell you that he has nothing against the Speaker and his ability, but it is that the Speaker must not let any hon. member get away when he is wrong.

This may have happened during the last session, but it must not happen this session.

Sir, we can only put our case to this House. The Hon. and Learned Speaker knows only too well that everything was not well on the 15th December, last. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy might have got up on the high horse and lost his temper. I do not think when one kills another that he was really within himself. You have to be out of your mind at that particular moment. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy should have got up and bowed to the Chair because some hon. members on that side, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even you yourself must have been one of those hon. members who told him to withdraw. He was told that he should withdraw, but he knew he had a lenient Speaker. If he had someone in the Chair like Mr. Carmichael, it would not have happened. Knowing he has a lenient Speaker, he felt that he could get away with it.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows his stuff. He may be getting old. I do not know why he does not go back into the law courts and show them that he still knows his stuff. I know that he can show them what to do. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have nothing more to say on this matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened with great interest to all the speeches made over the last ten hours and I had no intention of speaking at length or at all; but as I sat and listened to this unusual debate, I thought that it is just as well that I should participate in this debate lest it be thought in certain quarters that I was incompetent of making a contribution.
11.55 a.m.

Now the Speaker, eminent lawyer, Parliamentarian and Queen's Counsel as he is, is today being denied by virtue of Parliamentary practice and procedure the opportunity to rise here and speak in his own defence. Being a close friend and close Parliamentarian of His Honour the Speaker - I knew him from the days of Harrison College where we sat side by side in the Fifth and Sixth Forms - I could not sit here and allow rambling misstatements and scurrilous remarks to be made about the conduct, behaviour and ability of a man whose ability, conduct, upbringing, background training and education far surpass that of anyone around here with the exception of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Prime Minister, the Hon. Leader of the House and, of course, some of the barristers on the other side.

Many members, Mr. Deputy Speaker have made a lot of rambling speeches which were unconnected with the matter, but I do not enjoy or ever attempt speaking that way. I try to marshal my facts and set them in sequence. But be that as it may, everyone has been elected here on a similar footing, and each of us has a right to represent the Island as a whole. So far as His Honour the Speaker is concerned, owing to Parliamentary conventions, practice and procedure, and etiquette, he cannot be found stating his case today and the Hon. Leader of the House has done on his own behalf. He has defended himself and has attempted defending His Honour the Speaker; but if His Honour had the opportunity of defending himself, he would probably have been able to do it more ably and effectively than any of us who sit in the Government.

I am not here, Sir, to question the Ruling of the Speaker or Deputy Speaker. I am not here to say whether the amendment which we have before the House is relevant or not to the Resolution which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because that has been ruled upon on two occasions by yourself, Sir, and it has to be accepted as a proper amendment duly drafted. When His Honour the Deputy Speaker makes a Ruling, there is no question of doubt as to whether it is a Ruling or not; all and sundry are satisfied that a Ruling has been made and has to be carried out. This is no aspersion on the Speaker; but to come to the point, I had better say here and now that His Honour the Speaker is being charged with allegedly reversing a Ruling in the body of the Resolution moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Unless he had deliberately reversed a Ruling as such, the whole subject matter of

this Resolution falls apart. I am not a barrister, but I belong to a family of barristers, and I can say that unless he reversed a Ruling, the substance of this Resolution falls to pieces, and I am going to prove it here now.

I will start from the beginning and build up my case and present it forcibly. I am dealing with the question of the Ruling, because it is on that that everything hangs. The second part of the Resolution reads as follows:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House considers that His Honour in reversing a ruling which he had given with respect to language used by the Leader of the House with the result of freeing him from the punishment which the Standing Orders provided for a member guilty of gross disorderly conduct or of disregarding the authority of the Chair was himself guilty of conduct unbecoming the dignity of the Chair and is deserving of the gravest possible censure."

Now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said there are two Resolutions, but I have been trained in the law, and I say that there is one Resolution before us with two paragraphs. Anyhow, the whole body of this Resolution hinges on the question of whether His Honour the Speaker had been found reversing a decision as such and is thereby guilty of misconduct as Speaker, of not being impartial, of being biased and taking one side, and trying to defend the Hon. Leader of the House, his colleague in St. Lucy. Now let us go through what actually transpired. It is strictly necessary in my view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this record must be set right, and the words in the Resolution must be viewed in the proper perspective. We have to examine the Resolution as moved by the Leader of the Opposition and take every word in its proper perspective. I am no schoolmaster, but let us take the first part of the Resolution which says: "Be it Resolved that the House deplores the conduct of His Honour the speaker in accepting, without reproach,....." Even that is not strictly correct. I must compliment the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who spoke just now, because he seems to be as astute a lawyer as many lawyers. He has read only a part and left out the material part. He has all the law tricks; I do not know if he practises some at District "F". The hon. senior member for St. Joseph reading from the *Official Gazette* quoted as follows:

"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..."

But the hon. senior member for St. Joseph left out the words "and to which, I gather, exception is being taken."
12.05 p.m.

In other words, exception is being taken to those words, but the hon. senior member for St. Joseph chose to leave out those words for some reason or other, being a very astute politician and parliamentarian. Now it is alleged that the Speaker "in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December, 15th, 1966, he not only disobeyed a Ruling by Mr. Speaker that he should withdraw words that he had spoken and to which objection had been taken but added to his refusal to do so language completely destructive of parliamentary order and respect for the Chair", committed an offence.

What actually happened was that the Hon. Leader of the House made use of certain remarks, but I am not here to uphold or defend or to find very much favoured language, but the fact is that the words were deemed to be parliamentary and I am not here to say anything about that. It is a fact that in the debate the Hon. Leader of the House said this:-

"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 remarks 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."

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and said: "I object to that. A former Minister of that Government...."

A long time might have intervened between the words objected to and anything being said, but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition promptly objected to the use of those words which he deemed to be unparliamentary. That is the first observation which really does not mean much; it does not weight very heavily. We have to be very careful as to how we draft these Resolutions. This Resolution says this:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December, 15, 1966, he not only disobeyed a ruling"

Let us stop there. It is well known that by virtue of His Honour's background, training and culture, he uses very sedate and choice language and his language is always of a high, parliamentary standard; but let us not be mistaken that when the Speaker referred to the Speech, he asked the Hon. Leader of the House if he is "disposed to withdraw the words 'rank hypocrisy' to which, I gather, exception is being taken". That is not a Ruling. He asked the Hon. Leader of the House if he is disposed to withdraw the words. The word "disposed" has this meaning: I ask you if you are disposed to go to the sea tomorrow. I am asking you to elect if you would join me in going to the sea or not. You have the right to elect and therefore that is not a Ruling. If I care to ask you if you want to go to the sea or not, you have the right to exercise, or a right to be exercised, of your own free volition. Later on His Honour the Speaker ruled, which is an entirely different thing. To say that His Honour the Speaker reversed his Ruling is not a statement of fact; it is an absolute, gross misstatement of fact. If you are censuring the Speaker and holding him up to the entire world as a nit-wit and a nincompoop - he has served as Speaker and Leader of the Opposition for years and also as Deputy Speaker and an eminent lawyer for the past thirty odd years - you have to realise that doing something like this is something which some young politicians might look like a joke. That affects a man's practice outside and cuts it in two.

I take it that this is a serious thing which has perilous chances. You are holding the Speaker up to ridicule, that he makes a decision now and in a few minutes he reverses it. He has not done any such thing. Anyone who says that is not interpreting correctly what has happened and what is written here. I think I have cut this thing to pieces and the length of a speech may not be any contribution, but will cause us to forget the main points which were used. I could speak for an hour on this, but that may not serve any useful purpose. When we have dealt with the Resolution, let us sit down and at least reconcile ourselves. I am not here to throw mud or to do any mudslinging with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I do not say that I agree with his being called a rank hypocrite; I would not say that. That is my private opinion for whatever it is worth. Whether the statement used is "rank hypocrisy" or "the man is a hypocrite that means one thing, but the Ruling of the Speaker stands,

To say that His Honour the Speaker has reversed his decision is entirely and radically wrong. The Speaker did not reverse his decision; he made one Ruling and one Ruling alone. For you to set out that the Speaker has reversed his Ruling and taken the side of the Hon. Leader of the House and defended him and prevented him from being governed by the Standing Orders of the House, that is absolutely incorrect.
12.15 p.m.

Now, His Honour the Speaker before he made his Ruling said:

"I have had the advantage of referring to all available authorities and have considered the exact words as taken down by the Official Reporter. 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'."

I do not think that that could be termed unparliamentary in the way that it was used. That is how I feel about it, although I do not agree with that statement: "rank hypocrisy".

The Speaker said further:

"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."

His Honour the Speaker said that those words which were used were not used by one member to another. Then he went on to say in the context that they were not unparliamentary. That is the Ruling by the Speaker.

You might give a Ruling which I do not entirely agree with. It is for that reason I have not spoken yet today. If I have a contribution to make, I make it; but if I do not have a contribution to make, I prefer to sit and listen. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I feel that for a person who is learned and well trained, that is no contribution to parliamentary debates. We have to try and gain the respect of the House and the Speaker, and unless we do that, we would not be doing anything to help Barbados. I have been properly trained and I would not be a party to hooliganism. When you come to this Honourable Chamber, the days of election campaigning are over. Let us sit down and work in a constructive manner and do something lasting and good for the ones who sent us here. Let us make some sort of concrete contribution to the debates of this Chamber, and let us exemplify some sort of respect at all times and have some respect for His Honour the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, the staff and all members of this House.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have a long speech to make on the question of the amendment. I regret that I did not hear the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. I had the opportunity of hearing the contribution of the hon. junior member for Christ Church who has just sat down who said that when he has a contribution to make he makes it, but when he had no contribution to make he sits down and listen. Certainly, his speech bristles with facts. Especially was this so when he gave us his views of the words which were spoken by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

The hon. member felt that the Official Report was correct in every detail, but it can be disputed. It is inconsistent in many parts. I would just draw the attention of the hon. junior member for Christ Church to the following passage on page 10 which was his contribution. This is how it appears:

"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."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation, I really did not say so. I said that the people of Christ Church would be glad to know that I have got an increase in salary because when I go around, they would be able to get a bigger drink out of it. I did not say at election time.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, that is exactly my point. I drew attention to the Official Reporter of the contribution by the hon. junior member for Christ Church who said that that is not what he said, and yet the hon. member is relying upon the correctness of the report on page 19.

Many hon. members would remember that what the hon. member rose to explain was what transpired. However, many people would read that the hon. junior member for Christ Church in his speech said that they would be glad to know "that I get money to give them a bigger drink at election time". In exactly the same way some people in the future and hon. members may read what the Official Report has said concerning this matter. For example, it is reported that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said: "I would be guilty myself of rank hypocrisy if I obeyed you." We know that was not precisely what was read out at the time. The Official Report is not accurate in my view. We would not be justified in saying that it is exactly correct.

Speaking on the amendment which is before us, members of the Opposition regret that we are not in a position to vote for this amendment because we are not satisfied with Your Honour's Ruling that this amendment is relevant to the motion which was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

12.25 p.m.

It is possible in our view to agree with the amendment and agree with the motion as well, because when this amendment is passed - not being a hostile amendment, not containing necessarily within its terms a fraction of the original motion - the original motion will still have been left undecided by this Honourable House. All that this House would have decided would be in fact not to take a decision on the actual charges made in the motion; and if the Mover of the amendment had realised this, perhaps he would not have put the amendment over in these terms, because where are we who moved the motion? The amendment does not say that His Honour was not guilty on the 15th December of the charges made against him. The amendment does not say that the House does not deplore the conduct of His Honour the Speaker; the amendment does not say that this House does not consider that His Honour the Speaker reversed a Ruling. If the motion as amended is carried, the original spirit of the motion will still have been left in mid-air, and His Honour will be in no different position than he was before, and that is why I intend to vote against the amendment, and I am urging hon. members to bear that in mind.

There is nothing in the amendment with which, speaking for myself, I can disagree. It contains a very full and adequate summing up of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy's career in this Honourable House, all this to be put on parchment; but it does not say anything about the charges which we are making and on which we are seeking a decision by this Honourable House; so if we vote for the amendment, and if the amendment is carried, the original charges will merely be dismissed into the limbo of neither won or lost cases, because no decision would have been given by this Honourable House. If that is the intention of the Movers of the amendment, let them say so. I understand from the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the hon. junior member for Christ Church that whatever the whips of Party dictate, the whips of conscience dictate to them that the Ruling as far as the expression was concerned was one which could not stand up to close analysis. It may well be that members on the other side responsible for moving the amendment do not wish a decision to be taken on the motion as such, and the spirit of the motion remains; it may well be that this is an oblique way of denigrating the Speaker, that this is a complete way of protecting the Speaker from having an outright decision as to whether or not on December he behaved improperly. It may well be that somewhere in the subterranean minds of some hon. mem-

bers opposite something has been thought up by which the appearance of confidence in the Speaker will have been given, but not in reality; but from our point of view, the Resolution discusses the event of December 15, while the amendment discusses the events of 26th January, 1937, the year 1961, the thirty-year period since 1937, and the month of November 1966. Those are the dates referred to in the amendment. For that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot find it possible to vote for the amendment, no matter how much I might agree with the sentiments expressed therein.

One last point. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has referred to a few scurrilous remarks made about His Honour the Speaker. I for my part have not heard them. Perhaps during my absence from the House other members made these scurrilous remarks, but as far as I am concerned, I made my speech on the main motion clear, because I was deeply conscious of the effect of a vote of censure, and deeply conscious of the responsibility of the Opposition not to put it forward lightly, and the responsibility of any member not lightly to support a vote of censure on the Speaker. And I would regret if anything that has been said has given the hon. junior member for Christ Church the impression that this motion was brought forward to be supported frivolously or without regard to its true import and importance in this Honourable House. As far as I am concerned, it was with deep thought that my support was given to this motion, and I spoke in support of it when the motion was before the House. The amendment has given us nothing about the terms of the Resolution other than that I see nothing there with which any hon. member could disagree. My only regret is that it has been put forward at this time to obscure the true issue before the House. I will not cast any doubt whatsoever on the motives of the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. Nevertheless we may yet consider that in or outside this Honourable House this matter should have been given perhaps greater thought before the amendment was put forward in this way, at this time, in this debate and in this atmosphere.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this would perhaps be a convenient time for us to take the suspension.

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

The question that this Sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

12.35 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sitting of the House was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas had just completed his address.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I happen to suffer from the advantage of not being present on the 15th December, 1966, when the incident which is now the subject of such vociferous and ill-felt complaint on behalf of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his scattered army of discontents took place in this Chamber. I say I suffer from the advantage because, as Leader of the Government, it is not incumbent upon me to sit through the proceedings in this Chamber and listen to the diatribe, the vituperation and vicious attempts made upon the integrity of the Government and its members, which are more fitting for the political platforms during such time as they are seeking the support of the Electorate than in a Chamber of this kind. I understand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made an attack on the scholastic attainments and integrity

of the Officers of this House, and the hon. senior member for the parish of Christ Church - I heard this myself - made an attack on the veracity of the record which I have before me and suggested that it has been added to and doctored up. I have put this in the record because asides are not normally reported. Before entering upon the subject matter of this motion, I would like to assure the hon. senior member for Christ Church that he is not aware of the intricacies of parliamentary procedure in this Chamber. I intend to appoint a special Committee to go into the allegations which the hon. senior member for Christ Church has made to the effect that the records of this House has been tampered with (*Cheers*). (A MEMBER: We welcome that.) I have carefully checked with all the Officers who have been involved in the reporting and printing of these Debates, and I am satisfied that there is not a single officer of this House who has been guilty of any aspersions of this kind. It was, however, my experience in the sixteen years since I have been in here that a former Minister took away the transcript of the Debates so that up to now - I am talking about this year of grace 1967 - the general public of Barbados and the representatives in this Chamber and the official archives have not been vouchsafed the debates of 1957-58 because they were taken away by a member of the party on the other side. There is no record of debates here in this House available for anyone who would like to check things like the occasion when the late Speaker - I do not mean "late" in the sense of "lamented" or "departed" but he is no longer with us in this House - the then hon. junior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins, had occasion to be the mover of a Resolution on behalf of the Leader of the Party who is now setting himself up as this paragon of parliamentary rectitude. The hon. member holds an exalted opinion of himself, and he is now trying to re-establish the position before the Federation of the West Indies was wrecked by the intemperate attitude of the Leader of that Federation towards his brethren outside - he and his offspring who are pushing him relentlessly to a timely end. They are pushing him to the limit of his physical and mental endurance, and we have the spectacle of this defender of the faith, this upholder of Parliamentary tradition, this tradition on that side of knowing what he was talking about because he was named by Mr. Douglas Pile in 1938 for refusing to obey not only the ruling of the Chair but for refusing even to listen to the blandishments of the persons whom he always attacked, who besought and implored him to withdraw certain remarks and had the House adjourned for half an hour in order to give him an opportunity to display that parliamentary rectitude which he is now complaining of. 2.40 p.m.

"A reckless misstatement is a lie whether you call it so or not, and the Rules say, 'No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.'"

The hon. member is saying that the records of this House were tampered with. According to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, this was not the statement made against another member of this House. Fortunately I was here, so I do not have to depend on second hand information which was passed down to me.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I did not say that that was a remark made by any member of this Chamber. I said that the only information which I had was from the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who said that the Hon. Prime Minister was not here. He should listen and not report from hearsay.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member may not have been aware of that because I was not in my place. I am not talking from any remarks handed down to me. If you heard the specious remarks which were made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas when he said that the only information which he had was from the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I would only say that I do not know if he were born in this age; I do not care whether he was born. It would be a matter of great rejoicing to the people of this country if he never were born because we never would have had the affliction that the father imposed on the people of this island and whose words the hon. senior member for St. Thomas

could not take the trouble to read in the *Official Report* which I have before me. He does not care to read the records of his own ancestor.

On that occasion, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said about the gentleman whom we know as Mr. Charlie Elder who was a member for St. George:

"On the last occasion when this matter was before the House I moved a counter Address. I am not going to do that today. I am actually going to vote for this Address as it is because to my mind it gives the Secretary of State the assurance that he was perfectly right in what he did. That is, the terms of this Address prove it."

I pause here to read that part of the Report of January 18th, 1938.

I would not ask my colleague, the Hon. Leader of the House, what happened on that occasion. I depend upon the records of this House of the 15th December, 1966. That was printed to save the time of this Honourable House. I can only treat this Resolution with the contempt that the author or the authors deserve.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I object to that. I ask that the hon. member withdraw that remark.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that until the record proves to be wrong that I am going to treat this Resolution or the author or authors with the contempt which they deserve. To that, I will add this reservation, the subjective attitude which I have for all the people on the other side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not consider that expression to be unparliamentary.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, you well know that members of the Opposition do not regard themselves as Barbadians or themselves as Parliamentarians. They come to this Chamber without any programme; and if anyone in this Chamber were so misguided as to think that the real purpose of this Resolution is to move a Vote of Censure on the Chair, then they can only refer to the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which are inconsistent with the terms of the Resolution that I have read before the House on this occasion.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about his long experience in Parliament and how he never had to bring in a Resolution to castigate a Speaker. In truth and fact, he is not consistent.

I have in my hand the Legislative Debates of 1938 and admonish the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to take it as a Bible and read it sometimes. If he turns to page 742, he would see how dishonourable were his remarks to the then junior member for St. Peter.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said:

"That part of the Address should be modified, and the words used by the senior member for St. George should be added, namely, 'the propertied class and all persons capable of thinking.' This would show the Secretary of State the nature of the objections, and the nature of those who were in opposition to his recommendation.

"I have great praise to give to the hon. mover of this address for the pertinacity with which he has pursued his way of thinking, and even sometimes for the language he has used, because if this were not a parliamentary body I would perhaps use the little word 'lie' or certainly 'reckless misstatement' as regards the last sentence with which I was dealing."

Unfortunately for Barbados, these are historical cases. 2.50 p.m.

Now they have a Minister of Propaganda on the other side. Is the Minister of propaganda for Christ Church going to say that the record which has been unchallenged for a

period of twenty-nine years is an incorrect statement of what took place on that occasion when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was named? I shall go on, Mr. Speaker then without intervention - this is very significant now - Mr. Deputy Speaker - on the part of any one of the twenty-four members or as many as were present sitting around the Table at that time, as a Speaker, not by a political act of instigation by someone who is out to destroy the Government of the country, without any hiatus or any pause, immediately said:

"The hon. member cannot make a remark like that. He said, 'If this were not a parliamentary body he would use the word 'lie' or 'reckless misstatement'. I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark at once."

Now let us see what the champion of democracy, the defender of parliamentary institutions, did on that occasion, and see wherein lies hypocrisy.

"Mr. ADAMS: I say it was a reckless misstatement."

This is how he answers the Speaker. The Speaker asked him to withdraw at once; but intemperate, unbridled and insolent, what did he do? He did not say he did not think that it was an unparliamentary remark, I refer to his conduct then; I am not referring to his conduct now.

"Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member to withdraw the remark which he made in saying that the hon. member for St. George was guilty of a lie."

This is Mr. G. D. L. Pile who has been called to the Great Beyond. Are they going to challenge the record now that Mr. Pile is not here to say that the record is incorrect twenty-nine years after it has been the subject of many a debate in this Chamber? For the sixteen years I have been in here they certainly did not refer to it, but only now we have the neophytes from St. James and St. Thomas who are trying to upset the whole course of history trying to reverse the record. They want to start writing history as if the history of creation started by the advent of the parliamentary scene. In 1938 the Speaker told the hon. member:

"I have asked the hon. member to withdraw the remark which he made in saying that the hon. member for St. George was guilty of a lie. That is the effect of what the hon. member said, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark."

"Mr. ADAMS: With great respect to Your Honour, if you say the use of my phrase was equivalent to saying that the hon. member for St. George told a lie I will withdraw that word, but I was not speaking of the hon. member for St. George. I was speaking of that statement, and I am suggesting that I am perfectly right in using the words 'reckless misstatement' instead of that word."

I understand that the hon. senior member for Christ Church today spoke of gross misrepresentation; so I do not want to make any further reference to that, but I am merely drawing the analogy.

"Anyone who can say that an overwhelming majority of educated and responsible people of this island were drawn together in protest against it is making a reckless misstatement."

"Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must remember that this occurs in the Address in answer to the Governor's message. I took it that the hon. member was referring to the hon. member for St. George, because just before that he had been speaking of the hon. member. The hon. member now says that he was referring to the wording of the Address."

"Mr. ADAMS: I was referring to the last sentence."

"Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member accused members of this House that when they drew up an Address in an important matter like this they were guilty of making

"a reckless misstatement. That is a remark which I cannot allow."

Will you notice one significant thing, if I may pause here? It is this; that this is a running dialogue going on between Mr. G. D. L. Pile, the Speaker, and who, I believe, was the hon. junior member for St. John at the time, and the member for St. Joseph, Mr. Adams. There had been no prompting, no instigation by any one of the members of the house; but this was a direct appeal being made by the Speaker without intervention, without malice on the part of any individual member, but a direct attempt by the Chair to exercise its customary authority which we all respect. What did the upholder of parliamentary traditions do on that occasion? I am not for one moment attempting to say that two wrongs make a right, but there is only one wrong in this case, and the wrong is all over on the other side; the malice is all over on the other side; all the malevolence is over there that you can hope to find in the Commonwealth of Nations. And he went on:

"Mr. ADAMS: I am not referring to what hon. members did in Committee. I may say this, that at no time were any people drawn together in protest against the amendment. Further, who is to say who are the educated and responsible people in this colony, when did they meet to protest, how and where?"

"Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member withdraw or not withdraw his statement that the hon. members who drew up this Address were guilty of a reckless misstatement?"

This is now the fourth time. Even Peter only had to listen to the cock crow three times.

"Mr. ADAMS: With great respect I do not withdraw it."

"Mr. SPEAKER: I shall have to name the hon. member if he does not withdraw it. Will the hon. member once more refuse to withdraw that statement?"

"Mr. ADAMS: I am prepared to prove that it is a reckless misstatement. It cannot be defended."

I never heard or read anywhere in the debate that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said that he was prepared to prove that the hon. member was a hypocrite. He may be in a position to prove it or he may not be in a position to prove it; but that is not for me to go into at this moment. If I made a remark about the hon. member I would be in a position to prove it as I can prove from the record everything I say here today, and I do not have to be a lawyer to do that. All you have to do is to be able to do research, to study people, study their actions and their protestations, and you will be able to prove a lot of things that escape the organs of public institutions in this Island.
3.00 p.m.

I will go on, Mr. Speaker said: "It is not what the hon. member is prepared to prove or not prepared to prove. He must not make statements like that about members of this House. It is against the Rules of Debate in this House to make a statement reflecting on the character of Members of the House."

"Mr. ADAMS: The literal interpretation of that is this. If I saw a member commit murder, am I then because of the rule, prohibited from saying he is a murderer?"

This is the kind of legal artistry which has now passed into disuse Courts of the Commonwealth. It is no longer tolerated by Judges today, and their machinations surely betrayed their skill as malcontents and miscreants that they were before. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker went on to say this: "The hon. member cannot make a statement reflecting against the character of members of the House, and I must again ask the hon. member to withdraw it."

This is now the sixth time. I understand that it was said during the course of this debate that the Speaker was vacillating that he did not call on the hon. member to withdraw

the remarks. The complaint is that the Speaker failed to call upon an hon. member to withdraw the remarks. If the Speaker failed to call upon an hon. member to withdraw remarks, how can you castigate an hon. member saying that he is out of order and the Speaker did not consider that the remarks were such as to make the hon. member withdraw them? We should not be here holding a *post mortem* on the ruling of the Chair because there are people who are pretending that they are upholders of parliamentary democracy, and by the same act they are attempting to subvert and overthrow the very institutions themselves. That is the object of this debate. This debate is not inspired by any motive to get His Honour the Speaker on the right path. The Speaker has been in here for thirty odd years. According to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, this is an attempt to get the Speaker disciplined and get him on the right path and to make sure that parliamentary traditions are not subverted. That is not the actual language. His language might be more acrimonious and less solicitous than mine. The truth is that shortly after we attained our independence, there were those who said that we cannot maintain independence. They have not succeeded in carrying out their felonious intentions, and now they want to say that we do not even have a Parliament which can run the affairs of the country. If there was any way in which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph could run up to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and begin to attack the Barbados Independence, he would be the first person up there. As soon as any two members of this House start a disagreement, he would have started with his cap in his hand, with the Mottley bowler hat and he would borrow the Mottley Derby and the Marshal's swizzle tail coat and he would run up to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and say: "Look what has happened in the House of Assembly now; we have not even got a proper Speaker! His Honour the Speaker has been in this House for a longer period than most of us. We always take pride in a position of authority; but there is a new doctrine being promulgated in this country that you must destroy the self-confidence of the people and you must undermine the institutions which they have established. Mr. Deputy Speaker, their actions betray them. You must forgive me as a Barbadian and Parliamentarian, someone who considers himself to be a proud son, as it was said in the case of no less a person than the New Zealand Ambassador that we are proud sons of defiant states."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not at any time connive at the kind of undermining of the institutions of this country under the guise that you are trying to be the symbol of rectitude, but I have witnessed the intention in this country for the past two or three years ever since we have had unemployed politicians in this Island. I was born in this country and I know no other country, despite what they say about my birth in the Virgin Islands. I was born in this Island and I owe no allegiance to anybody which transcends the allegiance which I owe to the people of this country, the place of my birth. I will examine with a certain amount of care anything which may be even deemed to be undermining the institutions to which we look up. I want to tell the people on the other side this: when they have finished tearing down this country, who will build it back up for them? The people who underwrite their affairs will be the first ones who will be swept away in the kind of ogrom which will be instituted by those on the other side, and they are wasting their money. When they underwrite this kind of action, I would like to warn them that they are going to pay people to tear down these buildings and they will be pulling down the Houses which they have built over their heads. They are the very people who will wipe them off the slate.
3.10 p.m.

This is a warning which I want to issue solemnly. We have a lot of worthless people who go around saying that they should resurrect people who have an unenviable record of destruction and inexcusable potential for wrongdoing. Perhaps, I should return to the record of the 18th January, 1938. I have just enumerated the sixth occasion on which Mr. Pile called on the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the remarks.

Then the Speaker said:-

"I shall have to name the hon. member if he does not withdraw it. Will the hon. member once more refuse to withdraw that statement?"

Then the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said:-

"I am prepared to prove that it is a reckless misstatement. It cannot be defended."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you talk about vacillation, it was at this time that there was an amount of vacillation between the hon. member and the Speaker. For the sixth time the member was given a warning. I do not know if it is the sixth time because it is difficult to find from his speeches. But let us suppose so.

Nowhere in this debate you will find that any hon. member on this side interjected in remarks charging the Speaker to do anything against the Rules.

At this stage Mr. Pile appealed and called on the hon. member to withdraw for the seventh time. The Speaker ruled that he should withdraw and asked him to withdraw. He used the same words twice. That is in the record.

Mr. Speaker then implored him to withdraw:

"I do not think the hon. member quite realises that what he calls a reckless misstatement occurs in an Address drawn up by members of this House, appointed in a Select Committee. I say that he has been saying that members of this House are guilty of a reckless misstatement, and I cannot allow the hon. member to make that imputation against hon. members."

I wonder, if the hon. senior member for St. Thomas had taken trouble to read the debates whether he would have the effrontery to say that the remarks made on the floor of this House by the Hon. Leader of the House are the same as his predecessor made when he said that they were made against the propertied classes and not against a member of the House.

Fortunately, they have not burnt all the records and, therefore, he should check to see if there are records left, quite apart from the ones which they have not allowed to be printed. I say that because the 1957 debates have not been printed.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph then said in reply to the Speaker:-

"I would be saying something contrary to my conscience and untrue to myself if, looking at that statement, I withdraw the words I used."

This is on page 743.

The Speaker then said these words:-

"I am not asking the hon. member to say that he does not think that hon. members are guilty of making a reckless misstatement. I am asking him to withdraw it because it is against the Rules of this House and against the Rules of any Legislative Assembly to make a statement reflecting on the personal character of members."

To this the hon. member replied:-

"To impute corrupt or dishonest motives."

The Speaker then said:

"I have tried my best to point out to the hon. member what the point is. If he is not prepared to withdraw, I shall have to name him."

This is now the ninth time. The then Speaker then named the hon. member.

The object of parliamentary debate is not to score points or to try to humiliate any hon. member, but to try

to give opposition to people in the most positive manner. Hon. members on the other side should realise the better contribution they would be able to make towards the controlling of the Government of this country, even taking consideration of the distance they are away from it. This is what I want to advise them. Therefore, the hon. member was intemperate and malicious.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I rise on a point of order. This is the sixth time that the hon. member has used unparliamentary expressions - I do not know whether he would withdraw - but I object now. According to "May's" the word "malicious" is unparliamentary. I do not object to the others now because I should have objected at the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the 16th Edition?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have been in here for sixteen years with one break during that period.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have asked you to rule that the remark "malicious" is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the hon. member spoke I asked him if he referred to the 16th Edition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have here before me a series of unparliamentary remarks and when somebody says that somebody is malicious that is unparliamentary.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am making a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member please sit?

I do not consider "intemperate and malicious" to be unparliamentary.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I copied down the words after they were used.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is appealing to you. He is out of order. He has no right to get up again.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It looks as if we would have to endure this session, not in the economic construction of Barbados, but in challenging the rulings of the Chair.

Anyhow, I go on.
3.20 p.m.

I hope that that is not the fate of the people of Barbados. Anyhow if I may go on, Sir, on page 743, right hand column, Mr. Speaker said:

"I have tried my best to point out to the hon. member 'what the point is. If he is not prepared to withdraw I shall 'have to name him.'"

Not the vacillation again, Sir. This is now four columns of debate taken up with this point between two persons, the member for St. Joseph and the Speaker. No one else interjected, or protracted or prolonged the debate, and even then Mr. Pile waited for some considerable time, because the record says "After a pause". The Speaker, Mr. G.D.L. Pile then said: "I name the hon. member."

Look at this and see how recalcitrant and incorrigible the person who is professing to be the upholder of parliamentary rules and procedure was on that occasion, because the person whom he elects to describe as the greatest enemy becomes the interceder and said at that stage: "Although it is my unpleasant duty to have to make the 'motion, I hope that I will be able to make the hon. member 'himself appreciate just how he has offended the Rules.'"

At this stage he should have withdrawn his services from this Chamber for good. All I have recited is to demon-

strate that it is not the duty of a Speaker, even if unparliamentary language had been used, which we do not admit and which we vehemently deny, to see how many people he can make withdraw remarks to maintain the equilibrium of the debate - which should be the hallmark of all proceedings. The Speaker is not there to see how many people he can exercise his authority over. He is there to exercise a certain amount of sanity and equilibrium during the course of the proceedings over which he presides. Any Speaker who does not have that as his characteristic would be likely to be dragooned into a situation which he may subsequently regret and which may have far-reaching repercussions. I am not here, Sir, to lecture you on the office of Speaker. Learned authors have set out these propositions in a much more lucid manner than I can ever do on my feet in the course of a debate of this kind; but my main reason for quoting from the debate at that time is not to expose the recalcitrance or contempt for parliamentary rulings which up to a few moments ago the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has never abandoned, but to show how the Speaker reacted in a situation in the face of very trying conditions created by the intemperance and lack of respect by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and that despite the fact he was of a different political persuasion from the hon. member, that not only the Speaker, but after the hon. member had been named, the Leader of the House, whom he regards probably next to me as his greatest enemy, tried to make him see where he had offended against the Rules. The hon. member has probably transferred his hostility to the Leader of the House on my left, because he always appears to be hostile against the Leader of the House. As a matter of fact, on one historic occasion in the Federal Parliament when Mr. E. R. L. Ward was the Federal Speaker and gave a Ruling which was not at all congenial to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he referred to the Federal Speaker as a person who came from a second-class parish, - that is on the Report of the Federal Legislature - the parish, as he thought at that time, which the hon. senior for Christ Church is now supposed to represent. Outside of Barbados he is referring to parishes as second class parishes; therefore second class parishes must have second class citizens, and we do not recognise there are any second class citizens outside the ranks of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was at the point of explaining why I found it incumbent upon me to introduce the right orientation to the proceedings which have taken place in here, because long before the Resolution was tabled, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, no doubt prompted by his intemperate off-shoots, elected to commit what I consider a breach of privilege by a harangue in the local press on the Speaker's Ruling. What is the object of that? Why, before you bring in a Resolution here, do you go to the local Press? Because the local Press is not as local as some of us would like to feel it is. This is all in furtherance and pursuance of their objectives - that it must be demonstrated to the outside world that from the Speaker back down, the people of Barbados are not ready to run their own democratic institutions. I say that without contradiction.

I have learned from a very long time ago that, whenever the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does something, never look at what is the obvious and direct objective, but always look behind that to find some circuitous reasoning and ulterior motivations and see what he is driving at. When the hon. member went up to Jamaica and said that the Federal Government would impose retroactive taxation, the action was not to serve notice that there would be retroactive taxation, but to get rid of Mr. Manley.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member just spoke about motives. I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the specific Standing Order uses even the same word "improper motives", and I ask Your Honour to call on the hon. member to withdraw.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What Standing Order is the hon. member referring to? You had better consult one of your stool pigeons and let us know.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I object to the words "stool pigeons" and ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not referred to anybody inside here. May I continue the debate? Sir, what I was merely saying is this: let us.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am asking for Your Honour's ruling. It may help Your Honour.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants me to rule, I did not hear any words.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I invite the hon. member to say the words that he objects to, not a word. Let me hear the words that the hon. member objects to. It would be better to let the hon. senior member for Christ Church stand up and make the objection, as it would save the House's time if he has to tutor the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, is that a point of order?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Of course it is a point of order to save time.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The Rule is on page 25 and it is Standing Order No. 26(7), and as regards my authority, it is page 474 of the Sixteenth edition of May's.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member to repeat the words for me. I did not hear the words complained of.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I with great respect suggest that it is the constant practice to call on the Reporter to give to the Chair the words complained of?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. junior member for St. Joseph please tell me the words of which he complains?
3.30 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am perfectly prepared to do so - I am not using the expression he used about persons who have recently come into the House. The constant practice in the debate is to call on the Speaker to call on the Official Reporter to supply the words. I ask the Reporter to transcribe the words just before I objected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Since the hon. member has not given me the words, I am calling on the hon. senior member for St. John to proceed with his speech.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I ask Your Honour to rule on the other expression "stool pigeon". I cannot question it, I have no intention of questioning anybody's Ruling, however wrong it may be. The hon. member has used the word "ulterior" and I am asking the Official Reporter to supply the whole of the sentence. What are we coming to? You tell me that I have not done something which I have just done?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not give me the words, I say that I cannot rule.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I said it is better to have the Reporter to give you the whole sentence.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member is complaining about the words "stool pigeon" there is nothing unparliamentary in that. The hon. member said "a member and his stool pigeons". That is not unparliamentary.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what they are trying to do here is to transfer the authority from the Chair to the Opposition, and the responsibility for running the Government to that side. It will never happen in my life-time. Mr. E. K. Walcott, the Leader of the House, went on:-

"Mr. Speaker, - although it is my unpleasant duty to 'have to make the motion, I hope that I will be able to 'make the hon. member himself appreciate just how he has 'offended against the Rules. I feel sure that a little reflection on his part must make him feel that if we allow 'ourselves to use words of that nature, we would descend 'to common brawling. It happens, and has happened to me, 'and I have had to withdraw it, and it will happen to any 'man who says something which is unparliamentary....."

It is some twenty-nine years since the hon. member has been in Parliament and he has not got beyond that.

Mr. E. K. Walcott went on to say this:-

"The hon. member excuses himself as many lawyers 'try to excuse themselves in an address to a Jury in a 'Court of Law, by saying, 'if it were not so and so, I would 'say of a person that he was guilty of a lie.' Surely the hon. 'member will realise that the very manner in which he put 'the phrase was tantamount to saying that the hon. member 'was guilty of a lie."

If he wants to bring up anything, let him bring it against Mr. Walcott, not against me. I am just reading the Speech in the Debates of the 18th January, 1938. The debate goes on:-

"Mr. ADAMS: On a point of personal explanation, I have 'withdrawn that.

"Hon. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not know if the hon. member appreciates the effect, I did not understand that he 'had withdrawn it, because he is definitely saying of the 'hon. member that he is a liar, and that he tells lies.

"Mr. SPEAKER: The point which I took up with the hon. 'member is that it was a reckless misstatement.

"Hon. E. K. WALCOTT: 'Or' he said 'otherwise he would 'say it is equivalent to a lie.' Just to withdraw the para-phrasing of his own words does not make it any less an 'offence. I am appealing to the hon. member. I have been 'here twelve years and I have not seen this unpleasant 'episode ever to take place."

The hon. member was breaking records as he is trying to do now in breaking down the House. It has never happened before that a member refused to withdraw remarks after having been implored to do so ten times. Now he accuses His Honour the Speaker of vacillating. His Honour the Speaker did not rule, as the Speaker then ruled, that the remarks were unparliamentary. There is an object of this debate. Let us see if we can find something in the records of the House to assist us. Mr. Walcott went on to say this:

"I will have to make the motion, and I would do so most 'unwillingly."

What is more vacillating than that? Here is a man's political enemy. He told the Secretary of State for the Colonies that he was the enemy of the Secretary of State, Mr. Walcott, after he had asked the hon. member for St. Joseph to withdraw the remarks, was not saying "are you disposed to withdraw the remarks"; he said "these remarks are unparliamentary, and I am asking you to withdraw them." Even then the hon. member was recalcitrant and contumacious. Are those words unparliamentary? Mr. Walcott said he was unwilling to make the motion to put the hon. member out of the House where he never should have been. Mr. Walcott went on to say this:-

"I will have to make the motion, and I would do so 'most unwillingly, but we must maintain our decorum. 'Persons like himself and myself sometimes in a Court of 'Law have to withdraw things that are perfectly right, because they are not in keeping with what the Bench considers proper.
3.40 p.m.m.

"A reckless misstatement is a lie whether you call it 'so or not, and the Rule says, 'No member may use of-

"fensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House." I do appeal to the hon. member. After all, he must realise that if someone else said it of him he would easily see that it was most unbecoming in a Parliamentary Assembly. I shall make the motion, but I hope before any member seconds it the hon. member will see it from that point of view and save what is undoubtedly an unpleasant episode."

I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is very fortunate. Never in his parliamentary career has he been exposed to the kind of malicious undermining as members of this Government are exposed to. There is the accusation of our being guilty of doing the most dastardly things. That is the kind of accusation that the members of my Government have been exposed to during the last six years. The hon. member has been fortunate. Even when his political enemies were at the point of naming him, they called upon him to reason according to his better judgment in asking him to obey the Ruling of the Chair. I wish that I in my rash moments had that kind of wellbeing of members that the hon. member had.

We are warning our political opponents that we are at a state of war against the furtherance of Facism and Nazism and I have heard a lot of talk, Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the past few months of South Africans, Rhodesians, Australians and people like that. I have heard remarks being bandied about trying to arouse people's passions against people from South Africa, Rhodesia and other countries and people of other races and colours. I have heard all that kind of talk.

I am not going to enter into the merits or the demerits of the case for the antagonists or protagonists or anything of that kind. I may say here that I was almost dragged into it. There are a lot of people in South Africa, there are ninety percent of the Europeans in Rhodesia whom I would prefer to sit down in a parliamentary Chamber with than the people of this country. You cannot draw up an indictment against a whole nation. You cannot say because a man comes from Rhodesia that he is worse than some of the people we have to deal with in this country. There are some people in this country who are worse than Dr. Verwoerd. They have had two or three ex-Prime Ministers of Rhodesia who were Europeans in origin who had a greater sense of decency than the people who are sitting in front of me.

I have had the good fortune to be engaged in camping with South Africans on my side. I trusted them and they trusted me and I would entrust my life in the hands of any of them more than I would trust my life in the hands of my neighbours or any of the people sitting opposite me.

I want to say this very seriously right now. A South African has a far greater sense of decency and the rules of parliamentary democracy than the people on the other side. They are less criminal minded. I would rather be court-martialled before I found myself flying in a plane with any of the members on the other side. We have to put this thing in its right perspective. I repeat, South Africans have a greater sense of decency than the Dr. Verwoerd in all his life never spoke against the population of South Africa nor said things as some of the expressions which I have heard from members on the other side. I shudder to think what the future of the young people would be if the political reins are going to go from us to the people on the other side. If that is unparliamentary I would withdraw it. I am making a statement of fact and saying how I feel about them. I am saying that I trust a South African more than I trust them. I would put my life in the hands of Dr. Verwoerd before I put it in the hands of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is their motive in bringing this motion? I say that this is not an attack on the Speaker at all; this is an attack on the Government, and primarily on the Hon. Leader of the House. This is an attempt to sow dissension in the ranks of the ruling Party. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph found himself in the Opposition. Let us see how he was carrying on. This is in 1938, I digress to

say that Mr. Walcott whom he has stipulated throughout his length of time in Parliament as being his greatest political foe was trying his best to save him from this disgrace. Mr. Walcott in appealing to him said:

"I do appeal to the hon. member. After all, he must realise that if someone else said it of him he would easily see that it was most unbecoming in a Parliamentary Assembly. I shall make the motion, but I hope before any member seconds it the hon. member will see it from that point of view and save what is undoubtedly an unpleasant episode."

Then the gentleman moved the motion that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be suspended from this House until such time as he may see fit to withdraw the statement which he has made in his last speech with regard to a reckless misstatement made by the member for St. George, 3.50 p.m.

For any person, no matter how recently he may have entered into this Chamber like the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, to get up and say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not make the statement against the hon. member or against hon. members, or against the membership of the House, but against the ruling classes, the same ruling classes who underwrite their political campaigns and even now are trying to get them to destroy the country - and nobody who knew Charlie Elder could call him a member of the ruling classes - it would be no more than describing the same hon. member for St. Thomas as the founder member of the Legion of Decency. It would be as impossible to give that description as to describe Mr. Charlie Elder as one of the ruling classes of the Island. Mr. Speaker can then be accused of being more vacillating. This is after ten invitations extended to the hon. member for St. Joseph to withdraw what had been ruled - Past Perfect Tense - as an unparliamentary and unbecoming remark to use against another hon. member. The Attorney General, the Leader of the House, got up and he himself was vacillating. He made a motion, but implored hon. members not to second the motion to give the hon. junior member for St. Joseph another chance to redeem himself, and then the Speaker in his turn went on to say: "There is no one more unwilling than I am to have to take such a step for the enforcement of this rule of the House. I have done my utmost to show the hon. member that in withdrawing the statement he does not say that he does not believe it to be true, but in withdrawing it he is conforming with the rules of this House which allow no offensive or unbecoming words to be used in reference to a member of the House. I hope the hon. member will now possibly see the point which has arisen, and will withdraw those words he used."

"Mr. ADAMS: I fully appreciate Your Honour's words".

He could not plead ignorance because he said he appreciated them.

"Mr. ADAMS: I fully appreciate Your Honour's words, and I know they are intended sincerely, but if Rule 129 is the rule under which I am said to be using "offensive or unbecoming words", I regret greatly that I see no reason to withdraw those remarks. My mere presence here is offensive to some people, let alone what I may say. I have in mind what I said, and if what I said in argument makes it demonstrably clear that that sentence is a misstatement I cannot in disagreement with my conscience say it is not a misstatement. I used the word "reckless" to show I do not think it was deliberate.

"Mr. SPEAKER: A man may make a misstatement that is quite unintentional, but when a man makes a reckless misstatement he has gone out of his way to say something reckless knowing it to be untrue, or that it is very doubtful whether it is true.

"Mr. ADAMS: With great respect my interpretation of the word "reckless" is, "without going fully into every side of the question," and for that reason

"Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given my interpretation of a reckless misstatement. I am at this moment in the chair of the House, and it is my interpretation that counts.

"Mr. ADAMS: I feel sure that Your Honour's words are a suggestion of the course you would like to see me follow, but I regret that I cannot follow it.

"Mr. KINCH: As the senior member of the House I am going to second the motion. If the hon. member will not maintain the dignity of the Chair and this House, he should be suspended."

This is the first time that a member other than the Leader of the House is interjecting.

"Mr. BRATHWAITE: Before that question is put I beg to move an adjournment of the House for half an hour. I think an adjournment supersedes every other motion, and I believe Your Honour will appreciate the position of hon. members. We feel, as the hon. member feels himself, that the position is one which we regret very much, and as the panacea for the position I beg to move the adjournment of the House for half an hour.

"Mr. REECE: I beg to second the motion of the hon. member. I too think that every possible effort should be made to avoid the unpleasantness of compelling the hon. member to leave the House if even for a short time, and I hope that in the interval this matter will be smoothed out, and when we resume we will hear no more of it."

"The question was resolved in the affirmative, Mr. SPEAKER declaring 'the Ayes have it'."

The adjournment was taken, but I would like to pause here. It is also my experience that if you want to make an enemy of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, you have to do a good for him. Of course, they say in the Bible that if you do good and suffer for it, that is acceptable to God; but if you want to make an enemy for life, a moral enemy, you must do something for the hon. member. Now look at what happened! Mr. Pile, the Speaker, vacillating, refusing to exercise his authority. Mr. Walcott, vacillating as Leader of the House, asking people not to second the motion to immediately expel the hon. member. Mr. Kinch, oldest member of the House, Mr. Chrissie Brathwaite recognising that he was wrong says that "time is the panacea, let us adjourn for half an hour". Everybody in the House was willing to save the hon. member from disgrace, and every one of those persons that I have named have been castigated, abused, cursed and vilified from that time onwards until all but one of them were laid to rest, and even after they were laid to rest, they have not been allowed to rest in peace. Even when I was a member of the House, when Mr. C. A. Brathwaite died - he used to live next door to me - no greater fighter for democracy in those days could you find other than people like Clennell Wickham and so on, and when at 4 o'clock in the afternoon the Leader of the Opposition got up and asked the hon. member for St. Joseph to adjourn the House because we had to go to the funeral, the hon. member refused to adjourn the House to allow us to attend the funeral of a past member of the House who had adjourned the House to prevent him from being disgraced. (Shame!) I was the most surprised man. He was left without a quorum. The record is there. But, you see, I am a very simple minded person. Mr. C. A. Brathwaite called me to Roebuck Street and told me: "Boy, I heard you are joining the Labour Party with that man; you are making a great mistake." I wrote Mr. Brathwaite's remark off as coming from somebody who had been pushed into the background of politics. Mr. Brathwaite was wiser than I was; but I like to learn by experience. You will see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am none the worse for it. By associating myself with them, I really learned for the first time in my life the significance of the words "good" and "evil". They had been abstract terms to me before, for I really did not understand. I had had a comparatively sheltered life, exposed in another but not exposed to the kind of intrigue and so on that goes on in the political life of this Island. Mr. Brathwaite warned

me. When I came in here it was brought forcibly to me when we were refused the adjournment. Who moved the adjournment on 18th December, 1938? Christopher Augustus Brathwaite, M.P. moved the adjournment, who said that "time is the panacea, let us go outside and talk to him." All of them knew he was wrong.

What has happened on this occasion, some twenty-nine years later? The Speaker did not call on anybody ten or eleven times to withdraw. The Speaker, whose conduct is being impugned at this stage and called into question after thirty years of service in this House, asked the hon. member whether he was disposed to withdraw the remark, 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the course of my address this afternoon, you would have noticed that the hon. member got up on at least six occasions and implored you to invite me to withdraw remarks. You gave the hon. member a lot of latitude, but that is your prerogative. He does not understand what is going on in the world today and therefore you have these little idiosyncrasies. That is the price we have to pay for democracy, that we have to sit down here and know that decent people in Barbados are being represented by that kind of business you see on the other side. It must be a shock for a lot of Barbadians who looked to this country years ago when we had a reputation in the West Indies. Where is our reputation now? In the evening of his years he is content to sit amongst the ruins of this country. What I have to say in reply to Mr. Walcott is that he has advanced in age, he has receded from virtue and he has grown more wicked with less temptation. He prostitutes himself for money which he cannot enjoy and spends the remainder of his life in the ruins of his country. That was said in Parliament by William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, about Mr. Walpole; so it could not be parliamentary, could it? When the present Prime Minister of Great Britain objected to the presence of a gentleman by the name of Mr. Griffith, he described him as a political and parliamentary leper, and any one who supports a Resolution like this is a parliamentary leper as well. We do not think that they are going to support it, therefore they cannot be parliamentary lepers; but when they make the mistake of sending this motion to its conclusion, the motion will be defeated and we will be able to separate the parliamentary domestics from the parliamentary lepers. It is as simple as this.

Shall I tell you, Sir, that the aftermath of this debate in 1938 has now exposed the debate in this Chamber? After the adjournment of the Sitting, the Hon. E. K. Walcott said this:-

"It has been moved and seconded that the junior member for St. Joseph be suspended until such time as he shall see fit to withdraw the statement which he has made with regard to a reckless misstatement made by the hon. member for St. George.

"Mr. Speaker said: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

"The question was resolved in the affirmative, Mr. SPEAKER declaring 'I think the "Ayes" have it'."

That is on page 74 of the Debates of 18th January, 1938.

I have explained my reasons. You know the composition of the House at the time. There is this significant thing about the debate that there was no division. Nobody elected to put himself on the side of the hon. member, but the Speaker who, for reasons best known to himself, has refrained from taking part in this debate and has absented himself from the Chamber, will have all of us on his side. (Cheers) I would like to say that this is nothing to do with Party because His Honour was elected Speaker of the House after the unanimous vote of this House, and the person who seconded his nomination was the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Mover of this Motion. He would not allow the passage of time between the supporting speech he made on this occasion and the vituperative tone he used in this debate less than two months ago, and this is inconsistent with

anything he said before. One can look merely at the contents of the Resolution rather than the purpose of the Resolution. We are living in a tearing down society. There are no more colonial masters to whom you can run cap in hand. In that debate of January 18, 1938, the hon. member would say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies was right. The quickest words which can come out of his mouth are the Secretary of State for the Colonies this and the Secretary of State for the Colonies that. There is no Secretary of State for the Colonies to run to and therefore what do they hope to do? The people who want to spend the rest of their lives in the ruins of their country are now pulling down the country. If in pulling down the Speaker it assists you to give the impression to the outside world that this country is not able to run its affairs and is not eligible for independence, that does not help you. If they thought that they could oppose the Speaker and all the members on this side of the House and get into power and get away with it, I have no doubt that that would be done; but they are not satisfied yet, because they have not so brainwashed the people of this country that they will allow them to get away with it. That would be shortlived because the people would show their resentment if they were to touch a hair on the head of the Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want it to go on record that the purpose of this debate is not to censure His Honour the Speaker, but to sow dissension in the ranks of the Government. It is public and general knowledge that they have been trying to catch the members on this side and promising them Ministries if they will support them in this debate. They cannot wait for the election, the passing of time or the ordinary parliamentary procedures to run their course, but they want to undermine the very institutions which they say they are trying to protect. It is for that reason that I have tried to put the debate in the proper perspective. 4.10 p.m.

Now, there are only half dozen people around this Table who have had the misfortune to listen to the rantings of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I know that he is going to abuse me, but I am not going to get up and ask him to withdraw the remarks because even when the Speaker of the House in 1938 asked him thirteen times to withdraw he did not withdraw; so I cannot expect to succeed where Mr. Pile failed.

The hon. member has no respect for me or you, but you should see him bowing and scraping to the other people. Before I sit down I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment which has been moved, especially the paragraph where it congratulates the Speaker for his long unbroken service. If I have to make my own individual judgment on anyone introducing the motion of Censure on the Speaker I would say that the motion was irrelevant; but since you have agreed to it, it is the duty of the members on this side to give the right representation to the Speaker not only on this occasion but from the time which we have sat under his jurisdiction; and in sitting down, I would only like to repeat the remarks of the Earl of Chatham to Mr. Walpole. There can be no more fitting way to end than with these lines:-

"Who as he had advanced in age had receded from virtue,
Who has grown even more wicked with less temptation,
Who prostitutes himself for money which he cannot enjoy,
And spends the remainder of his life in the ruins of his
country."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is difficult to reply to the debate on the other side. You have allowed the Prime Minister to make the most vituperative malicious and intemperate speech to be made in this House. A speech like that can hardly ever be made in this House. It may have been made sometimes in other parts of the world, but for the years which I have been in this House, from 1936 to 1958 - and we had some fiery people - I cannot remember anything coming close to the speech that we have listened to just now.

As I have said, nobody can accuse me in this Parliament of not respecting the Chair and the Deputy Speaker

and of not respecting the Chairman of Committees at any time when I was speaking. I did not even do what I was tempted to do - to object - but I refrained from doing it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember the offensive remarks, nothing to do with the tirade and the blasphemous manner when he ended up in a sneering way. Then, there was a lot of hooligan laughter from the gallery.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition ought to know that he cannot draw your attention to the people in the gallery. He is saying that there was a lot of hooligan laughter from the people of the gallery.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to give a warning. However much we on this side want to observe the rules of this House, if this sort of thing is to go on, then this debate would never end because if the Government can use its powers in this way, how can it ever come to an end? This debate has descended to the rancour to which reference has been made.

If there is one thing - and it has been referred to by some hon. members before - when some people have no case, it is the old adage that the best method of defence is attack. You must attack whether rightly or wrongly, whether truthfully or untruthfully, but at all events it is to attack. We had the warning from the Prime Minister that he would not be objecting. All the rules state that when offensive words have been used by a member on the floor of the House in respect of another, the member himself must object.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member said, and I am not going by what anybody told me, that he is going to say something to which I would not be objecting. I made the remark that I did not intend to interrupt the hon. member.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you also would see my reference to the deviation of public behaviour. What have I referred to except what the Hon. Prime Minister said? He gets up on a point of order. I drew Your Honour's attention to the fact that any objection to the remarks of a member by another member, the member must make the objection before any other member has spoken. That is in the English Rules and in our Rules. 4.20 p.m.

That is the Standing Order copied from the English practice, the English Standing Orders and the English Rules. The hon. member spent this afternoon for the time he was speaking in a vituperative, abusive, insulting style. In the whole of my speech, I was speaking as to what comes from my heart and with a full sense of my position, and without any desire whatever to play to the Gallery. Far from it. I have just rebuked some parts of the gallery for their conduct on a previous occasion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If this is going to go on, just declare it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet and the hon. member must take his seat. I am on a point of order and he must give way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy has risen on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He should be glad for the rest too. Again he is breaking the Rules of this House because he has said that he has already rebuked a part of the gallery. He must not draw the attention of this House to the gallery unless he wants it cleared.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: One of these days the hon. member will get it straight in the face what he is and why he acts the way he acts. He has been begging for it a long

time, and it will come eventually even if not in this place, but in the Law Courts. If the hon. member is making a point of order, I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you ask him what is the point of order and what Standing Order is being broken. That alone should be a point of order, that an hon. member is out of order because he has broken such and such a Standing Order. I have broken no Standing Order. The hon. member is quoting an Order because he wants to quote one to support all he says; and despite all the interruptions and unseemly jumpings up by the Leader of the House, I will continue and I shall say everything I want to say, and I shall say it in language which is appropriate and which is parliamentary. I shall not even take advantage of the use of phrases to be used in this House and which have not been declared unparliamentary, although some other authorities may call them and do call them unparliamentary. I have almost reached the stage - I say "almost" - when we may cease to raise objections when unparliamentary language is not checked. I do not say anything more on that point now because I have already promised that I will respect the Chair and not, however much I may disagree with it, fail to obey its Ruling. I have my own views about some things that have happened in this House. One hon. member on this side said that the interpretation of the Standing Orders is a matter for lawyers. One hon. member on the other side seems to agree with that. All I can say is that I know of no lawyer on this side who has not expressed strong opinions against some things that have happened in this House. I say no more on that point. The hon. member, I repeat, is now in the position of Prime Minister of a sovereign country.

I will pass by the indecent reference and statements he made over and over again in spite of corrections that we on this side of the House, and I apologise to hon. members for having to say this - have been opposed to independence for Barbados. How often have we made it clear that we are not opposed to the idea of independence for Barbados, but we have said that the economy, the life, the everything of Barbados is bound up with other Eastern Caribbean Territories and that we should have independence in a Federation. I have made it clear, and sometimes I feel almost ashamed of myself to have to repeat it especially as I was talking about myself, that the Federal Parliament on a Resolution by myself unanimously agreed to call on the Colonial Office to give the West Indies independence in 1961. I made it very clear that that was the policy of the Labour Party of Barbados, and that that would continue to be the policy; but in spite of corrections, in spite of statements in the Press, editorials in the Press and in spite of his attention being drawn to it, the hon. member, however untrue, will make the point which he thinks will go down with people and persuade them to be favourable to himself and to his Party. In that he has a faithful and equally efficient, if not a more efficient lieutenant. It does not matter if what you say is true or not true; what does matter is if the people will believe you. That is their motto. Some of the things which have been said in here are patently untrue, like the statement he made about my getting up and going to the telephone and the others following me not knowing. It is a patent, blatant, brazen lie. What does it matter that things that can be demonstrated to be untrue and you point them out? They will still repeat them and go on repeating them. Up to today the Prime Minister has chosen to tell the world that this Party is trying to wreck Barbados, trying to destroy Barbados, trying to destroy its institutions. The hon. member owes his place, as one of his colleagues has said, to my fighting for years and years to get him, among others, in this House to fight against the Conservatives of this Island who had the grip.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are to correct this debate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member has said he has fought to get me in this House. That is not true. Everybody knows that I came into this House

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member is suffering from hallucinations. The hon. member

did not fight to get me in here; he never gave me one push. He never had a majority in the House of Assembly in Barbados until myself and other people like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, Mr. Lorenzo Williams and "T.T." Lewis came along. The maximum number of seats he had was twelve. That political Party has never given me five cents to run any political campaign, and I have appeared on more of their platforms than they have appeared on mine; and in my first experience in politics I was elected a member for St. George. The hon. member knows I was extremely reluctant to run for the House of Assembly at all. He came back to England in 1948 and told me I would be a traitor to my country if I went to Africa; and he says that he got me in here!

4.30 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member entered this House as a member of the Labour Party. Those of us who were in the House already and those who were about to get into the House, worked hard to get through our plans. The hon. member entered this House as a member of the Labour Party. He remained in this House and spoke in this House from the Labour benches. The hon. member constantly attacked the Government. I have the facts before me. He was reproved by me at a meeting of what was called the "Parliamentary Council" in those days. The hon. member said that he came into the Labour Party or joined the Labour Party because he was a Socialist and had Socialist views. He said that if he found himself guilty of disrupting the Party he would abandon this House. He left us. I will not continue this part of the matter because subsequent statements were made in the organ of the Democratic Labour Party in which there was a light bearer in every paragraph. "We had no organisation, no rules, no minutes and so on". We were not all right. That was at the time when the hon. junior member for Christ Church could have told him that he was our first General Secretary, but he had to see after his legal work and I pay him this tribute that he did good work with the Barbados Progressive League. He was the Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party when the Hon. Prime Minister ran as one of our candidates.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the hon. and learned junior member for St. Joseph, but I should just like to draw to his attention Standing Order No. 26 (2) which states this:-

"A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In a debate a member must do that, but you did not read that Standing Order to the Hon. Prime Minister. Was he confined to his remarks when he talked about this member and that member running as a candidate? Your Honour has got to keep to the Standing Orders just as we have to do so. If we owe respect to the Chair the Chair owes respect to hon. members. Respect must be mutual. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew said this morning that each side must respect the other; but think of the constant vituperative epithets which the Hon. Leader of the House and the Prime Minister used as regards members on this side of the House. The Government benches owe us that respect, and we are to be equally respected by members of the Government. What is true of the relationship between members is also true of the relationship between the Chair and members of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees are the Servants of this House. They must give credit to members of the House for a willingness and desire to respect the Chair; but equally the Chair must be worth the respect, and that is what caused me to bring this motion of censure against the Speaker for one lapse to which I will confine myself in this Resolution. Unless we deliberately establish proper decorum and proper respect and behaviour for the Chair of this House, we might just as well finish with democratic Government or rule by the Legislature. I will speak no matter who says what; no matter what terms of abuse of rules, no matter what I am supposed to be, if something is out of order, no matter how much it will be

bringing the Chair into disrepute, I will speak. Every single mistake will be pointed out. Some hon. members on the other side seem to think that we, on this side, say that we are human beings; but both sides should act as human beings and there will always be something to attack.

I am glad to see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and the hon. junior member for Christ Church spoke as men when they said what their consciences told them should be the true interpretation of some of the charges brought in this Resolution. Later on, even if it falls on deaf ears, and I suppose after the Prime Minister's speech it will fall on some deaf ears, I shall appeal to hon. members to get their members to be above Party to see that it is the conscience which guides them where the simple interpretation of certain things is not present to their minds. I began with the Prime Minister's vicious speech, a speech full of malice, a scurrilous speech and that is the expression he has used of speeches on this side, speeches with ulterior motives, circumlocutory expressions, ulterior motives, such motives being to play to the gallery and to his stool pigeons.
4.40 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again, Sir, on a point of order. This is the third time. It is out of order for the hon. member to refer to the gallery, unless he is prepared to make a motion that the gallery be cleared; otherwise he is out of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: When I used the words "stool pigeon" I was thinking more especially of the hon. member who has just sat down.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member said that when he used the word "stool pigeons", he was thinking of the hon. member who had just sat down. That is an offensive remark and I am asking him to withdraw it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should have remembered that the hon. member likes quotations. "I give him laughter without speaking." I am reminded that the hon. member used it without acknowledging that it was a quotation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: One of these days, somebody is going to split the hon. member's head open and leave him lying in a pool of sawdust.

I have taken objection to the remarks which he used. It is offensive and unparliamentary, and I am going to ask him to withdraw them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not consider the words "stool pigeons" in that sense to be offensive.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In the hon. member's case, it would even be worse than sawdust, but I refrain from saying what I feel should have been said.

I am replying to the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister in the manner as I took notes of his speech. If there is anything which I have misunderstood, I hope he will stop me. I did not quite gather whether he said on one occasion I was named. Apart from the occasion on which he referred to at such length, I cannot remember any other case where I was named by a Speaker. If it is, it has completely escaped my knowledge. I put it no stronger.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is impossible to say before hand, just as it is impossible to say when the Hon. Leader of the House gets up whether it is a point of order or not, what the House is going to be asked to say about my conduct in 1938 and what is has to do with this debate. If anything were dishonourable in this House, it was the remarks of the Hon. Leader of this House, and the Hon. Prime Minister does not see that it is a reflection on Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister went to say generally that it showed no disrespect to anyone. We are saying that the one thing which the conduct of the Speaker on the specific occasion - that one incident which the Hon. Prime Minister brought up - pointed to, was the whole character of Mr. Speaker. They are saying that it is a reflection against me as Leader of

the Opposition. They fail to see that the incident is a grave reflection on Mr. Speaker. We are saying on this side that Mr. Speaker made a slip and a real slip. What very much stands in his favour is that we say that this is the first real slip.

It shows the downward trend that Barbados is taking in the eyes of the outside world. People who used to respect us and also to venerate us for our parliamentary behaviour are beginning to wonder what sort of House we have today. For instance, the whole of this 1938 episode is a reflection on the present Speaker. What does the 1938 episode show? It shows that Mr. Douglas Pile without any intervention called on me to withdraw the words. If the rules are broken, he can intervene and should intervene. The Hon. Prime Minister is talking about the 1938 episode and is not seeing the difference between Mr. Douglas Pile in 1938 and His Honour the Speaker in 1966. Mr. Douglas Pile without any intervention called on me to withdraw and showed a great deal of patience in speaking to me and listening to me.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. Douglas Pile showed a great deal of patience, it is true, in speaking to me and in listening to me in reply. All that is true; but contrast it with the action of the Speaker, and the gross contempt by the Leader of the House. Never has the Speaker called on him to apologise. Ruling or no ruling has nothing to do with it. To get up and tell the Speaker of this House "if I obeyed you"! I go further and say that in spite of what the Hon. Prime Minister or anybody on that side may have said, the official report could not be worse. We on this side thank God that without any of us knowing it the hon. junior member for Bridgetown got up and said it is his undoubted recollection that the Leader of the House said "if I obeyed your ruling." Not only is that my recollection, but as soon as I read what the Advocate had said, I sat down with everything fresh the next day and wrote my letter to the Press. And what made it more emphatic was that the word "ruling" by the Reporter of the News newspaper was changed to "request".

What is the position of a Speaker who is told "if I obeyed your ruling I too would be guilty of gross hypocrisy" or "rank hypocrisy"? The word "gross" has been used sometimes and "rank" on another occasion. My recollection as I wrote it down is "gross". I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, here is Mr. Pile promptly calling on me to withdraw. Here is Mr. Pile patiently, rather than having it blown up, saying "you must withdraw. You may say it is a reckless misstatement, but it is against the Rules of the House." The Hon. Prime Minister said with the statement of Mr. Elder that the more enlightened people were against the Governor as regards the Address he sent to the House. It was an Address, as pointed out to both Houses, that was going to limit the life of members of the Upper House, and this was the Address in reply to point out that they were protesting against it. I moved a counter request, and Mr. Elder was speaking about the enlightened classes who would support them against the Government. Of course, the hon. member would say whenever I open my mouth, I support the Governor or the Colonial Office. I have not got to defend myself as regards my public life. The mere fact is that I am here again to torment members of the Government, and they are tormented.

I repeat for the last time, perhaps, that to bring into the argument and in support of the arguments of the Government benches and some of the Government members a debate of 1938 is to make a great contrast between the act of Mr. Pile and the present Speaker. Incidentally I am only now using the wording of the Resolution. The hon. junior member for Christ Church reminded me when I said they were two Resolutions that it should be called a Resolution in two parts. Nothing has been said even on this side of the House specifically, clearly or fully on the first part. My Resolution speaks of the gross contempt which the Hon. Leader of the House showed to the Speaker - "that His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Lucy and Leader of the House when on December 15, 1966, he not only disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker....."

Now what did His Honour the Speaker do? Unlike Mr. Pile he did not call on the hon. member promptly and with-

out my intervention. I did not say he deliberately waited because I did not jump up immediately. But before, I believe, I used the words "I object to those words" and then I began to say "as Leader of the House" meaning to go on, the Speaker said, "Before the hon. member proceeds". He then asked the hon. member whether he was disposed - and my recollection, I repeat, the words which I used at the beginning when I introduced this motion - was that His Honour the Speaker said that these words should be withdrawn, and then asked the Leader of the House whether he was disposed to withdraw those words. I shall not go over in detail the arguments I used as regards the type of language that His Honour the Speaker used then, but I repeat my recollection is that His Honour the Speaker said that these words should be withdrawn. "Are you disposed to withdraw those words?" I am told that hon. members who have been in this House in the last five years will know whether it is accurate or not to say that this is the formula which apparently His Honour the Speaker uses. Let any three year old child answer this question. If the Speaker did not think those words unparliamentary, why ask the Hon. Leader of the House whether he was disposed to withdraw? You do not have to withdraw a proper thing. You do not have to ask an hon. member of this House whether he is disposed to withdraw words that are proper or words that are not unparliamentary. It is childish to adopt the attitude of saying this was a request. Frankly I do not want to say anything critical of the hon. junior member for Christ Church after his speech, because although he was faithful to the Party line, his inner conscience made him also say what any reasonable member of this House - and all are supposed to be reasonable - should say about the request. I have to thank him for that. At this stage let me say, the Hon. Prime Minister - to use the expression of him that he used of me - is always anxious, I would say, to win his point by saying something that he cannot prove, but happens to be untrue. No member of the Barbados Labour Party, no member of the Opposition ever approached any member at any time in the last elections running under the D.L.P. banner to try to get him to come over to our side, let alone promise him a Ministry.

5.00 p.m.

I know that some people owe their positions through promises, and some other people hold their positions as candidates through filling Party coffers with money. That is another form of corruption with which I will deal as time goes on, the corruption which existed in the last Session. Even the highest post in this country is not immune from it. There is the possibility of our finding ourselves in a position which we have to accept because somebody happens to have a lot of money which he is prepared to give to the Party as compensation of which much will he said. Let us clean the slate, let us get rid of the muck which has descended upon this island. It has been said that we offered people Ministries - only a lunatic would do a thing like that. "If you keep quiet, we will give you a Ministry". I want to say that that has never happened on this side. It is a flagrant untruth for the Prime Minister to get up and say that. It is a plain untruth and he knows it, but it will help his argument. We accept anybody who has seen the light and comes into our Party or joins it for the first time. That is why the hon. senior member for St. Peter is on this side of the House. He left us; because he saw the light on his own, he came back with us and we accepted him. Of course, that is not an invitation to any hon. member on the other side.

Mr. Churchill was the greatest Englishman of his time and to some people he was the greatest Englishman of the Century. He crossed the floor of the House; he left the Liberal Party, went over to the Conservative ranks and remained there. By way of parenthesis I hope the House will pardon a simple, personal thing. I have a gramophone record more than sixty years old or nearly sixty years old of when Mr. Churchill was attacking the Conservatives on their free trade proposals. It is really music to hear the record of that. Crossing over the floor is not anything immoral or dependent upon any principle. I myself have crossed over from being a Liberal to a Labourite and I am still the same. Therefore this childish talk about our saying that we were trying to bribe members of the other Party to come over to us because we would give them a Ministry - it

is a grave reflection on the Democratic Labour Party. There is notice "for sale, come and buy them," according to the Prime Minister. I cannot imagine anybody offering to bribe a man because it means that he has no respect for him. "I am coming to you to see if I can buy you;" you do not respect that. You cannot possibly respect any man if you feel that he is for sale and you can buy him. That is only part and parcel of the methods of the Prime Minister in making speeches. I do appeal to him sincerely to see that as Prime Minister of this territory his duty is to be big, to drop the slanderous, vicious language that might be very good for use on platforms in the heat of an election campaign. A barrister might be a super advocate fighting hard at the Bar; he might fight hard in politics; but as soon as he gets on the Bench and becomes a judge, he is careful in his language. He does not attack unless it arises on the evidence before him. Some of the politicians as barristers became famous judges and Lord Chancellors. No matter how he may attack people in order to get votes night after night as Prime Minister, he must establish gospel truth in his speeches.

I speak as a Barbadian. It is true that all Barbadians who like cricket like to see Garry Sobers make runs, but it is also true to say they also want to see the West Indies win. All Barbadians who may be behind the Prime Minister in supporting him politically are also Barbadians who want to see Barbadians respected in the Commonwealth of Nations. At the United Nations or wherever we happen to be represented, we do not want to be able to say: "Good heavens, look at the language used on behalf of Barbados!" Whether here or abroad, we expect the Prime Minister to set an example instead of coming in here with all the adjectives used in Independence Square that he could think of. The word "abusive" is a mild term in the Prime Minister's speech. What, in the name of Heaven, could he gain except to satisfy a style of speaking by reading at full length what happened in my case? Look at the conduct of the Speaker, look at the Speaker trying his best to get things smooth again; but in this case, the Speaker calls on the Hon. Leader of the House and asks him if he is disposed to withdraw the words, without saying that the words should be withdrawn!

5.10 p.m.

These were the words I distinctly remember because he may have said "if he is disposed to withdraw." He promptly said "if I obey your ruling I would be guilty of gross hypocrisy." Mr. Speaker does not there and then call on the hon. member and speak to the hon. member and say "that is gross disrespect to the Chair; withdraw those words". He does not do that. I took the time from that clock on the wall and drew it to the attention of the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the length of time in the going and coming between the Deputy Clerk and the Clerk and the time Mr. Speaker took was twenty minutes after the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said "I am not going to obey your ruling."

I recall - not the first four members who were sitting down there - while this was happening, you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the next three members, all of them were calling on Mr. Tudor to get up and withdraw. I should apologise for saying Mr. Tudor, I should have said "the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw."

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. At that time, during this hiatus, did I call on the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to withdraw? Any reference made to me on that is completely untrue and cannot be substantiated by anyone. I have up to now kept out of this debate and I intend to keep out.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, I specifically said not the first four, and I said that one was the Deputy Speaker. Why were they telling the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw. Why were they telling him to withdraw? What happened? If we examine the question whether the words used by the Hon. Speaker to the Hon. Leader of the House were not a request or "take-it-or-leave-it", you can know by this fact.

I am grateful to the hon. junior member for Christ Church - and I say this not with any ulterior motives - for speaking in a manner which we all can admire. He stated his views as to the use of those words by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and as regards my Resolution.

To get back to the point. Why should hon. members want to persuade the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw if he did not do something wrong? It is playing a very childish trick to try and interpret this thing in any other way but unparliamentary. The Hon. Prime Minister came perilously near to saying specifically that he did not agree with the ruling of the Chair. I expect him to jump up now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member specifically referred to me and I intend to defend myself. I never at any time stated that I did not agree with the ruling of the Chair. I said that the report is there and the Speaker made his ruling, and all the hon. members were trying to do was to pull down the country by challenging the ruling which the Speaker made. The Speaker specifically ruled that the words were not out of order. How then can the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that I came perilously close to contempt or -

(A VOICE: Out of order).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a question for the Chair and not hon. members. I will not have that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to repeat, speaking on a point of privilege, that I have been in Parliament for sixteen years, longer than anybody. The question whether a person is in order or not is for the Chair. Before they made any contribution to a parliamentary debate, they want to give all the rulings.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member would behave himself. Even a simple matter - it is not a matter of how long he has been in the House. He said, on a point of privilege, for sixteen years. He said that he was a member of the House longer than anybody. What about the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. James? Mr. Speaker, some people cannot even speak the truth by accident.

(A VOICE: That is exactly you.)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would not count the hon. member so much as to take notice of what he is saying.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regret to see that hon. members on the other side have chosen to bring this reference to Mr. Speaker at this time. If they had not done so, I doubt whether it would have been necessary in addressing this House to draw attention to the comparison between Mr. Douglas Pile, the Speaker, in 1938, and Mr. Speaker in 1966.

Every member of this House would refrain from accusing the Hon. Speaker of deliberately misleading anybody or of finding a distinction for ulterior motives, between words. Apart from the fact that it is suggested that Mr. Speaker drew a distinction between hypocrisy and a person guilty of gross hypocrisy, the distinction drawn only showed the great difference between the Speaker's ruling in 1938 on the incident in the House and Mr. Speaker's action on December 15, 1966.

My motion reads:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the conduct of His Honour the Speaker in accepting, without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair by the junior member for St. Luch and Leader of the House when on December 15, 1966, he not only disobeyed a ruling by Mr. Speaker that he should withdraw words that he had spoken and to which objection had been taken but added to his refusal to do so language completely destructive to parliamentary order and respect for the Chair.

5.20 p.m.

My motion reads "in accepting without reproach on his part, a gross contempt of the Chair". Suppose nothing had happened that subsequently happened after that remark was made, there would still remain the fact that that remark about the refusal to obey the order was made, and the Speaker did nothing about it, and up to now has done nothing about it. There was no apology from the Leader of the House that it was a gross contempt of the Chair although it is his duty to obey the Chair. That is the first part of my Resolution that is completely separate from whether a proper interpretation was given to the word "hypocrisy". Are Hon. members going to say by their vote that they approve or rather that it is not a reflection on the Speaker that he allowed the hon. member, and that member the Leader of the House, to say to him face to face on the floor of this House, "I am not going to obey your ruling" - or if you like, those members who think that the Official Gazette is sacred could use the words that appear in the Official Gazette "I am not going to obey you"? Do hon. members over there say that the Speaker has done right by not calling on the hon. member then in spite of that approach to him? This is something to which the Speaker should have promptly objected and called on the hon. member to withdraw that remark. Are hon. members going to say they are going to vote against my wording on that? It has already been drawn to attention that the same hon. member was trying to get an hon. member to withdraw something. History repeats itself. This happened today while this House has been sitting. Nobody has directly approached me or the Opposition, and on that I will only say this: often there are motions of censure in the House of commons. The hon. member of the House who moves his motion of censure makes his point and does not let it go to the vote; he withdraws the motion at the end of the speech. If the proper spirit existed in this House of respect for each other, that could have been done. How could you possibly get amity and proper behaviour in this House when that sort of thing happens? I am appealing as I appealed almost in my first utterances when this House opened, why can't there be peace? Why can't each side hold their own views but behave like proper human beings to each other?

As has been pointed out, the Government Benches just ignore the Opposition. Imagine before consulting with the other side you appoint a Select Committee including members from the ranks of the Opposition without asking the Opposition whom they would like to put forward! You get up and propose 9 o'clock meeting without previous intimation to the Opposition that you want to come back at 9 o'clock! 9 o'clock is not just early; it is very early; but as long as Generalissimo gives the word, the stool pigeons follow. All the members on the other side are counted in that category. There is still hope that proper behaviour and proper respect for each other will prevail in this House.

As regards Mr. Speaker, there are two points I must raise, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not going to say all that I might say on this, but it is very suggestive that I would not have thought of it if the hon. member had not referred to myself in 1938 in which, as I said, he merely contrasted the actions and conduct of Mr. Douglas Pile with the action of His Honour the Speaker, who unlike Mr. Pile did nothing to try and get matters smooth. He spent a great deal of time looking up authorities. It is unfortunate he did not have the Thirteenth Edition which is fuller as regards unparliamentary remarks than the Sixteenth Edition. I deliberately accused him of quoting - and giving the impression that should never have been given - part of what happened at the end of his report to the House. He distinctly gave the impression - and I go further and say that from his quotation and the fact that he stopped at a particular place - that the authorities would show that you are on the borderline, and that you should not step over the borderline. If hon. members would look at their copy of the ruling, this is what His Honour the Speaker said: "I have had the advantage of referring to all available authorities". Well, if he had asked me, there could have been another authority available. He said: "I have had the advantage of referring to all available authorities and have considered the exact words as taken

down by the Official Reporter. 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. 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."

Who spoke of patriotism, if not the hon. member?
5.30 p.m.

It is unnecessary to suggest it because I am quite convinced that no hon. member in his heart considers that that was a proper ruling. He is referring to patriotism and not to the hon. member who pretended patriotism. The Official Report is wrong even on that. His pretended patriotism is the correct thing just as the Prime Minister spoke of us as pretending to have regard for parliamentary procedure. The Speaker goes on in his ruling:-

"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 Grimston) observed: 'It would be better if the hon. Gentleman did not use that phrase.'"

He thereby gave the impression that in 1962 the use of the word 'hypocrite' was modified by the Chairman, as he then was, or Deputy Speaker. It was modified and he said "You had better not use that phrase" as if the ruling in 1902 was that the use of the word 'hypocrites' and pharisees - definitely unparliamentary - had been modified. The Speaker stopped there. Reference has been made in this debate to some stalwarts who did this and that and read something which suited them, and omitted the rest. I accuse the Speaker of doing just that. If he wanted it to be made clear to hon. members that expressions of this sort are unparliamentary, he would have gone on reading. The Speaker was near the end of his speech, and this is what he said:-

"Of course, I shall have no support from the Benches opposite save only that of the Liberal Party."

"Mr. BENCE said: 'The hon. Gentleman will.'"

"Sir G. NABARRO said: 'The hon. member says that I will, but he is such a hypocrite in these matters.'"

"Mr. BENCE rose on a point of order and said: 'Is it in order for the hon. Gentleman, who has been carrying on like this for eleven years, to call an hon. member on this side of the House a hypocrite?'"

"Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: (Sir Robert Grimston) Then said: 'It would be better if the hon. Gentleman did not use that phrase.'"

Mr. Speaker stopped there, but listen to the rest.

"Sir G. NABARRO said: 'I apologise at once to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I unreservedly withdraw the word. I did not mean anything offensive to the hon. Gentleman.

What I meant was that he has turned turtle politically. I trust that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will deem that expression wholly exceptionable in a parliamentary sense.'"

It was not modified and the offender promptly apologised and withdrew the word. The Deputy Speaker did not say that it was near the borderline to give the impression that he was saying "don't use the phrase 'rank hypocrisy', because it was near the borderline", when we have a prompt withdrawal in this instance. What I have read out immediately follows where the Speaker stopped off in his ruling. It is remarkable that the Speaker did not put these words in his ruling that the expression was unparliamentary and not near the borderline.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I specifically and categorically accuse the Speaker of saying something which he never should have said. It was not a question of being near the borderline, it was well inside the borderline. He was mashing the crease in this case; he was well run out. This is one of the few last things I wish to say. The other thing is to ask hon. members this: knowing the temper and fear of some of them as soldiers of the Generalissimo, I speak to them and I ask them to vote according to their conscience. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has a conscience, the hon. junior member for Christ Church has a conscience, and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has a conscience. In short, if it were a question of voting and voting by Party, what is the position? The Opposition represents ten persons. It is true that not all ten of these persons are here and all the members on the Opposite side are not here because the Speaker is not here. Two hon. members on that side have in fact said that the Speaker was wrong. Well, out of 24 hon. members, or rather 23 if you exclude the Speaker several have expressed, either by reason or default or in actual speech, that there was an unfortunate slip or fall on this one occasion and that nothing we have said is in any way contradictory of the eulogy made by this amendment. But before I sit down, as I said, I will ask hon. members if they can obey their consciences now and not the General's orders.
5.40 p.m.

If they are going to vote to say that this remark was not unparliamentary - and I quite appreciate what the Hon. Prime Minister cherishes especially his standing in the community, his love of the country, his love of procedural matters - I ask them to bear in mind that these words were held to be unparliamentary in the old Editions of 'May's'. But there are a lot more words to be unparliamentary, although they are not definitely unparliamentary words. These Editions only show some of the words which are held to be offensive. Among these words, 'hypocritical', is held to be unparliamentary. What did the Leader of the House say? 'Pretended patriotism'. He is saying that the Island cannot afford it. That is pretence; that is gross hypocrisy. I therefore appeal to hon. members to see that that is unparliamentary. I give them another instance of the same 'hypocrisy', a lover of liberty." The hon. member hypocritically pretends because of his reference to the state of the Treasury. I do not see how hon. members can vote against this motion.

The Hon. Prime Minister was not in here all the time. You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a member on that side pointed out: 'there is a serious accusation of the Speaker. He is also the Speaker and a member of the Government Party'. I do not mean that he is both at the same time. The Hon. Prime Minister did not give the full facts of the speakers on both sides. If this were a matter in the law courts a Judge would have stopped the case if the jury were being asked whether the words were unparliamentary. Can you see that there is no distinction between them? I do not expect that all the other members on the other side would have it enumerated as it was enumerated by the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is now reading contrary to the Standing Order of this House which says that members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologise.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Who said that I was reading?)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If I said the hon. member was reading, I would say now that he was looking at a book.

There are times when hon. members have to choose between Parliament and their consciences. The Prime Minister has told the House that he left the Labour Party because he could not stick it any longer. Their consciences would tell them that it has been abundantly proved that the Leader of the House was guilty of contempt and Mr. Speaker should not have forgiven him. When His Honour the Speaker allowed the member to save his face, Are you telling me that you are going to vote against that? I have known juries to give verdicts against evidence of disinterested people merely because the evidence of interested people was different; but I do appeal to hon. members and I would remind them for the last time that they sit down today not as members of the Democratic Labour Party, but they sit down to examine this with an impartial mind to a serious allegation brought against their Speaker.

I remember one of the most pointing answers to a Counsel who made an appeal was one like that made by the Hon. Leader of the House as regards the Speaker when he said that if the motion is carried against Mr. Speaker, he would have to resign. Mr. Speaker has not been called upon to resign. Nobody has suggested that Mr. Speaker should resign just as some people would resign, but this is not a motion where any member of the Opposition would be calling on His Honour the Speaker to resign. We would be the first to tell him not to do that. Resign what? I repeat, while we are anxious to stop irregularities, we are not unmindful of the value of this or that person. But if a person is wrong, however long he may have belonged to the institution or to Parliament or whatever system it may be, he can make a mistake and Mr. Speaker made a mistake on this occasion.

I'm sorry to see some members of the Government laughing. Once, a barrister in his plea told the jury that the defendant was a man of good character and left behind a wife and five children. If you found him guilty, he will have to go to prison. What was the argument of the magistrate on that occasion? He should have thought of that and his wife and children before he committed this act.
5.50 p.m.

When His Honour the Speaker made these two slips both as regards not calling on the Leader of the House to withdraw his remark about not obeying the Chair, and secondly the distinction that he drew between "hypocrisy" and "hypocrite", I am asking you to say that they were slips after a long career in the House. We are not asking you to say they are implications that he is unfit to be Speaker, and in spite of the loud interruptions on the other side, we would as quickly, if not more quickly than the Government members, say to the Speaker that he made a slip but that is no reason why he should resign. You have a classic example in recent times where they have a feeling that they must go. Something operates in their minds to say "I cannot agree with this; therefore I am not staying". His Honour the Speaker may feel the same, but that is no reason why we should not say: "You made a slip on this occasion, but remain as Speaker". So to use that argument as regards what had happened should not prevail for one half-second in the minds of any hon. member in this Chamber.

I now bring my reply to an end by again appealing to hon. members to remember that this is a judicial decision they are giving and not a political decision.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted be inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, may I point out to you, as has been pointed out in the course of the speech made by some other hon. member that this acceptance of the amendment does not in these circumstances put an end to the motion. The motion has nothing to do with a wrecking amendment. The motion as has been carried is that the Speaker is a wonderful person with thirty years' service and all that. The question of whether he should or should not be censured has not yet been put before the House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand there are no orders for costs after listening to the impassioned speech of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

The question that Government Business be now resumed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you proceed with Government Business, I am asking on behalf of all hon. members that you direct the Clerk to inform Mr. Speaker that the motion of censure against him has been defeated, that the amendment to that motion was unanimously passed, and that this House awaits Mr. Speaker's presence.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have directed the Clerk of the House to carry out this order.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, during your temporary absence, this House was pleased to pass *nem. con.* the following Resolution:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House notes with extreme pleasure that the honourable senior Member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein;

recalls that during this thirty-year period the same honourable member has at different times served as Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, and as Speaker since 1961;

recalls further that the same honourable member has been elected Speaker with the consent of the whole House on two occasions, the latter as recently as November, 1966;

records herein profound appreciation of the honourable member's long and distinguished Parliamentary service;

congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership; and again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the text of this Resolution be suitably engrossed on parchment and handed over to Mr. Speaker, as a tribute from this Honourable House." (Cheers)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very grateful to the Hon. Leader of the House for what he has disclosed and I am particularly pleased that, in the third oldest of the British Institutions, this Resolution was passed *nem. con.* I thank hon. members.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE GUARANTEE BY
GOVERNMENT OF THE REPAYMENT OF
\$300,000 TO BE BORROWED BY
THE TRANSPORT BOARD

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Minister of Communications:- To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of the sum of \$300,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board, together with interest thereon, for the purpose of meeting its obligations and discharging its functions.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of this sum of \$300,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board together with interest thereon for the purpose of meeting its obligations and discharging its functions. As the Addendum to the Resolution sets out:-

The Transport Board has negotiated a bank loan of \$300,000.00 repayable in five (5) years. The rate of interest chargeable on the loan is the rate applicable to prime commercial borrowings which is currently 7 1/2% per annum but may not exceed the legal limit of 8% per annum. A condition of the loan is that it should be guaranteed by the Government and this Resolution seeks approval for the guarantee. The loan is to finance the purchase of additional rolling stock for the Transport Board. The bodies for ten buses will be constructed locally and fitted on imported chassis while eleven buses will be purchased from the Progressive Bus Company.

The amount will be drawn by the Board in such instalments as it may from time to time require.

Hon. members who are in the Chamber this afternoon and who have the Addendum to this Resolution before them, will have no doubt as to whether I can read or whether I was looking at pictures. As you know, Sir, the Transport Board is one of those Statutory Bodies in this Island.
6.10 p.m.

At least, the transport of the Island was taken over from some of the concessionaires in 1955 when the famous statement that "bus fares would be raised over my dead body" was made.

The Transport Board as it was then was set up with no proper machinery to look after the finances of the Board and, therefore, for the first two years, there were a lot of unsavoury things. As a result, this Government had to write off something like \$2 million.

What I am doing here today? I am not asking members of this Chamber to lend the Transport Board money. What I am asking is what we who are in business have to do some time or the other, that is tantamount to backing a note for someone. In this case, I am asking the Legislature to back a note for the Transport Board.

Hon. members, I have here some information as regards the Transport Board. I would be willing to answer any question from you that comes within my portfolio dealing with the Transport Board. However, I want to make it specifically clear that I am not asking for one cent for the Transport Board. I am asking this House to approve the guarantee by the Government of the sum of \$300,000 so that

the Transport Board could borrow this money in order that the transport system of Barbados could be improved.

Hon. members know there has been a change recently in the service and we have been getting complaints; but we have been always getting complaints. The transport service has always been a problem and a hot-bed for political aspirants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like hon. members to pay great attention to this.

The Transport Board has a fleet of 117 buses comprising of 26 Toast Rack and 91 Corridor type buses. One hundred and seven of these buses are between eight and 16 years old. In the current Development Plan, it is proposed to embark on a programme of fleet replacements to the extent of ten new buses in each year of the four-year period, April 1965 to March 1969.

So far, ten complete buses and ten chasses have arrived from the United Kingdom. An order has been placed with the Crown Agents for ten more chasses, and it is proposed to purchase a further ten chasses next year. A contract has been awarded to Acme Engineering Works for the construction of bus bodies for the chasses which are being imported from the United Kingdom.

I pause here to say that the chasses imported have been Leyland chasses.

The United Kingdom Government has agreed to provide an expert to advise on the construction of bus bodies. It is expected that he will arrive in Barbados around the middle of next month and will remain for approximately three months. While he is here, he will train at least two persons to continue the bodies' inspections after he leaves.

It is expected that Acme Engineering Works will complete six buses by the end of April, 1967, and four by the end of July, 1967.

The Transport Board employs 536 persons categorised as follows:-

Administrative Staff	...	9
Clerical Staff	...	28
Inspectors	...	52
Drivers	...	170
Conductors	...	180
Mechanics and Artisans	...	42
Apprentices	...	24
Yard Staff	...	23
Watchmen	...	8

Total	536
-------	-----

The Transport Board has been operating the following routes with effect from 1st January, 1967:-

Route 1, Bridgetown to Speightstown; 1A, Bridgetown to Indian Ground and Boscobel; 1B, Bridgetown to Pie Corner; 1C, Bridgetown to Connell Town and Josey Hill; 1F, Speightstown to St. Lucy's Church; 10, Bridgetown to Bayfield; 11, Bridgetown to Marley Vale; 11A, Bridgetown to Edey's Village; 12, Bridgetown to Sam Lord's Castle and Crane; 13, Bridgetown to Silver Sands; 15, Bridgetown to Rendezvous Gardens; 16, Bridgetown to Gall Hill; 16A, Bridgetown to St. Patricks; 17, Bridgetown to Brittons Hill and Club Morgan; 18, Bridgetown to Belleville and Deighton's Road; 19, Bridgetown to Boarded Hall and Yorkshire; 19A, Bridgetown to Pine; 24, Bridgetown to Paynes Bay; 24A Bridgetown to Grazettes; 25, Bridgetown to Deacons Road.

The financial position of the Transport Board is improving, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy to state that the Board made a profit of \$49,000 during its last financial year ended 30th September, 1966.

The Government has guaranteed a loan of \$600,000 from the Royal Bank of Canada and it is being asked to guarantee a further loan of \$300,000. The purpose of these loans is to enable the Board to acquire additional rolling stock. Following is a breakdown of the estimated expenditure to be met from the two loans:-

Loan of \$600,000 - 10 Bedford Buses complete - Bodies \$147,496.40, Chasses \$55,987.20, Freight \$13,218.12, Duty \$31,150.62, Landing Charges \$3,272.36, Preparation of buses \$1,500.00, Total \$252,624.70.

10 Leyland Chasses - Chasses \$128,304.00, Freight \$6,798.30, Duty \$19,423.70, Landing Charges \$1,199.00, Paid up Insurance \$656.30, Total \$156,381.30.

Other Charges - Solicitor's Fee \$1,160.50, Crown Agents' Commission at 1 1/2% \$4,936.80, Marine Insurance \$1,658.93, Total \$7,796.23.

Construction of Bodies locally - 10 bodies for Leyland Chasses \$100,000.00, 10 sets fibre glass seats \$15,000.00, Total \$115,000.00; Grand Total \$531,802.23.
6.20 p.m.

The loan of \$300,000 will be spent as follows:- cost of 10 chasses \$128,304; freight \$6,798.30; landing cost \$1,199.00; duty \$19,423.70; paid up insurance \$656.30, making a total of \$156,381.30. Construction of bodies - 10 bus bodies \$10,000; 10 sets of fibre glass seats \$15,000, making a total of \$115,000. Other charges - Solicitor's fees \$1,160.50; Crown Agents' Commission \$2,343; Marine Insurance \$1,658.93 making a total of \$5,162.43.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I have already said that there was a balance from the first \$600,000, and with that balance we have been able to acquire the Progressive Buses for a total sum of \$4,024. This is how the money for which a note was backed for the Transport Board was spent, and how we intend to spend the other \$300,000.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the Transport Board for the first time in its history has shown a profit of \$49,000. This is a remarkable feature because for the life of the Transport Board from 1955 it was losing money. As we all know, because of politics being played with people's welfare and wellbeing, when at the time bus fares could have been raised by one cent or one penny asked for by the concessionaires, because of a general election being around the corner in 1956, the general public was taken for a ride, and as a result the buses were seized and carried over to where the Transport Board originally was, where the yard was an open sepulchre and any and every one used to walk in and come back out with a lot more than they went in with, and the general public had to pay for this rank misdeemeanour.

Since this Government came into power, you will remember that the then Premier who is now Prime Minister of the country said, I think in his first budget speech, that he was not going to give the Transport Board any more than a token vote of \$1.00 and they must try and get through. Apparently that \$1.00 was like the talent which the fellow got from the Master because we have not given them anything since. We have lived to see that the Transport Board is now making a profit, and we hope that with the new concessions and new routes other Departments might in the near future find themselves in a position to borrow from the Transport Board instead of the Transport Board asking us to guarantee a loan for them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I correctly understand the Hon. Minister to say that all in politics have to back a note?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg your pardon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I hear the hon. member correctly that all in politics have to back a note?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said that all of us who are in politics will eventually be asked, and I want to stress that those of us who have come in recently and who have not had to back a note yet, will eventually be asked to back a loan for somebody to do something.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not disagree with what the hon. member says because I have been in politics for some time, lest it be understood that I have to back a note.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister began by telling us that he is not asking members to lend the Board money; he is only asking our approval, that is, to give the green light. I would like the Hon. Minister to understand that it is not the person receiving the money who is the borrower; it is the one who is signing the note. He is asking us to lend the Board money. I want to know if this Minister thinks he is talking to a child, or whether he understands anything about this banking business. No sooner than the Minister rose, he is attempting to throw sand in my eyes by saying he is not asking me to lend the Board money. Whom is he asking? Why bring this Resolution if he is not asking? I am only saying this is what you have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not said anything of the kind.

Mr. SMITH: I was not even talking to you Sir!

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for St. Joseph not addressing the Chair?

Mr. SMITH: I might not have been at the time when I said that. The Hon. Minister told us how much money the Board made and I am very glad to hear that. The sum of \$49,000 is a lot of money and the Board has done very well. He has told about the condition of the buses and how many he has, but I wonder whether the Minister expects me to sit here and allow the hon. member to read out a long list of figures and for me to digest them and feel that they are all right. These figures should be circulated to us. You are asking us to assist you to borrow money from the Bank, and you have not even told us the particular Bank, although you have said in the explanatory note and the Addendum that the Board has already gone ahead and agreed to borrow this money from a Bank. Now I am to give my approval without knowing which Bank. I want to let the Hon. Minister know that I am a purse-string-holder in this, and he is asking me to give the green light to this loan. That is the authority which the people of St. Joseph have given to me.

Now the Addendum states that the Board is buying eleven buses from the Progressive Bus Company. I would like to know how many of them are on the road, if they are all in working condition, whether they are still on the road as they were bought from the Progressive Bus Company, and if not how many are in the workshop at the Transport Board for general overhaul. I would also like to know the financial position of the Board and how much money has been repaid from the loans, because I understand that the Board was borrowing money. We allowed them to borrow money not long ago - I do not remember the amount - to buy buses and to buy chasses, and a particular company was to build some bodies.
6.30 p.m.

I would like to know how many of these buses are in the Island and how many have been built out of the money which I was told would be used in obtaining these buses. Of the last amount of money which we gave authority to the Transport Board to borrow, how many of these buses which were obtained are on the road? We have already voted money for the purpose of buying buses; how many of these buses are on the road? It is not so long ago that we gave the O.K. to buy buses, but I have not noticed the locally-built buses at all. It is not my job to go to the Transport Board and see how many buses are on the road, but it is the Minister's duty to let me know how many buses have arrived and how many have been built as a result of the

last money which we gave the authority to the Transport Board to obtain. I would like to know how many buses we are about to buy and how many have been bought; I would also like to know how much is the debt of the Transport Board. If the Board has made a profit of \$49,000, then the Board should not be owing away much money now.

I am not referring to the amount which has been borrowed to buy new buses. I know that the Board borrowed money to buy buses before. I want to say that there is a lot of dissatisfaction now existing among the people who have to travel on these buses. Are we to buy more buses? Are we to give the O.K. to buy more buses and yet in a particular area from Bank Hall all the way down White Park the people are suffering and they have to walk from their homes all the way down to town to their jobs? There is no bus service on that particular route. I want to know the meaning of that. Why is it that the buses from Bank Hall Cross Road are not going down White Park and the people have to walk? Where the bus puts the people on the Deep Water Harbour Road, the people have to walk all the way to the City to their jobs just as if they have to walk from their homes to the City.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. That is *apropos* to additional rolling stock, and additional rolling stock might well be provided for White Park. The hon. member cannot go into any further details as to the particular road as far as this Resolution is concerned. The point has been made as to additional rolling stock.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asked by this Resolution to give my approval to the guarantee of the repayment of this money to be borrowed by the Transport Board for the purpose of purchasing buses, and I am asking if any buses will be on that road.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should check his facts before he comes in here and makes those remarks. This is not a Resolution for the purpose of buying buses. This is a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of this money to be borrowed by the Transport Board. This Board is seeking the approval of the House of the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of this loan according to the Statutory provisions. It is to ensure that the Board in their wisdom or folly.....

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tolerate rulings from the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on the floor. I will ask both hon. members to take their seats. *(Both hon. members took their seats.)* The hon. and learned senior member for St. John has risen on a point of order. Will the hon. member complete the point of order on which he has risen as precisely as possible?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: My first point of order is that the hon. member says that this is a Resolution for the purpose of buying buses. I do not know who is running the hon. member's business for him.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is a point of disorder.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot arise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Buses run all around. The hon. member has not checked this with the Director from the time that the system has been instituted. It is not true that people have to walk from Bank Hall to the City.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made. Did I hear from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the words: "What is the point of order?" Let the hon. member rise and make his point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am going on with this Resolution and if I am allowed to be interrupted, then 1966 will

be drawn into 1967, I am not going any further. I am quite willing and ready now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The year 1966 must go into the year 1967. It cannot go into the year 1968.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Transport Board has negotiated a Bank loan of \$300,000 repayable in five years. According to the Addendum to this Resolution, the rate of interest chargeable on the loan is the rate applicable to prime commercial borrowers which is currently 7 1/2% but may not exceed the legal limit of 8% per annum. 6.40 p.m.

The advantage of the loan is that it should be guaranteed by the Government and this Resolution seeks approval for the guarantee. The loan is to finance the purchase of additional rolling stock for the Transport Board. Ten bodies will be constructed locally and will be fitted on imported chassis while eleven buses will be purchased from the Progressive Bus Company.

Sir, while I am stating this as regards the buying of these buses, I must give my facts. I am not a twister; I cannot dance the twist. I do not know how to twist; I can only go by what is stated here. If the Hon. Prime Minister wants me to do otherwise than that, I cannot do that and say that it is not for the purpose of buying buses. It has clearly been stated that it is to buy rolling stock. The Hon. Prime Minister is a lawyer and he must know what is the meaning of rolling stock.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution is to approve the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of the sum of \$300,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board, together with interest thereon, for the purpose of meeting its obligations and discharging its functions.

Mr. SMITH: If this is not approved by, say, tonight, is the guarantee worth anything, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to give a legal opinion.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if this matter could be done without us, it would not have been here. There is some reason for bringing it here and so long as it is here, it concerns the people; therefore the people should know about it.

I am drawing to the attention of the Government that the people have complained to me, and if it is anything relating to Government, the Government should hear what it is. I do not know if Government does not hear these things. I do not know if they do not care anything about the people and try to muzzle them; I cannot be muzzled and will never be muzzled by anyone.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister when he rose said he was on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH sat down.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I object to the hon. member saying that we are trying to muzzle him. The Transport service is one which we expect to hear complaints about. I want to inform the hon. member that the complaints that there is no such service is untrue because there is such a service. It is not for the Leader of the Opposition to tell Your Honour if that is out of order or in order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything on a point of order. I made an observation which was not meant for the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would excuse any new member of the Chamber for that, but with great reluctance would I excuse an hon. member of this House with the experience of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am telling you that the people do not get the service which they were accustomed to get in that area. If the hon. member is telling me that what I have said just now is wrong, well I am saying that the people cannot get the service in that area. I have to send a motor car to get a certain individual to the job in the morning. A bus may pass by, but not at the time to suit this individual.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Somebody may have taken the hon. member for a ride.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not so sure if it is.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I want you to rule and do not let the Prime Minister make sport.

Sotto voce remark from the Government side.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, have you heard him?

Now, Sir, I have also been told that there are people walking from part of Cave Hill, Codrington Hill across to the Bow Road to catch the Bush Hall buses so as to get into Bridgetown and so as to get away from walking all the way from the Deep Water Harbour. What it is that the Hon. Prime Minister is getting up and telling me about? It is easier for them to walk across the Bow Road and catch a Bush Hall bus so as to get nearer to their jobs in the heart of the City than to take a bus which is going to the Deep Water Harbour. They have to walk from there, and that is a thing which they never did before. I do not think that is fair to the travelling public of this island. It is not fair for the Government to be making changes which are going to create a hardship on the people. If the members on the other side did not hear of it, I have heard of it and I say it. I am telling the Government that Cave Hill buses are getting very little trade from that end and the Bush Hall buses are getting the trade. It is not that the people do not want to take the Cave Hill buses, but those buses carry them all the way down the Deep Water Harbour and then they have to walk a much longer distance than if they walk across the Bow Road and catch the Cave Hill buses.

I agree that the Government is trying to get away from the congested areas and things of that sort. But the people come first. You took them down there before you were ready. Because of that the people are burnt by the sun and then the rain comes down and wets them. I do not see any facilities in that stand. I do not see the use of making a change. You could have thought of a nearer site.
6.50 p.m.

I cannot see the reasons for making the change before you gave the necessary facilities. I am talking, Sir, for those people who are not able to buy a car, and I ought not to be doing that. I ought to be supporting the people who buy cars so that I can 'fix-them-right'; but I have to remember those poor working people who are unable to buy a car, who work as hard as anything and are tired on evenings, and then have to walk this long distance which the people in Bridgetown are not accustomed to. Whenever I pass a bus stop in the Bridgetown area, I see crowds waiting for a bus. In the country where I live, two or three miles are nothing for people to walk, but the people in Bridgetown are not accustomed to it. Must I say that since the people in the country can walk, the people in Bridgetown can walk too? You must not make it hard for them, although that is the policy of this Government - to make it hard for them all the time; and it is my policy to show them that it is not the right policy and that something should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I passed through the area of the bus stand last Saturday or Sunday and the sun was broiling hot, and there were these poor people standing waiting for a bus with nowhere to shelter. Why carry them there before you were ready? It is only because you can tell the bus concessionaires to carry the buses there. You have done that

without thinking of the inconvenience, hardship and embarrassment you are causing to the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that his points are no doubt extremely material and important, but they do not come specifically within the ambit of this Resolution which is to approve the guarantee by the Government of a sum of \$300,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board! I can appreciate the points which have been made which are no doubt important points, but they may very well be dealt with by way of questions to the Government as to the routes and so on for buses to travel; but to go into detail in respect of these routes does not in my view come within the ambit of a Resolution which is generally just to approve the guarantee by the Government of certain sums.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, it is not your view. My view is that this money is to buy rolling stock.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand it, irrespective of my view, the Resolution reads "Resolved that the House of Assembly under the provisions of Section 15 of the Transport Board Act, 1955, approve the guarantee by the Government of the sum of \$300,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board for the purpose of meeting their obligations and discharging their functions under the said Act."

My point is that although these buses and these routes must come within the ambit of the Transport Board, so far as this Resolution is concerned, we are not concerned with particular routes which are or are not being serviced. We are merely concerned with approving or disapproving of a guarantee by the Government of a certain sum of money.

Mr. SMITH: This Resolution in my view is asking permission to get money to improve the bus service of the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. It is to approve a guarantee by the Government. The Government, as I understand it, gives the guarantee, but the guarantee will not be in order unless the Parliament of this country approves it.

Mr. SMITH: It is to guarantee.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is to approve.

Mr. SMITH: It is to approve the guarantee to get this money. And this money is to do what?

Mr. SPEAKER: This money is to be borrowed by the Transport Board for the purpose of meeting their obligations and discharging their functions. I may point out that the question of running buses on certain routes is important and vital, but so far as this Resolution is concerned, it does not arise specifically. The matter can arise, but does not arise with this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you were not in the House today, but the hon. junior member for Christ Church said that I could be a good lawyer - I read what I want to read and leave off - and you look too much as if you are doing this with this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I accept that as the definition of a good lawyer.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, where you have left off, I am going on. The loan is to finance the purchase of additional rolling stock for the Transport Board. The bodies for ten buses will be constructed locally and fitted on imported chasses while eleven buses will be purchased from the Progressive Bus Company.

Now the Transport Board is telling us after we have given our approval what they are going to do with the money. I am therefore drawing to the attention of the Transport Board the embarrassment to the people, and I would like this embarrassment and these hardships relieved. It is not that I want to prolong the debate or attack any person;

I want to represent my people. I want to let my people know that they are not forgotten by me, and I am trying to draw to the attention of the Minister and the Government that they should do something as soon as possible. If the Transport Board had said that a portion of this money is to erect sheds and so on for these people, that would encourage me to approve it more quickly; but up to now they have not, which makes me believe that these people will be there in the sun and rain all the time. I have not seen any provision in this Resolution for it, and I am asking the Minister to call on the authorities and ask them what about shelters for these people.

Mr. Speaker, this bus stand is on your route and you have seen the people waiting there yourself. When I pass there and see them, I feel for them because I am in my car while they are outside burning up. I feel I would get out of my car if I had a chauffeur and send them along in it. It is not fair for any Government member or representative of the people to be driving in his big limousine and big sports car and passing these poor people burning up in the sun. That is how I look at it. Everybody is not in a position to own a car, but those who do not own a car make an effort to use the buses. It is, therefore, the Government's duty to accommodate them as much as possible. I do not know if latrine facilities are provided down there. It is not good enough to have these people suffering like that, and I am ever so proud of this opportunity to draw it to the Government's attention. I know that they do not feel happy when I am on the floor, but I am representing the people and those responsible for the overwhelming amount of votes I received in my constituency, and that is why - they can sing the Hymn - they cannot remove me from St. Joseph, and I am going to make the Island see that St. Joseph has two honest representatives.

7.00 p.m.

Whenever I see anything that is wrong, it is my duty to draw it to the attention of the Government. If they do it, I have won, and if they do not do it, I have still won. They may have the idea that if they do not do what I say, they will be out. The people will say that you did your best. I will do all that is possible for the good of the people of Barbados and not merely the people of St. Joseph. You may have a coke in the morning and you want your breakfast. The cook arrives late and you are bound to arrive late for work as well. It is either a question of arriving at work hungry or arriving late. You have people who are waiting for a bus and there is no bus. The Government will have to consider the business people. It is like soap and water; it is a business which we have to look into. Each person wants to get to his job, and there are some people who lose their jobs if they arrive late for their work. Sometimes they will put the fault on the buses.

I want to see the bus service improved, but I also want to see the service run as it should be run. I would like to get the "rat traps" off the road. On the last occasion on which I referred to these buses as rat traps, the Hon. Minister told me that we would soon be without these rat traps. We were asked for our approval and we gave our approval for them to have these buses, but we did not see them. I hope that the Minister has got down my questions. I will repeat them for him. I want to know the financial position of the Board, because when I go to the Bank, the Manager wants to see my balance sheet. I have to go in for a review so that he can see how things are going. Just as the Bank Manager would question me, I am questioning the Minister. I want to know how many buses have arrived in the island as a result of the last amount of money which was borrowed; how many buses have been built locally; how much is the agreed price for Mr. Birch's buses and how many buses are on the road and are road-worthy. I will sit and await the Minister's reply.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, on reading this Resolution and hearing the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I think that the hon. member has dealt extensively with the matter and it is quite understood. We are being asked by this Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of the sum of \$300,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board, together with interest

thereon, for the purpose of meeting its obligations and discharging its functions. This loan is to finance the purchase of additional rolling stock for the Transport Board, and all that concerns the Board, I feel that any hon. member could stand up and speak on the subject of transport. I have been listening to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph; I cannot say anything about the routes which he has mentioned, but I will speak about the routes which I know. I use the bus now because it is more convenient and pleasurable for me. That is so because I do not have the strain of driving the car. Since the change has taken place, I have decided to use the bus so as to see the routes and to hear comments. The only way in which I can get these things right is to use the bus on mornings and on evenings.

In my area, the bus route is all right, but as regards the matter of bus stands and the other things about which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has spoken, they are very glaring. I suppose hon. members have passed along the Princess Alice highway. In that vicinity, since the buses have started operating from there, I have learnt that these buses will be parked just as you see them now, and inside the area, there will be a park. I have been told that in that area, the bus stand is for a tourist attraction. Well, Sir, it may be all right to beautify the area, but at the same time I am asking the Hon. Minister to consider for the needs of the people. I am asking him to see that a shed of some sort is erected there for the convenience of the people who are using the buses.

7.10 p.m.

If you should miss a bus on that route coming up and the rain comes down, there should be a small bus shelter of some kind there, as large as to hold a bus load of people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Where?

Mr. HOLDER: I am speaking of the bus stop near by the Arts College. Really, when I am driving my car along there, I am looking for accidents and to avoid them. It is the bus stop near by the Arts College. You can put a bus shelter along there. As I have said, I understand that they intend making that area in a garden or something of that sort for a tourist attraction.

I am asking the Hon. Minister in charge of this portfolio to see if something can be done to help the people who are waiting along there for a bus. He should not sit back and do nothing because something should be done to help them. They are exposed to the sun and to the rain so long as they are waiting there for a bus.

Before that site down by the Deep Water Harbour was made a bus stand, there were large evergreen trees there, but now the travelling public waiting there for a bus is exposed to the sun and rain, and sometimes the people have to wait there for quite a long time.

There are other things which can be done as regards transport, but speaking on this motion for which we are to approve the guarantee by the Government of the repayment of this sum to be borrowed by the Transport Board, I would like to see some part of that place taken up and a bus shelter placed on it. I would not like to see the whole of it put into a garden. It would create some difficulty to the people who await alongside there to catch a bus.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before this House seeks to approve the guarantee by the Government of the loan of \$300,000 for the Transport Board. As I understand it, this money is to enable the Board to meet its obligations and discharge its functions. My feeling is that the Transport Board's primary obligation must be to the people who support the Transport Board; that is, the passengers who use the buses. As such, Sir, I am to wonder after this speech which was made by the senior member for St. Joseph if any attempts were made to help the travelling public.

While discussing the Resolution, I am wondering if I am in a position at this stage to examine what in truth and fact has caused the Hon. Prime Minister to bring this

Resolution before the House. It is mainly because the Board has to meet certain obligations. These obligations must, first of all, be to the passengers who use the buses. I think I can say that where the Transport Board has accepted the responsibility on certain routes, you can say that the people who have got to rely on the buses to get to their jobs are suffering. I want to lay some emphasis on suffering. I may tell you that not only are these people suffering to get to their jobs and elsewhere, but it goes further than that. If we who sit here do not give our approval to this guarantee by the Government, it would mean that the Transport Board would not have enough rolling stock to meet the requirements of the people who use the buses to get backward and forward.

Now, why have I asked that question? It is because we have seen that while the Transport Board and the other concessionaires might be trying in some measure to meet the requirements of the travelling public, the suffering of these people has been so great that we find that lots of motor vans, called pick-ups, are plying on some of these routes. That has come about because the Transport Board has not been able to provide buses enough to meet the requirements of the travelling public. What do you find? At this stage, you find that the Hon. Minister has come before the House to get its approval to guarantee this loan, but a lot more than that is being done. We are not even told that buses cannot be acquired in a single day or night, 7.20 p.m.

I know that buses cannot be acquired in a single day or night, and although some reference has been made to the buses taken over or proposed to be taken over from the Progressive Bus Company, what I would like to know is the age of these buses. That is what we have got to concern ourselves with, because what we have to guard against is that we may run up against the Government having \$300,000 with which to buy buses, then we are told that the buses are so old that the Insurance Companies refuse to take any insurance on them. The Minister is in a better position than anybody to tell us this, and that is why we must direct our questions to him. We find that, after waiting for long periods, people who would be glad to be passengers are left because the buses are already filled when they reach them, and if a pick-up comes along and can take them, they get to work half an hour or three quarters of an hour late. What I would like to know is whether, after we give our approval to this, the Board will be able to provide enough buses so that we will not find people waiting and suffering any longer, because I feel that the motor vans perform such a valuable and useful service, that the Minister ought to come on an occasion close to this with a comprehensive policy for transport in general. The question of the motor vans is not for them unfortunately, but the service they have been providing for the waiting and suffering public is now being curtailed in very many respects.

I find, Sir, that the people will have to wait and continue to wait for a long time until the Government takes this money we are going to approve and spend it in the right direction. The motor vans which accommodate the people whom the buses apparently cannot accommodate do not rob the buses, but in truth and in fact they assist the travelling public, and now they have been directions to carry less passengers than twenty-two. I am just trying to show you what service these motor vans give by way of helping the travelling public who cannot get buses.

Mr. SPEAKER: I fully appreciate the point which the hon. member has so effectively made, and may I suggest, having made the point that he should not dilate on it. He has made it so well already and so succinctly though it does not come within the ambit of this Resolution. This Resolution is merely to approve the guarantee of a loan by the Transport Board. Let the hon. member proceed without dealing with this point anymore. If I needed to be convinced, the hon. member has convinced me.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is telling us that this Resolution is asking our approval of a guarantee for a loan of \$300,000 for the Transport Board, but what

made me go so far is that the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution made mention even of bus fares.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps that is one instance in which the Hon. Minister went further than he need have in introducing the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I take that to mean we must not always follow the Minister:

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless he is of one particular Church or denomination.

Mr. HINDS: We were told that the buses were seized in 1955 and taken over to the Transport Board yard, but it would be of interest for people to be told who seized the buses. This brings me to one point further. We ought to be told now if the buses that the Transport Board is now to buy from the Progressive Bus Company are not buses that already belong to the Transport Board. I understand and appreciate what the Minister meant when he made use of the word "seized", but if I can remember correctly, Sir, some of the buses which were handed over as far as I know to the Transport Board in 1955 or thereabouts came from the Progressive Bus Company, and the Progressive Bus Company at a later date received back from the Transport Board a number of buses. Like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, all of us on this side want to know the financial position of the Transport Board, because if proper and thorough investigations are carried out, this House might be told at some later date that it could have effected a saving on the purchase of the buses of the Progressive Bus Company. I must tell you, Sir, of the suffering of the travelling public between the hours of 6.30 a.m. and 9.30 a.m., between 11.00 a.m. and 12.30 p.m., and then again on afternoons after 3.30 p.m. 7.30 p.m.

I am to tell you, Sir, that the Transport Board, according to the Addendum to this Resolution, is to purchase additional rolling stock with a part of this money. We are glad to see this. I heard the Hon. Minister say that in 1955 bus parts and whatever else were left in open yards elsewhere. I am wondering if, in giving our approval to this guarantee, anybody can give us the assurance that whatever rolling stock is purchased, it will be protected for the taxpayers of this island, whose money it will be, in truth and in fact that is being borrowed from the Bank which has been given this guarantee and which only awaits our approval. We are glad to be told that the Transport Board has now made a profit, I understand, of \$49,000. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if they have been able to pin-point the source from which this saving was affected or accumulated, that is, if it is a case where there is a more exact accounting system carried out by the Office staff, or if it is a case where bus fares are really now being paid, because nobody credits bus fare. If you do not have your five cents or ten cents, you just cannot get on the bus. We may be told whether there is an army of inspectors. From these figures which have been given to me, I think that there are 52 inspectors and a fleet of 117 buses or something like that. I am wondering if they have found out that by not employing more than 52 inspectors, they have been able to effect a saving, or if it is a case where all the money received in bus fares is reaching the Head Office and after it reaches the Head Office the accounting can be so conducted as to reflect this sum of \$49,000 which we have been told is a saving.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is saving of \$49,000 is not merely a saving on paper, because the Hon. Minister might find that when this rolling stock is purchased and he comes at some later date to have his staff to take stock, well, we would like to be told that the rolling stock really did come in. If it is a case of giving the approval of this House to this guarantee with a view to bringing relief to the travelling public, if it is to bring relief to those young men and women who have to wait for such long hours to get into Bridgetown or other places where they have to get to their work, I can assure you that this side of the House would give this Resolution our approval without any hesitation whatsoever. We hope the Minister will give us the little information for which we have asked.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who seeks to contribute to this debate, the hon. introducer of this Resolution may exercise his right of final reply. (AFTER A PAUSE). There being no other hon. member who seeks to contribute to this debate, the Hon. Minister of Communications may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to say that some hon. members in this Chamber seem to think that the House of Assembly is some pentecostal Mission where each and every one of us must testify in order to save his soul. Everybody apparently seems to stand on his feet and use some words which I heard used in this Chamber recently, and to give a good display of buffoonery and laughter. I do hope that when hon. members on the opposite side of the House have now seen it actually written and if they can read then they should understand. In reply to members on the opposite side, I distinctly read out that with the first loan which the Transport Board obtained from the Bank, they had bought ten Leyland Buses, ten Bedford Buses and ten chasses. I even told them the exact amount of money that was used. It may be, Sir, that I went a little too far in giving that information but I was just trying to save time, because I realised that we have been sitting here since 9 o'clock this morning; 7.40 p.m.

but if hon. members want to play it hard, I can play it hard too. I now understand Mr. Speaker that certain provisions which should have been made are not even made. If hon. members on the opposite side want to play their politics hard, I am willing, ready and able.

When I was speaking on the Resolution, I said that the \$600,000 was for the purchase of ten Bedford buses complete, ten Leyland Chasses and the construction of ten bodies for Leyland chasses and I said that the remainder would be used to meet any unforeseen expenditure. I said that \$531,802.23 of that amount was spent already. I also said that we have bought over the buses of the Progressive Bus Company and we gave \$44,024.00 for them.

Mr. SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear what this \$44,024.00 was for.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said it was to purchase buses from the Progressive Bus Company. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that he has not seen these ten Bedford buses. The hon. member said that he goes out of his way to take up people who cannot get a bus. I wonder if that person is a male or female.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of sex does not arise in this House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Now, Sir, I am going to reply to the question. I hope hon. members on the other side have heard all that I had to say as regards the loan of \$600,000 as I do not intend to repeat myself. I said that of the loan of \$600,000 the sum of \$531,802.23 was spent.

When the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said and repeated himself that buses were difficult to get on that route and spoke of hardship which the travelling public was meeting, that is not true. The hon. member does not read the newspapers or listen to the news because this was given to the newspapers. It was in the "Daily News", the "Advocate" as well as it came over the C.B.C. and Rediffusion. The buses are not all run by the Transport Board. Route 24 B is not run by the Transport Board. Nobody who comes in here should expect to give that statement which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph gave because it is not true. When the hon. member said that we on this side want to muzzle him, I would like the hon. member to be assured that nothing could be further from the truth. It would take quite a lot of leather to muzzle him.

Another point which I would like to make is this. The reason why buses were disallowed from using the Fairchild Street bus stand is because we have people in this community who live on crises and we look at this as a crisis.

One day a bus was driven along the Careenage and the bow of a schooner was overhanging too far in the road and the bus hit it. If one day a bus runs into the wharf, many lives would be lost and then this Government would be getting complaints about buses running along there. As a result, we on this side are not satisfied that the transport of passengers in buses should pass along the wharf. You might be in the bus, Mr. Speaker; so we have tried to see if we can prevent that sort of thing happening.

Sir, you have people in this community, no matter what this Government does, they can never see it for the good of the community. They always take what this Government is trying to do for the benefit of the masses and twist it to suit their imagination. As I said, that is one of the reasons why we have stopped these buses coming into the Fairchild Street bus stand. Another reason is because the town is expanding. Just now, you are going to have a Post Office down by the Deep Water Harbour.

When the hon. member talked of people standing in the sun, I have had the privilege of going to other lands and I have never seen in those places a bus stop where people do not have to wait for a bus, and while doing so standing in the sun and the rain. There is a terminus here at the Constitution bus stand. When people get off there, they just have to walk over a bridge into the market where they sell their wares, so we have made it easier for them. Furthermore, as regards the Princess Alice bus stand, the buses do not deposit the passengers there; they deposit them on Cowell Street; so the people are well provided for, even better than before. 7.50 p.m.

When the hon. junior member for St. Peter talked about the returning of the buses, I would like to draw to his attention that the buses were seized, I think, in 1955, and Mr. Birch got back his buses in 1955; so we never had his buses for any length of time - perhaps not more than a week. But I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that when the Federal Buses were handed back, the then Cabinet knew absolutely nothing about it. It is claimed that one member of the Cabinet alone knew about these buses being handed back. I do not know what agreements were made, but I am only bringing these points to show that when members are asking questions, they have to be careful because I have a fairly good memory. It is very significant that Mr. Birch got back his buses after reconsideration, but the gentleman who obtained the Federal buses never had a pick-up before.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter is saying that he hopes the saving is not on paper. I made a statement to the House, and it could only mean that he either doubts my veracity and is calling me a stranger to the truth, or he is annoyed that under our guidance the Transport Board can show a net profit of \$49,000.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that from what the hon. junior member for St. James has said, I am very glad that he entered the debate, because to be forewarned is to be forearmed. He said that when he is driving he looks for an accident. I thank him very much for that, because I will try to avoid him as much as possible whenever I meet him on the road.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas misunderstood me, and he seemed to be listening so intently, I will repeat what I said with your permission. I said that when I am driving I do not look around; I keep my eyes out for accidents. That is to say, I am on the alert to avoid an accident. Traffic on my road is heavy, being in the tourist resort area, and you know, Sir, that sometimes when you get to Eagle Hall corner it is very difficult to get along that road. I try to get away from the traffic by going by way of Green Hill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of explanation has been made. The Chair took it that the hon. junior member for St. James, having certain constituents who are in the legal profession, in looking out for accidents was looking out for at least some of his constituents.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, if what the hon. member has just said is what he meant, apparently, the English language being a bit ambiguous, I read into it that what he said he meant. Anyhow, Sir, before I sit down I should like to tell hon. members on the opposite side that the Transport Board has absolutely nothing to do with bus shelters. They do not build bus shelters. I should hate to think that anybody could be so dense and abysmally ignorant - I am not speaking of anybody in this Chamber - as to expect that a Resolution asking this House to approve a guarantee of a loan for the Transport Board could have something to do with bus shelters.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, are not unmindful of any legitimate complaint; but as I have said before, people just like to complain, and I believe that is one of the good reasons when the Almighty was making the world that he made the world first and man after, because if he had made man first, some people would want two suns, and somebody would want five moons and all that. Before I sit down, I should like to say that in my life and going around I have met people and things I have had to ignore, and when I hear asides, I put them in the same category among such people and things.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, through you I had asked the hon. member how many buses are on the road.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not through me. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. SMITH: But he was to reply. I asked him how many of Birch's buses were on the road and he did not give the reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member does not have to reply. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph might send the Whip of his Party around to speak to the Whip of the other Party to remind him. If the Whips are off duty, the question may be put in good time.

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

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (EMOLUMENTS) ACT, 1967

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day, and this is the last item which I have already notified hon. members opposite we will do.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The instant Order of the Day is that which is designated No. 5 and stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking its indulgence to take charge of this Bill standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision in respect of the emoluments appertaining to the office of Governor-General of Barbados, 8.00 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members will notice the requirements of this Bill. They will notice also that the figures of the new emoluments are set out in the Schedule on page 5 of the Bill. Apart from the increased

emoluments, I should just like to draw to their attention that in this Bill provision is also made with respect to the emoluments to be paid to the person who is acting as Governor-General from time to time. The present position is that, or rather in the Colonial days whenever a member of the Civil Service acted as Governor, the custom was to pay the person acting in the post one half of his own salary and one half of the salary of the Governor. What we propose to do in this Bill is that whenever a person acts as Governor-General as distinct, of course, from somebody acting as the Governor's Deputy, he shall, for the time that he is acting as Governor-General, receive the full emoluments of the Office.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else which the House may wish to know in this respect. On or about the month of October, 1965, the Secretary of State for the Colonies informed this Government that the United Kingdom Government had proposed to pay to the Governor a non-pensionable allowance, which is additional to his salary, of £750 per annum, which was increased to £1,000. This is subject to income tax. On the 30th November that was the allowance which the Governor used to draw, but it has ceased and hon. members will note that the proposal as outlined in the Schedule to this Bill is to increase the emoluments of the Governor-General from \$19,200, which it now is, per annum to \$23,040 per annum and the duty allowance which is at the rate of \$9,600 per annum remains the same. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

8.10 p.m.

Clause 11 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 31st January, 1967, at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, before the House disperses today, I would like to congratulate you on behalf of all of us on behalf of the anniversary which you now celebrate. Tomorrow will be the thirtieth unbroken year that Your Honour has been in

this House and it has been distorted in the debate over the last two days; but I think all hon. members wish you, as I myself wish you, our heartiest congratulations of your reaching this great milestone in your career. I wish Your Honour to know that we congratulate you very warmly on your anniversary.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I think that you certainly know why only a few members from our side are present now. At any rate, I have known Your Honour for many years and I am sure that members on this side of the House, although their seats are empty, would wish me to congratulate Your Honour and wish you all good things on the celebration of your anniversary. May you be long spared to preside over this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very grateful to the Hon. Leader of the House and the hon. junior member for St. James who was my colleague for many years for their good wishes. I wish I would be spared to see the day when I shall be a member of this House for three decades.

Again, I thank hon. members for their good wishes.

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

The question that this House now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 31st January, 1967 at 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.17 p.m.

