

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th November, 1967

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S.,
(*Speaker*); Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY,
C.B.E., J.P.; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E.
TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*);
Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of*
Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C.
WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L.A. LYNCH, J.P.
Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and*
Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (*Chairman of Committees*);
Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy*
Speaker) Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P. and Mr. L. S. CRAIG.

Prayers were read.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS
entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that I am glad to see hon. members back after the Summer recess, and to inform hon. members that the Minutes of the following Meetings have been, I am told, circulated and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

There are the Meetings of the 2nd, 23rd, 25th and 30th May, 1967; 13th, 20th, 27th and 30th June, 1967; 4th, 18th and 25th July, 1967; 1st, 8th, 15th, 22nd and 29th August, 1967; 5th and 12th September, 1967.

If there is any objection to any of these Minutes hon. members will indicate which date. (A PAUSE)

I take it that hon. members have availed themselves of the opportunity of reading these Minutes.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have discovered some errors in some of these Minutes but, unfortunately, I did not make a note of the dates. I wonder if these Minutes can be confirmed now, and if there are any other mistakes along with those which I have found we can raise them and let you know.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said and the fact that hon. members had quite a heavy task of perusing 18 sets of Minutes, I would suggest that we leave over the confirmation of them until the next meeting of this Honourable House by which time hon. members would have adequate opportunity, I hope, to read them carefully.

LETTER FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from His Excellency the Governor-General which was dated 22nd September, 1967, and which reads as follows:-

Your Honour,

I have the honour to inform you that at the invitation of the United Kingdom Government, I shall be paying an official visit to London from Thursday, 19th October, until Saturday, 28th October, 1967. Thereafter, I propose to pay a brief private visit to New York, returning to Barbados on Saturday, 4th November. Arrangements have been made for me and my wife to travel to London on Wednesday, 18th October by B.O.A.C. Flight BA 696 leaving at 6.30 p.m. and to return to Barbados from New York by Flight PA 229 on 4th November arriving here at 3.20 p.m.

2. During my absence, Senator the Honourable E. S. Robinson, C.B.E., President of the Senate, will be appointed to act as Governor-General from Wednesday, 18th October, until Tuesday, 24th October, when the Honourable W. R. Douglas, Chief Justice, will have returned to the Island. Mr. Douglas will thereafter be appointed to perform the duties of acting Governor-General from Wednesday, 25th October, until my return to the Island on the 4th November.

3. As the House of Assembly has gone into recess and will not have resumed sitting before my departure, it has not been possible to address formal Messages to the Legislature. I am, therefore, com-

municating my proposed absence to the House through Your Honour.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Honour's obedient servant,
(Sgd) A. WINSTON SCOTT,
Governor-General

LETTER FROM Mrs. EDNA COLEMAN

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform this House also that I have received a letter from Mrs. Edna Coleman dated 13th September, 1967.

She thanked this House for the letter of the 7th instant conveying a copy of a Resolution of Sympathy and was glad if I would convey to hon. members her deep appreciation.

It also stated that it was very gratifying to her to know how much her husband was respected by so many.
2.55 p.m.

I have also received from Messrs. Fitzpatrick, Graham & Co. a letter dated 7th October, 1967:

"The Honourable Speaker,
The House of Assembly,
BARBADOS.

Sir,

SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

I wish to offer myself for re-appointment as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1967, under Section 4 (7) (1) of the Act - 1943 - 15, at a remuneration of £125.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) J. MILLIKEN

Hon. members will realise that he is offering himself for re-appointment for the period commencing 1st July, 1967.

I have also received a copy of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue for the year 1965-1966.

I wish to acknowledge the receipt of the Accounts and Statement for February, 1967, as prepared by the Accountant General.

There is also a letter from Mr. John Birt Evelyn thanking the House for their expression of sympathy at the death of his Uncle, Mr. George Birt Evelyn, C.B.E.

There is also a letter from Mr. A. L. Evelyn doing likewise.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Customs Duties (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1967.

The Customs Duties (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1967.

The Caribbean Free Trade Association (Origin of Goods) Regulations, 1967.

The Exports and Imports (Caribbean Free Trade Association) Order, 1967.

The Customs (Caribbean Free Trade Association) Order, 1967.

Barbados Union Oil Company (Levy on Petroleum Products) (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations, 1967.

The Customs Duties (University Gowns and Hoods) Order, 1967.

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island for the quarter ended 30th September, 1967.

Statement of Accounts showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September, 1967.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th June, 1967.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 30th June, 1967.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amount repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st July, 1967.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Report on Probation Services for the year 1963.

Annual Report of the Public Assistance Board for the period April 1966 - March 1967.

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

Sixteenth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Natural Gas Corporation for the period from 1st April, 1966 to 31st March, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Leader of the House, I am commanded to lay the following:

Barbados Police Force (Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$4,380 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 26 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$1,335 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 25 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$99,767 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 24 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

3.05 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Leader of the House, I beg to give notice of a Bill to permit a more equitable distribution of the money paid to the Commissioner of Police for the services of the Band for the benefit of the Director of Music and the other members of the Band.

ORAL REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Leader of the House, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 66, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Also on behalf of the Hon. Leader of the House, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 57, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is also ready.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are also ready:-

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 69, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 71 asked by the same hon. member.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 88 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 31, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter is ready.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready:-

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 44, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 72, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready:-

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 1 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 93, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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 Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition. His Resolution *re* the conduct of His Honour the Deputy Speaker.

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

This House deplores the conduct of His Honour, the Deputy Speaker, in his putting to the vote a motion by the Prime Minister which had the effect of putting an end to a debate while a speaker was on his feet addressing the House on a Resolution affecting loans to the Barbados Marketing Corporation;

This House considers the conduct of His Honour the Deputy Speaker worthy of the greatest censure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* early statement by the Prime Minister *re* conference of Heads of Governments of Caribbean Commonwealth Countries:-

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

This House calls on the Prime Minister to make an early statement to its members on the recently held Conference of the Heads of Government of the Caribbean Commonwealth Countries and to issue a White Paper on its conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* ruling of Mr. Speaker.

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

RESOLVED that this House has noted with alarm and profound regret the unwillingness of Mr. Speaker to rule against members of the Government when as sometimes happens words used by them are objected to as being offensive and a breach of Standing Order No. 26 (5).

The House further especially deplores the act of Mr. Speaker in making a ruling which led to disorder and the subsequent adjournment of its sitting on July 4th, 1967, and deems the action of Mr. Speaker as unworthy of the Chair and a cause for the gravest censure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* conference on the Anguillan situation.

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

RESOLVED that this House request the Prime Minister to make a Statement to this Chamber on the Conference recently held here on the Anguillan situation with special reference to the policy of this Government thereon as stated at the Conference.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* the country's general policy in relation to other nations.

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

RESOLVED that this House having to rely in the main on statements in the Press, often in newspapers outside of Barbados, for information on the foreign policy of this Government, calls on the Prime Minister, as Minister for External Affairs, to give to this House from time to time as events warrant, information of what is the country's general policy in relation to other nations and what steps he proposes to take to implement this policy.

This House is further of the opinion that before going to conferences with representatives of other countries the Prime Minister should inform it of the general nature of this country's policy on the matters to be discussed at such meetings and should report after each conference on its results and on the stand which he took on behalf of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution in relation to Government Pensioners.

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

RESOLVED that this House is of the opinion that in respect of the payment of Pensioners for whom the Government is responsible:

1. rates of payment should not be fixed in accordance with the actual contributions made by them (in whatever way made) during their working life but in accordance with their value adjusted to the wage or salary and price rates at the time of their retirement;
2. these payments should be adjusted annually to keep pace with rises in the cost of living so that pensioners could retain their value in terms of purchasing power.

This House is further of the opinion that changes in the laws necessary to obtain these results should be made to operate retrospectively.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* the absences of the Prime Minister from attendance at meetings of the House.

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

RESOLVED that this House condemns the frequent absences of the Prime Minister from attendances at its meetings, in breach of Standing Order No. 64, and calls on him to conform to the spirit as well as to the letter of that Order as is the custom of other Commonwealth Prime Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* ruling as to the precincts of the House.

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

RESOLVED that this House requests Mr. Speaker to rule as to what are the precincts of the House and specifically invites him to make the necessary arrangements whereby twenty-four spaces will be reserved for the parking of Hon. Members' cars at least on those days on which the House is sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His Resolution *re* the Standing Orders.

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

RESOLVED that this House having regard to the present state of its Standing Orders is of the opinion that a Select Committee on Procedure be set up to consider and to make recommendations for their revision.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph. His Question *re* workers employed in the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications Works & Housing:-

Is it a fact that workers from the various parishes of Barbados employed in the Department of Highways and Transport, have to travel to the Head Office of H & T at the Pine, St. Michael, during their vacation period for their wages?

If the answer is "Yes", will the Minister state the reason why?

3.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query *re* roads and bridges in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

In view of the promise given to this Honourable House by the Hon. Prime Minister in reply to the Hon. senior member for St. Joseph, that all the roads and bridges in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew of which he complained, would be immediately started on repair work after the completion of the Victoria Bridge; and (2) in view of the fact that the Victoria Bridge has been completed; will the Minister state if it is his intention to have these roads and bridges repaired in time for the start of the 1968 reaping season, including the tenantry roads?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state at the next meeting of this Hon. House when such repair work will start?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query *re* inmates of the St. Joseph's Infirmary.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is it a fact that it is the intention of this Government to transfer the inmates of the St. Joseph's Infirmary to the St. Thomas and St. Lucy Infirmaries?

2. If the answer is "Yes", will the Government consider the inconvenience and embarrassment that will be caused to the said inmates and relatives due to the unnecessary removal of the said inmates to such an unreasonable distance from the parish of St. Joseph, and refrain from doing so?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. James. His query *re* the servicing of sows.

Mr. HOLDER: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the hardship experienced by owners of sows who find it difficult for several reasons to have them serviced at the appropriate time?

2. Will the Minister consider putting into effect a system whereby such sows may be insemi-

nated by Agricultural Inspectors - similar to the system at present pursued with respect to cows?

3. In the alternative (or in addition), will the Minister consider providing transport for getting cows from the homes of their owners to the several Government Stations for service, upon the application of the owner and at a moderate hire?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query *re* parcel of land aback of St. Silas School.

Mr. HOLDER: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that a parcel of land containing approximately half acre aback of St. Silas Senior School, Orange Hill, St. James, has been acquired by Government several years ago for the purpose of providing a playing field for the pupils of the said School?

2. Will the Minister state the reason for the delay in providing this essential amenity to the pupils of the said school?

3. Will the Minister state how soon will this playing field be available for use by the said pupils?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas. His query *re* cost of travel by the present Chairman of the Tourist Board.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. What is the total cost of travel undertaken at Government expense by the present Chairman of the Tourist Board since 1962 to date?

2. What journeys to Canada were made by the person concerned between August 1st, 1966 and election day, November 3rd 1966, and how long a time was spent on each occasion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query *re* revenue to be gained from the issue of commemorative postage stamps.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the revenue to be raised and the publicity to be obtained for Barbados from the issue of a judicious number of commemorative postage stamps at regular intervals?

2. Has the Government got a policy on the issue of such stamps?

3. Will the Minister give consideration to an Annual Christmas issue, with or without surcharge for charity purposes, to be put on sale on or about the anniversary of Independence Day?

4. Is the Minister satisfied that the Post Office is adequately geared for proper consideration of potential new issues, and for proper servicing of philatelic buyers of Barbados stamps?

5. Will the Minister appoint an advisory Committee to give assistance in selecting subjects suitable for commemoration on stamps?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query re better Post Office facilities.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

Is the Minister aware that the need for better Post Office facilities in the parish of St. Thomas is becoming more acute with increased Post Office responsibilities in respect of National Insurance administration?

2. When will work start on the building of a new Post Office in St. Thomas, funds for which are provided in the Capital Vote for the Ministry of Communications and Works for 1967-68?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His query re a pavement.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the pavement between the new extension to the Central Police Station and Coleridge Street is partially unmade, partially broken and generally in bad repair?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have this pavement made up and surfaced to the same standard as the remainder of the pavement between Police Headquarters and Coleridge Street?
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his query re the Magistrate's Court of District "D".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Government aware that the need for improved accommodation for the Magistrate's Court of District "D" in the parish of St. Thomas continues to be acute?

2. When will work commence on the replacement of the present Court Room, funds for which have been voted under Head 105 of the Capital Estimates for 1967-68?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his query re the Bridgefield public bath.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works.

1. Is the Minister aware that there is a great demand and need for a public bath at Bridgefield in the Parish of St. Thomas?

2. Will the Minister take steps to provide such a bath forthwith?

I beg your pardon, Sir, this question is really addressed to the Minister of Community Development and not the Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James has made a query re a Comprehensive School for the Northern parishes of the Island.

Mr. L. S. CRAIG: To enquire of the Minister of Education:-

1. Is the Minister aware that there is need for a Comprehensive School to serve the pupil population of the Northern parishes of the Island?

2. Will the Minister consider the construction, at the earliest possible time, of such a school to be sited in the parish of Saint James, preferably at or near Folkestone, Holletown?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John has a query re a playing field at Gall Hill, St. John.

Mr. YEARWOOD: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that work on the project for the provision of a playing field at Gall Hill, St. John, has ceased?

2. Will the Minister state why?

3. Will the Minister state:

- (a) how soon will work on the said project be resumed;
- (b) the probable time when the said playing field will be ready for use?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member has a query re disposal of garbage.

Mr. YEARWOOD: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that the disposal of garbage in certain areas in the parish of Saint John leaves much to be desired?

2. Will the Minister consider, among other means of improving the present system of garbage disposal;

- (a) the construction of concrete dumps at central points in each village in the said parish;
- (b) the extension of the service of collecting refuse by truck from two visits per week to one visit per day in the said parish?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to permit a more equitable distribution of

the money paid to the Commissioner of Police for the services of the Band for the benefit of the Director of Music and the other members of the Band, be now read a first time.

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

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

MEMORANDUM re DEBATES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with an undertaking which I gave the House at the last meeting that I would present a statement to hon. members as to the position of the Debates and would make my report as extensive as possible, I have to state that during the summer recess I have sought certain data from the Clerk of the House in connection with the Debates and in respect of the minutes and documents of the House.

In his memorandum to me dated the 3rd November, 1967, he states *inter alia*:

Documents of the House

"As far as I can ascertain there are no documents of the House that have not yet been forwarded to the Government Printer for period December, 1961 to 31st October, 1967. Relative to the Financial Statements (or rather the Auditor General's Report on the Accounts and finances of the Island for the years 1964-65 and 1965-1966) the Government Printing Office is still in process of preparing the first of these two documents and have completed with respect thereto the Auditor General's Report and the accounts up to and including Head 24. The remaining Heads have not yet been presented to me for proofing. With regard to the Report and Accounts for 1965-66, these were laid on the Table of the House on 15th August, 1967, but were not handed in at the same time to the Government Printing Office. They have since, however, been forwarded and the position at the present moment is that the Auditor General has requested talks with the Government Printer and myself as to the format of the Printed Report. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has repeatedly enquired as to the probable time when the Report of 1965-1966 will be ready, and every effort will be made to have the Statements for both these years circulated to Members of the House as speedily as possible.

Debates of the House

All the Debates for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 have been printed. The debates for the period 3rd June, 1966 to 30th August, 1966 have not yet been handed to me by the Reporters owing to the fact that Mr. W. F. Burke, who acted as Official Reporter during that period, owing to the indisposition of two of the substantive holders of the post of Official Reporter, has not yet handed in his copy. The Debates of the period 6th September, 1966 to 4th October, 1966 (6 Debates) were handed to me during the month of October, 1966. Of these the Debate of

20th September, has been handed to the Government Printer, whereas the other five remain at present in my hand. By the time the House reconvenes on 7th November, they will be in the hands of the Government Printer, as only one of them remains to be edited by me.

All the Debates since the beginning of the new Session of Parliament (17th November, 1966) up to and including 4th July, 1967 have been handed in to the Government Printer, who has printed and gazetted the debates for the said period up to 30th May, 1967. In addition, the debate of 18th July, 1967, has also been printed and gazetted. The Debates of 11th July, 1967, 25th July, 1967 and 1st August, 1967 have been handed to the then Acting Clerk for proofing, whereas the debates for the period 8th August, 1967 to 29th August, 1967 are still in the hands of the Reporters. The reason for this is that Mrs. C. Gittens who acted as Official Reporter during that period, only today handed in her portion of the Debates of 8th August and 15th August, while the Debates of 22nd 23rd and 29th August still remain in her hands. The Debate of 5th September, 1967 has been handed to the Government Printer, while the Debate of 12th September, 1967, is still in the hands of the Clerk, as several portions of this debate, most particularly the Prime Minister's Speech on the Public Loan Amendment Bill, have to be checked.

3.35 p.m.

Minutes of the House

The Minutes of the month of March, 1964, have not yet been handed to the Government Printing Office. As the Session of Parliament ended on 31st March, 1964, these Minutes cannot be confirmed by the House, but must certainly be printed and kept for purposes of record. A similar situation exists with respect to the Minutes of the month of September, 1966 and 4th October, 1966. These Minutes also cannot be confirmed, owing to the dissolution of Parliament on Monday, 10th October, 1966. These sets of Minutes, which number 14 I shall endeavour to hand in to the Government Printing Office by the end of November, 1967. All the Minutes since 17th November, 1966, (the date when Parliament reconvened after the General Election), up to and including 12th and 13th September, 1967, (the date of the last meeting before the present recess) have been printed and circulated to members.

As required by you, I have summoned a meeting of the Debates Committee for today's date at 3.00 p.m. and a meeting of the House Staff Committee for Monday, 6th November, at 2.30 p.m."

The meeting of the Debates Committee duly took place.

I would add that I am convinced that unless the Clerk adheres rigidly to his terms and conditions of employment, and particularly observes the time schedule therein contained, there is little - if any - prospect of improvement in conditions in respect of the Office proper or any other department of activity connected with the Chamber. Example set by the Chief

Administrative Officer - good or bad - is likely to be emulated by subordinate officers; and I have given an unmistakably clear intimation to Mr. Clerk that his *regular attendance within the specified* hours should go a long way to ensure that the standard of efficiency which the Public is entitled to expect will at last be attained and maintained so far as this ancient Assembly is concerned. That is my statement.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re DEATH
OF Mrs. ENA GODDARD

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, Standing order 8 provides for the kind of statement which I have already consulted Your Honour upon.

It is customary that when close relatives of members of the House or former members of the House or distinguished foreign representatives pass on, this House takes notice of such events and offers its condolences to the relatives of the deceased. Last week, Mrs. Ena Goddard, a former employee and faithful servant to the Government of this island in the General Post Office and sister of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the Minister of Health, Housing and Community Development, passed to the Great Beyond I know for certain that she did not achieve the allotted span of three score years and ten, and if we take that as the general average of expectation, Mrs. Goddard was cut off at a time when she still probably had a lot to contribute to this society. I do not intend to go into any lengthy discourse on the various qualities which will be well known to the most senior members of this House who would have come into contact with her more than I, both socially and in the efficient discharge of her duties as a very respectable member of the staff of the General Post Office.

I shall only say that it is my sad duty to take note of the passing of this lady, Mrs. Ena Goddard, and to move the passing of this Resolution:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy with the hon. junior member for Christ Church at the passing of his sister, Mrs. Ena Goddard.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the hon. member."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to pay tribute to the late Mrs. Goddard. I find it very difficult to make a speech or even congratulate or sympathise with people in times of sorrow or of joy, as the case may be; and more especially when the subject of the speech is in relation to one like the late Mrs. Goddard and the rest of the Talma family who are known to me and to my family. 3.45 p.m.

The late Mrs. Goddard was a gentle, efficient, quiet, and most likable personality and, as the Hon. Prime Minister said, all of us do shower our condolences towards the Hon. Minister of Health even if it were not that the late Mrs. Goddard had only com-

pleted half of the span of man's allotted life. I do assure the Hon. Minister of Health that we all do share with him the sorrow which has befallen him and other members of his family.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I can say anything more. It is almost impossible to express the feelings of your heart to some one whom you knew and who has passed on.

Sir, I beg to second the motion made by the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, like the hon. mover and seconder of the motion, I too would like to add our deep condolences to the family, especially the Hon. Minister of Health, on the passing of the late Mrs. Edna Goddard. I believe most hon. members who had any business, by reason of which they had to go to the Post Office, would have come into contact with Mrs. Goddard.

Sir whether it is that a person had lived the allotted span of life or not, no one can get accustomed to death. We sincerely offer our sympathy to the Hon. Minister of Health and his family on the passing of the late Mrs. Goddard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to associate myself with the expressions of sympathy from all sides of the House to the Hon. Minister of Health. I knew the late Mrs. Goddard and I support everything that has been said about her this evening. I too join in offering my condolences to the Hon. Minister of Health as well as other members of his family.

I will therefore ask hon. members to rise in their places for two minutes to indicate their approval to the passing of this Resolution.

Hon. members stood in their places for two minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution, I declare, to have been unanimously passed and I direct that the Clerk of the Table without any delay forward a copy of this Resolution to the immediate family of the deceased.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think it only fitting to say a few words on this occasion in appreciation of the expressions of condolence offered to members of my family and myself, not only the Hon. Prime Minister but by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the ex-Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the passing of my sister.

I would like to express on behalf of my family our appreciation of all that has been granted to my sister from all sides of this House. I refer to the National Insurance Scheme. The deceased was a Civil Servant for many years and I am very happy that we have approved of this national Health Scheme and that my sister have lived long enough to benefit from it.

BILL TO REPEAL THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND LIMITED ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day of Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the second passing of a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited Act, 1964.

When this debate was last carried on, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, one can say that this debate on the West Indies Hospital Fund Limited Act, 1964, can be termed very stale. Therefore, Sir, I am not prepared to take up any time in trying to convince the Government that this West Indies Hospital Sweep Company should be asked to pull up its sticks and leave our nice island.

I think I have said sufficient as to convince hon. members of this House that if we allow this company to carry on, we stand to lose more than we can gain because when one loses one's good name, one loses all that one possesses.
3.55 p.m.

A good name is something that can take you out into the roughest sea, and it will bring you back to a very calm ocean. As I have said, I do not want to take up the time of hon. members, especially the members of the Government who have made up their minds on this matter. We, the Opposition have also made up our minds, and the people of Barbados have made up their minds. What have we made up our minds to do? We, on this side of the House, have made up our minds to save the good name of Barbados. The people of this country have made up their minds to do likewise, but the members of the Government have made up their minds to do otherwise. We cannot make them do what they do not want to do, but the people of this country will know what to do when the time comes.

The West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Fund is a very dangerous matter. I have noticed a board at the airport placed in a position that incoming and outgoing passengers can see it. This board has written on it the words: "West Indies Hospital Sweepstake; first prize \$750,000 (U.S.) \$297,500 (BWI). Help Barbados by buying a ticket."

Now when people go to the airport and see these lovely figures, it will encourage them to spend more than what they expected to spend because the bigger the prize, the more chances you will try to take, and the more tickets you will buy. The question now is: When these people buy these tickets and they are lucky enough to win some money, will they be able to receive the money? I understand that it is not so. People have won money by buying West Indies Hospital Sweepstake, but they have not received the money. That board at the airport is misleading the public. It is telling people all over the world that the people in Barbados are a pack of dishonest gangsters. That could be very damaging to the good name of Barbados.

We all expected that we would have received profits from the winnings of this organisation, but we have not received anything. The Government has not received the amount of money it was promised. The Turf Club has not received the assistance that it had been promised. We had to go to the assistance of the Turf Club by way of a contribution.

These people, I understand, are still allowed to operate in this island. It is for us to decide what to do with them. I am not against them; I do not know them at all. I do not know any of the people who are responsible for the operation of this organisation, but I have to defend the rights of the people of Barbados. I can only do that honestly by voting this afternoon and asking them to leave this good country.

We stand to lose more than we can afford. Some of us may be ashamed to tell them to go; some of us may have gone too far in the matter; some of us may be afraid to say one word. The hearts of some people may be ticking now and missing a beat because they do not know what is likely to happen. There may be a "call-back", or some exposure may be made, if these people are called upon to pull up their stakes and leave this country.

I am not saying that some people are so closely involved with them that they cannot do anything because they are afraid that an exposure will be made. If we are going to represent the people, we must represent them fully; we must always acquit ourselves in such a manner that we can look a man in the face and tell him the truth. Tell the people that they are wrong, and we cannot encourage this sort of thing any more. That is the life a politician must live. If he or she does not acquit himself or herself properly, then the people cannot expect proper representation.

I have always said on the floor of this House that an honest servant has no right to be afraid of his master. I believe that we are all honest servants here. We have no masters individually, and we have no kind of organisation to please. We have to please the electorate or the people who sent us here. I cannot represent any organisation because in some organisations it is difficult to know the kings and queens.
4.05 p.m.

I know that the Hon. Prime Minister knows some of them because he told us here how strong some of them are financially and how much money they have. Therefore he knows some of them, but your humble servant does not know them. If they are so strong financially, why will they not pay out the winnings? It makes me feel that they will always be strong, because when a man has to pay out money and he does not pay it out and nobody takes it from him, it swells high in the bank; therefore those people should be strong. Promises have been made in order to get the Government to bite and give them a licence, and the Government made a big bite but they have not bitten off anything. The Government has as much trouble to get the taxes out of them as the people have to get their winnings. Therefore, we must decide in one way or the other. I am sure that in whatever way the

Government decides, it will cause trouble for them; therefore they may as well decide in the right way and not in the wrong way. These people could not come into this country and start a gambling den without the admittance of this Government. They know that if the people stand to lose, the Government will be the cause of it.

I know that there is nobody who stands to win. The ones who did not buy any tickets got more than the ones who bought them. There are those who got handsome drawbacks, but they did not see their way to buy any tickets. It has been drawn to our notice that all is not well with these people. I am appealing to the Government and I have reasons for appealing to the Government. I have told them all that I have heard, they know some of it and they have allowed these people to carry on their business. I want to let the people of Barbados know that I have appealed to this Government not to allow these people to carry on here any more. I have my reasons for appealing to the Government. If my words are going to the ground, let them go to the ground. I know that the time will come when I will be able to stand up and tell the people of this country how this Government is thinking about their security when it comes to these gambling dens which are being set up in this country only to swipe their dollar bills, and they are not prepared even to pay you. You only have one chance but they have all the other chances. The person who spends a dollar has only one chance, but these people have the remainder of the chances. They will always be on the winning side and we will always be on the losing side. Somebody should win at some time; and when he wins he should receive his winnings. When anybody wins money of this sort, when luck has turned up its face, I believe that that money should really be framed and not be spent. It should be put around the house like pictures because it is no mean joke to win these people's money. You have to show the ball that shot Nelson in order to win this money. When they make a little slip, something comes your way.

If these people who win this money and do not receive it were to take up a cutlass and go to the office and do some cutting up, no law should charge these people. If I knew that I had won money and I went to the office and I am told that there is no money for me, and I had a chopper and I started to do some cutting up, I think that the law should be on my side. I would like to gamble, but I would like to put money into pocket, not to take it out. (*ASIDES*) Mr. Speaker, I hear a voice and I suppose it is that of a gambler. I would rather get somebody to do the gambling for me; I would not be caught doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have done my duty. I am not against anybody. I am representing the people of Barbados and I have been told that the people of Barbados have been robbed. I cannot sit here and allow these people to carry on. If these people fail to carry out their obligation and it is no fault of theirs well, let us ask them to go peacefully. If you do not want to go, then you must pay the Government and you must also pay the people. If you do not go, then you should pay the money. There is a gramophone re-

cord which says:- "No money, no love." You cannot love without money, and you cannot love on a hungry belly. This is starving my people. If you take the people's money and you do not give them anything, that is starving them.

With those few words, I will take my seat. I am appealing to the Prime Minister to let us start new and do not give them anything, that is starving them.

With those few words, I will take my seat. I am appealing to the Prime Minister to let us start new and do away with the old-time robbery. Let us straighten up and fly right.
4.15 p.m.

I would like to know if hon. members on the other side want me to continue - I cannot complete in the remaining fifteen minutes of Private Members' Business - or, alternatively, if hon. members on the other side would like to proceed with what they consider other important items of Private Members' Business. At this stage, I give hon. members on the other side two proposals, either that they would wish to proceed with some other matter under Private Members' Business, or that I proceed with some other item of Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Prime Minister commences his speech now, he may continue until just before 4.30 o'clock, and then he may continue at subsequent meetings of this House during the time allotted to Private Member's Business.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: At this stage, I am only asking for a matter of indulgence. They have complained that they have not been able to get on with other items on the Order Papers. If there would proceed with some other item, then I would move the motion for the further consideration of this matter, and that delay would give me the opportunity to pick up the threads at a later stage.

Of course, I am prepared to go on now with this debate: but I would like to warn hon. members on the other side that in the course of this debate, it took up the time of a series of meetings, and if I were to reply to all the allegations of hon. members on the other side, it would take up the time of five or six meetings, and it will only be done under Private Members' time. It is possible that the next ten sittings of this House would be taken up with this matter.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, this is Private Members' time; I am asking you to rule. This is under the name of the hon. senior member for the City. Is the Prime Minister concluding the debate?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not speaking to the Leader of the Opposition. I am speaking to the mover of the motion. It is for him to decide what we should debate.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member has spent some time on this matter. He says what? That he is not making a speech. Only the hon. senior

member for the City, under whose name this Bill stands can move the further consideration of this matter.

The Hon. Prime Minister is taking advantage of the fact that he is Prime Minister to get up and do something which only the hon. senior member for the City can do.

On what, Mr. Speaker, is he speaking?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I do not know whether the hon. member who has just sat down wants to arrogate the functions of Speaker unto himself. Every single time that he gets up in this Chamber, he wants to pontificate on every item that comes up.

Sir we hear that they are making plans to stage a Civil War in this country. We will deal with them.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Prime Minister speaking on Private Members' Business now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister rose and intimated to hon. members that he would carry on now with his speech. Let him carry on now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek your guidance in this matter. I am entitled to reply to this important motion. I do not care who talks on it. I am going to reply last.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City said he rose to seek my guidance. I am going to guide him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before the House adjourned for the summer vacation, hon. members on that side complained about the time allotted to Private Members' Business.

I have merely got up, not so much as to warn, but to advise those who spoke on this Resolution that there are other matters of priority which they in the Press and on the floor of the House say they have to deal with. (*ASIDES*). Now, he is telling me that I must keep my advice to myself.

But what I got up to warn about is the allegations made on that side of the House. It is going to take a considerable amount of time to reply to them all and I may not be the only Speaker on the Government side. It is going to mean that the consideration of Private Members' Business is going to take up a considerable period of time, and therefore, I am merely indicating to the hon. mover of the motion that if they have some other matter they can deal with in the short time which we have at our disposal - some other matter which he or any other member considers of urgency - I would be prepared to give way and commence my speech on this matter at the next meeting of the House. It is not possible for me to finish my speech in fifteen minutes.

I wonder what has attracted hon. members on the other side I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to behave himself in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister is now speaking on the motion. He said that he would be prepared to speak on it at some future date. I would suggest that he continue his speech now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now, Sir, I understand the Leader of the Opposition said that I cannot speak on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying that the Hon. Prime Minister may continue his speech now. The Rules say that Private Members' Business shall come to an end at 4.30 o'clock.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, you are not suggesting that I should reply in Government Business Time? I cannot understand the hon. member at all. He is just like Rip Van Winkle.
4.25 p.m.

In November, 1963, almost exactly four years ago, certain proposals were made by the Government of Barbados for the institution of a sweepstake or public lottery under terms and conditions which were laid down by the Government and agreed upon by the operators of the sweepstake to be known as the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. Prior to that agreement, the Government-authorised organisation had been consulted, and the agreement drawn up between the proposed operators and the Barbados Turf Club to ensure that no detriment or harm would be suffered by increasing the sport of racing in the Island because the Barbados Turf Club is the only other organisation which has been exempted by statute from the strictures of the Gambling and Lotteries Acts of this Island.

In other words, the business of operating a sweepstake has been going on in this Island from time immemorial; therefore, no one can say that a sweepstake, *per se*, is something to which this community is unaccustomed. The licence under which the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake is operating was granted under the Act itself. The licence under which the Barbados Turf Club operates throughout the year to sell lottery tickets in this Island is one which was granted to the Barbados Turf Club when this House or Legislature was differently composed from the way in which it is composed at the moment, say, for the last 18 or 19 years.

Nevertheless, despite the constitutional changes which have taken place in this Island; despite the change in the political aspect of this House, no one has challenged the Barbados Turf Club in its operations. As a matter of fact, until comparatively recently the Barbados Turf Club, which I could describe hitherto as an unincorporated association, one which was not incorporated either by statute or under the Companies Act, and the control of which, up to the time I exhorted them to democratise their institution,

was in the hands of a few wealthy racing magnates in this Island. A certain percentage of the gross sale of income from the Barbados Turf Club tickets went to the Government. At one time it reached as high as about \$112,000 or \$120,00; a certain amount was donated to charity; a portion was paid out in prize money to the horse-owners, and the undistributed profits were put into a fund.

After the visit of a hurricane in 1955, the Grand Stand was repaired without having to seek any loans from the general public. We have to go back into the dim recesses of history to understand the controversy which now engage the attention of this House. Only in this way will the truth be established, and the people who believe in opportunism will be able to see this operation in its true perspective, and make the decision which we would expect them to make dispassionately and without any partisanship in order to secure a cheap political point.

We start off with the view that it is axiomatic that the purchasing of lottery tickets is an illegal operation that has been going on with the consent of the Legislature from time immemorial.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Private Members' Business is now expired, and we will proceed with Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Resolutions stand in my name. The Hon. Leader of the House is unavoidably absent, being out of the Island, and I ask for leave to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister has asked the leave of this House to take charge of Order No. 1. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted to the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister to proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider two Resolutions:

1. A Resolution to place the sum of \$80,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 22 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

2. A Resolution to place the sum of \$52,750 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the

Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 23 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1967-68 No. 22

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is a Resolution to place the sum of \$80,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 22 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the economy of this country has now reached a stage where the maximum possible use is being made of our local resources, but there is still a gap between the total available work force and the population of the working age as well as the number of persons in this Island who are actually employed in trade or business or on their own account, for one reason or the other.

Various institutions have been set up in this country to promote the development of the economy. We have first at the top of the Economic Planning Unit for which the House recently approved additional staff.
4.35 p.m.

We have also the Barbados Development Board which has succeeded during the past five-and-a-half years in promoting the establishment of well over sixty new factories and enterprises in this island, and then, of course, we have the Barbados Tourist Board which is concerned with the promotion of tourism and the expansion of the economy. The Development Board itself has a staff which includes an Accountant, a Manager and a Deputy Manager, although he does not go by that name, he is more a Promotion Officer, but that does not matter. There is a post of a single Economist attached to the Development Board. I do not think that we have had such a high turn over rate of Economists that the vacant post is filled at the moment. Then we have various other Clerical and Public Relations staff. We have a representative in New York and also a representative to be appointed in Toronto and a certain amount of promotional work is done by the High Commission in London and the High Commission in Ottawa. What we are concerned with in this Resolution is not the simple encouragement of the individual *entrepreneur*. There is a word used in the Statute Law of Barbados which would be more intelligible to hon. members on the other side, but it is a word which we on this side do not partake in, and that is the word "undertaker." That word is in the Barbados Light & Power Act and the Gas Corporation Act. Although we are enjoined to use the English Language in the debates, I prefer to use the word *entrepreneur*, which means something which does not have the same morbid interpretation. It is not a mere question of encouraging an individual

entrepreneur or would-be industrialist to establish a factory or factories in Barbados. That work could easily be done by the promotional officers of the Development Board. The literature is there and the legislation is well-known and it is available to any one who wishes to set up a factory and he can see what tax-free concessions he will get.

What we are concerned about now is that the economy of this island, having reached take-off point, is air borne and steadily moving forward with ever-growing momentum. It is not enough, in our opinion, to attract simply the textile manufacturer or textile manufacturers with manufactures and things which are conducted in varying forms in developing countries, developed countries and under-developed ones. I chose textiles as an example because textiles have started the industrialisation of Puerto Rico to a very large extent, and they are the greatest employers in Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, and Jamaica. But in all of these activities we are competing with places like Hong Kong and other sister territories in the Caribbean. Therefore while we encourage this kind of activity in order to take up the slack in unemployment, particularly amongst young women who have left school and in the very exacting period of stress of immediately leaving school and the time when they are considered to be of sufficiently ripe age to take more adult occupations, textile manufacture, therefore is one of the things which we will continue to encourage. But it is transitional and there is no great scientific achievement in attracting an additional textile factory to Barbados, and we will continue to do so, in spite of the competition which we face - the dumping from other territories and so on. We welcome the exchange of trade between one Caribbean territory and others in the Free Trade Area. We will be able to regulate it and we will be able to see what should be kept on the market and what should be kept out.

The main point is that a small country has its people and its educational system. If you have a good educational system and people who are keen on working, then it is possible in this modern age which, although it is an age of technology, is becoming the age not of the specialist but of the bringing down of heavy technical and heavy specialised operations into a series of unskilled operations. In other words, the process of artisanship and craftsmanship which used to be done by the hands in the Middle Ages, in this modern age, all of that careful work is now being done by automation and you want industries in which you do not need much in the way of unskilled craftsmen. At our economic stage, we have got to go in for industries which are expanding and not contracting. The Development Board would not encourage an *entrepreneur* now to put up a factory to make harnesses for coach horses or brass lamps for state coaches; neither would we encourage anybody to come down here to manufacture spokes for the wheels of donkey carts; and we would not encourage anyone to go down to the Temple yard to manufacture barrels for the export of sugar and molasses from this island.

4.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, why do we need Feasibility Studies? We need Feasibility Studies for the simple reason that we are going into fields - and we are doing it deliberately - which even some of the advanced countries themselves have not yet acquired a high degree of proficiency in, because of the recent nature of the processes which are going to be employed - and I would say the almost revolutionary aspect which it will have in the economy of any country. It is, therefore, very important.

We have already managed to attract in Barbados two industries, and these are industries which I am very proud of, particularly, because these industries manufacture not only goods which belong to the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries and to the space age and which show all signs of expansion, but the workers are working in conditions which are far removed from the sweat shop conditions. In other words, we have working at the New Industrial Park at Seawall nearly 250 young girls who are working in completely airconditioned premises. These are some of the activities which we consider would give dignity to our people when they work under challenging conditions. This type of industry is not something which is closing down but opening up.

In some respects, we have been fortunate because the undertakers - I say 'undertakers' but undertakers are not necessarily the same type of people who go in for investment as my friend on the other side - but *entrepreneurs*. An *entrepreneur* and an undertaker may not necessarily be the same person at the same time.

Every man who has money to invest does not have the perspicacity and the ability to carry on the business. You may be able to invest money in a business. Let us take, as an instance, like the hon. senior member for the City. He may have a good name; he may be a good investor, but he has to leave the business side of it to the business acumen of somebody else to carry on for him.

What I am saying, Sir, is that in some cases a man who is investing money himself is not fully aware of the implications of market research in establishing a business. He has heard or has noticed that somebody else is doing reasonably well in some type of business and getting a good margin of profit, and therefore he thinks that that is the type of business in which he should invest his money.

This is the stage at which Feasibility Studies come in. You need to have available not only literature on what the tax concessions are in Barbados and what the cost of labour is in particular lines of business or what materials cost. All of these things we have readily available. It is not only a question of posting them out. There is no problem there. But you get to the stage where all your traditional activities are being conducted in the community. That is what we have called the 'take-off' point. You now want to venture out into fields which, unless you carry out a thorough investigation into the market possibilities, overhead costs and so on, which entered

beyond your shores and may be localised as well, you may run into trouble. He may go and invest vast sums of money in a line of business only to find it going down the drain. Now, if a person who has money to invest looks around the Caribbean for a location to establish an industry and he discovers that all other things being equal - let us say, we have a Customs Union, Free Trade Area, internal free trade, common external tariff and everything - he is going to be attracted to the place which would eliminate a lot of his original investigatory costs, and which would be able to present him with a complete picture of the risks attending that particular operation.

This is how we feel about it: and since we have been successful in expanding the industries of this island and up to now we have not been proven to be wrong, we do not see any reason why we should feel different.

We are trying to attract foreign investors to come to the Island and establish industries, and I do not think - apart from the Leader of the Opposition who does not believe in progress - anyone would say that it is bad for investors to come to Barbados and invest money in a business.

I will now go to the next step. Having satisfied your private investors, you have to look at the public sector.

4.55 p.m.

We have inherited such a large backlog of neglect as far as accommodation for schools, offices and so on are concerned, that we have had to devote a considerable amount of our capital expenditure during the past two Development Programmes to the construction of buildings which they said could not be built in places which they said they could not go, and in doing these things like that which were necessary to build up the infrastructure of the economy of this Island. When you look at the Financial Building, you can see what I am talking about.

We have had to devote a large amount of our capital expenditure towards paying for projects which were started by the last Government. (Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: "Name them.") The Deep Water Harbour, the new Hospital. (Interruption) I can provide the hon. senior member for Christ Church with the figures.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first phase in setting right in the economy these things which ought to have been done and which were left undone for several years. This is proper planning. This is the first time I have seen the hon. member attempt to look at my face with such venom and spite. This is all careful planning and marshalling of our resources. We have been able to set right all these defects, so that we have now got to the stage where - with the exception of the Post Office and the Customs, which are still inadequately housed - with a little cosmetic operation done to the Law Courts - we have been able to set right the defects in providing proper accommodation.

The school problem is one which is continually with us, but we have managed to accelerate the rate of construction both of new buildings for schools and extensions. Even in the public sector, we have moved on to another phase. I started off by saying that it is no secret that the Government, as part of its deliberately planned policy, intends to go to International institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and to the World Bank in order to seek loans for further infrastructural development where essential, if the development of this country is to continue to grow at the rate at which it has been growing during the past five or six years.

In other words, there are certain things which private *entrepreneurs* will undertake if the profit motives are there. I refer to things such as the building of harbours, airports and even vital industries in this country where the economy is not right for investments in order to infuse new capital which we have high hopes of getting, despite the deliberately calculated, systematic design of the Opposition to run down the credit of this country, from international financial assistance.

I have looked at several charts, starting from investment studies of several international institutions. I have also looked at charts of institutions like the Federal Housing Authority in the U.S.A. I looked at them not only in the U.S.A. but elsewhere, and from my analysis I find that the average period between the original request for assistance in a particular sector for a particular project and the day when the project begins is 48 months or four years. That is what is happening even in the U.S.A. in studies at the Federal level and State level. Even in a case where there is no dispute as to its desirability, the planning pre-investments survey can take a considerable period of time. I would say that about 75% of the time is taken up with preliminary surveys and pre-investment studies and matters of that kind. Even in the U.S.A. they have these problems. Even elections come about, and work is held up.

We have a saying which I do not believe is peculiar to this Island. It is this: while the grass is growing, the horse is starving. As I have frequently said to the neo-Malthusians in our midst, who think that birth control or family planning is not a solution for the problems of the West Indies. I have frequently said that these things are desirable as a matter of social education in the community where you are not indiscriminate and you are thinking of the future and so on. But from the point of view of correcting the imbalances which now exist in the community, all the family planning in the world cannot create employment for the people who are looking for work and have left school and are willing to work.

Furthermore, we can predict all things being equal, almost within ten to twenty persons how many people will be born in this country of certain sexes 15 years from now because all of the people who are capable of bearing children, within the next 15 years,

have already been born. In the next 15 years we can predict accurately how many more mouths we have to feed, and how many more jobs we have to provide.

All of this brings me back to this particular problem with which we are confronted. If you start off with a Colonial, post - Colonial and Neo-Colonial legacy of neglect - I am not talking about neglect in the sense that soup kitchens were not available so that somebody could get a bowl of soup, but I am talking about neglect of the problems of people who did not have jobs - a complete disdain, you might say.

The Opposition thinks of putting aside money for a rainy day and doing quad housekeeping with Government revenue instead of carrying out those pump-priming operations which are likely to generate purchasing power in the pockets of the masses. *(Interjection)* We cannot now fall back on the clichés of over-population to excuse ourselves, of the shibboleths of family planning, which this Government supports, for reasons which I have already mentioned. It is a question of the social and mental attitudes of the community.

5.05 p.m.

We have to try to create employment for the people who are under the Queen's Peace by every possible means at our disposal. The present President of Chile, Mr. Eduardo Frei, wrote a very brilliant article, in my opinion, pointing out how it is that the extreme revolutionaries in the Western Hemisphere, the people who call themselves Marxists, can make common cause with the extreme Right-wing elements, neo-Fascists, Conservative elements in a community; all the shades in between are a 'whiter shade of pale.' That is the name of a song sung here recently by Percy Sledge. What Dr. Eduardo Frei was trying to demonstrate was this: that neither the extreme Left-wing elements or the extreme Right-wing elements have any interest in a peaceful, social revolution in the Western Hemisphere where all the people in the country are able to enjoy and partake of the fruits of the country and the fruits of their own labour, and where every person of working age will have a job and have conditions of security in the Welfare State. For different reasons they have common cause. The extreme Left-wing elements in any community are completely obsessed with the idea of cutting people's throats, the dictatorship of what they call the proletariat, and getting into power. The extreme Right-wing elements are concerned with retaining the economic power they have over the masses of people in countries such as ours, and it is central to their philosophy and essential to the successful pursuit of their aims to the concentration of power in the hands of a few, that they should have a large industrial reserve army of the unemployed. Therefore they believe in charity, larger Police Forces, larger armies, anything to keep the people quiet, and if you cannot keep them quiet you will put them in gaol. The person whom they wanted to foist upon us as the Governor-General of a new Federation - well, I do not want to go into that because I do not want to criticise the Heads of States anywhere. But you have the lust for power by the people on the Left,

with all the hairy-fairy dogma that they go in for, and the desire to retain power by the people on the Right. Any programme therefore which is designed with the use of International Funds to bring about the amelioration of the lot of the people, is likely to come into a blistering attack by the people on the extreme Left and those on the extreme Right. That is how you find them strange political bed-fellows: the people who want a bloody revolution, and the people who want to keep the people in soup kitchens all the time. So they make common cause. This has been the history of nearly every country in the Western Hemisphere, and it has been demonstrably true in the island of Barbados where these two extreme elements and the white shade of pale - according to Mr. Percy Sledge - were able to make common cause against the peaceful independence of the people of this nation. That is why they can employ assassins and people of every kind of doubtful character to work for them. They can place sums of money at the disposal of the extreme Left and the extreme Right to overthrow the democratic regimes of the Western Hemisphere. We are dealing with the Western Hemisphere. We are not concerned with Europe or the Far East or the Near East. We are dealing with the countries around us where we have threats to our peace and security.

We have to be concerned with the activities of these people because for different reasons they are consumed and obsessed with the same lust for power, although their philosophies are extremely different.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with the hon. member?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 26 (2) which deals with the Rules of debate. This is what it says:-

"A Member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Several times in the course of the last session, His Honour the Speaker has had to draw hon. members' attention to the fact that they were being irrelevant. What is the hon. member doing but piling up a mass of irrelevancies? What is he now saying got to do with this Resolution? What has that got to do with employing somebody to carry out feasibility studies, this talk about assassins and about overthrowing the Governments in the Western Hemisphere?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, may I continue, Sir? I do not know what the hon. member is getting agitated about. I do not regard him either as a member of the extreme Right or of the extreme Left I merely regard him as being of a whiter shade of pale. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas is even of a lighter shade of pale. Before I was interrupted, Sir, I was quoting the President of Chile as to the

crisis which confronts democratic Government in this area, in trying to bring about by international co-operation the amelioration of the lot of the masses of the people in the region. The purpose of these feasibility studies is not to give somebody money to study something; that is not the ultimate objective. Everything that this Government does is designed to bring about an amelioration of the condition of the masses of people in this country who cannot speak for themselves, and who have been neglected for so long. The people who are social - and other - snobs would not therefore want to see people independent with money in their pockets, working in decent jobs, and in air-conditioned surroundings and things of that kind. You will also get that they will employ people to say: "You have all of these industries coming in, but the people are only working for so much a week!" This is a technique of assault upon industrial development programmes which has been employed by the subversionists in every country in Latin America, the Caribbean, North America and the United Kingdom as well, and in every conceivable case the people who make these attacks are those who receive money merely for making attacks on the programmes of Government and not through any sense of sincerity or any concern for the well-being of people who have no jobs at all.

5.15 p.m.

The legitimate champions of the workers' conditions of service are the trade unions, and that is what we recognise - and not any individual who arrogates to himself the right to distort the efforts which are being made in democratic societies in order to build a sound economic base.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the private sector needs feasibility studies. The public sector does also, because there are things either because of their magnitude or the investment capital demanded, or because of their initial risk potential are incapable or unlikely to be undertaken by private investors.

It is therefore necessary, as I have said, where the private sector is unwilling or unable to take the risk, for Governments themselves to seek vast infusions of capital, and in a country such as ours the encouragement has not been to accumulate savings inside the society itself in order to cater to the expanding needs of a community that wants to develop and wants to bring about capital formations. Therefore, Governments then have to go to International institutions, as I said before. Both from the point of view of the private sector and the public sector, it is therefore highly desirable, before you go to them, that you can demonstrate that you have done your homework. Let us say, that you want fifteen or twenty million dollars. You go to them and tell them that your country needs that to create more jobs. You have to give them a complete picture of what you intend to do. You may want to construct a harbour. They may ask you what amount of tonnage of shipping that this harbour would have to cater for in the next five years. If you don't do your homework - as was the case in Barbados when this harbour was designed. They built a harbour to accommodate 150 thousand tons of

cargo, and five years later they were handling 260 thousand tons, which shows that their homework had not been done by the last Government in the construction of the Harbour. We are now faced with a bill as large as what we had before.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That happens all over the world.

(LOUD ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would hon. members observe Rule 26 (2)?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am just stating facts. I do not know why members on the other side are behaving like that, particularly the Leader of the Opposition and the ex-speaker who should know better. He is getting on like an agitated chimpanzee.

(ASIDES)

I said that the Harbour was designed to accommodate handling 150 thousand tons of cargo, and in five years it is catering to ships of 260 thousand tons. I say that is because of the lack of homework. What does that amount to? It shows lack of preparation and that there is a lot of third rate people around, in the community, both in the Legislature and outside of it.

Therefore, if you do not have all of the expertise inside of a community, it is necessary to invoke the assistance (a) of other Governments; (b) of specialists and (c) of international institutions in order to get your pre-investment surveys and studies properly evaluated: so that when you go with a submission, whether it be to the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank or any international source, you can say: "This is my blue print; here is my cost; this is the period of construction" in order to get the balance of money you need. "Here is where I am going to get some of the money from, and I come to you to ask you to lend me the rest."

I do not see why there should be this amount of talk and protests, some of which are of a venomous nature. Every single matter that this Government brings down, they are so sick and paranoiac that they think it is an occasion on which they should exhibit themselves. I think that if the Leader of the Opposition has wasted a little more time with pre-investment studies and constructive work in the Federal Government, he would not have broken it up. So do not tell me about wasting time. I say "know your place, old man; know your place!"

Let us have behaviour. Who has broken up meetings of this House? On each and every occasion they have deliberately set out to destroy parliamentary institutions. Every single day they have a Motion of Censure against the Speaker and the Chairman. Never in the history of British Parliaments has there been this kind of behaviour until since the guttersnipes have been let loose in the unwitting public. They do not like to have anyone on this side who can stand up and talk to them. They like to go unchallenged all of the time.

(INTERRUPTION).

Mr. Chairman, I want you to tell the hon. member who is Leader of the Opposition and a lawyer that he should know better in the evening of his years than to come in here and try to destroy the country in which he was born. I say "know your place, old man; know your place;"

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is the sort of thing that either only a lunatic or a guttersnipe would say. Only a lunatic or a guttersnipe would in a Parliament, merely because I happen to be older than the hon. member - I refuse to say "wiser" or any other adjective - for him to use gutterlike remarks and you do not stop him! To accuse me of all people, who made such sacrifices, to be doing anything against the interest of this community.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member on a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit? I recall that the Leader of the Opposition rose and did not state on what he was speaking.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member gets up and abuses me in a gutterlike way.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to observe the Rules of this House. Whether an hon. member rises or not, he should observe the Chair. Let the Hon. Prime Minister continue.
5.25 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Prime Minister has used offensive words to me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask both hon. members to sit.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Again, on a point of order, I object. The hon. member has used offensive words to me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said "Know your place" and I will continue to say: "Know your place, and sit down in it."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Again, I ask Your Honour to rule. I object to the words on the ground that they are offensive, and I call on you to call on the Hon. Prime Minister to withdraw them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition state the words precisely to which he objects?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Did Your Honour not hear them? The Hon. Prime Minister got up and repeated them, and you still ask me to repeat them?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule that the words "Know your place" are not unparliamentary. Will the hon. member sit?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, "Know your place" was not all he said; the words "Know

your place, old man" were used. Then he went on to say that I was constantly doing things against the interest of the community. I object to those words. How could he ever have got a place in the House of Assembly, if I did not fight to put him in here?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This will be a test case, as far as the other members of the Opposition and myself are concerned. I have remained in this House and I have heard the Hon. Prime Minister refuse to address the Chairman and address a member of Parliament. When the Hon. Prime Minister used the words "You sit down, and know your place" - unless he meant you, and I believe he meant you - are you going to say that these words are not offensive to a member? They may not be offensive to you, if he meant you, because you may condone that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you challenging the Ruling of the Chair? I have already ruled.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am saying that if you have interpreted those words as not being offensive to a member, then they were strictly directed to you and you condoned them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour has said that you have already ruled. You have ruled on what? "Know your place?" I have drawn to your attention the fact that the Hon. Prime Minister has not only said "Know your place", but he used the words "old man". Also, I am objecting most strongly that I, of all people in this Island of Barbados, should be accused of doing anything to hurt this community. The worst thing that I have ever done was to fight very hard to get the Hon. Prime Minister into this Chamber. That is the greatest evil I have ever done. I have saddled the community with a tyrant a dictator, and a very abusive mental case.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am objecting to the hon. member. I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw those words, on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am on my feet.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I know that in his spleen the hon. member cannot help himself, but he is in Parliament. If he cannot control himself, then the Chair must keep him in order. He does not agree with Your Ruling, but he is not entitled to get up in this House and say whatever he likes. Let us forget the expression of his fighting to get me in here. I am objecting to the hon. member saying that he has saddled this Island with a dictator and a mental case. If the hon. member does not withdraw these words.....(Interruption)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. senior member for St. Peter to observe the Rules.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member does not withdraw those words, I am asking that the words

be taken down. He said that he has saddled this Island with a dictator and a mental case I do not have a single Judgment Summons against me I want these words taken down and dealt with without debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am, for the last time, going to remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 29 (6). I will read it for the benefit of all hon. members:

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

If the hon. senior member for St. James were to continue with this behaviour, I shall have no other alternative than to do what the Standing Orders say.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have made my objection under Rule 26 (5). I have deliberately not sat down because I am not going to leave this matter where it is. I have made my point. There continues to be disorder, and I am suggesting, Sir, due to the unseemly behaviour of the hon. senior member for St. James, that the Speaker be called. I am very firm on this. They have no respect for the chair; they have no respect for anything.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the junior member for St. Joseph, to withdraw the words "mental case." (Voices: "No! No!")

If the hon. junior member for St. Peter does not behave himself in this House, then I shall have to do something about it. I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words "mental case".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you have already ruled I am trying to help you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this point I need no help. I am asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, to withdraw the words "mental case".

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I drew your attention to the fact that I objected to certain words being offensive. You quoted only four of those words, and you said that the words were not offensive.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words complained of.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am drawing to Your Honour's attention that that is not before the Committee now. What was before the Committee was my objection to the words used by the Prime Minister.

Hon. E. W. BARROW rose..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit! I did not consider the words "Know your place, old man," unparliamentary, and I have so ruled.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph sit down? I have ruled on that subject already.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On those four words only you have ruled.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ruled that the words were not unparliamentary, and I therefore ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words complained of.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I object to that; it was not an interjection.

Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit! 5.35 p.m.

I have ruled that they are not unparliamentary. For the third time I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw those words.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I am on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have been accused of breaking up the country and I object to that. You are ruling

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members take their seats?

Hon. E. W. BARROW and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS took their seats.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have objected to certain words used by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He has been disorderly and I am invoking you to rule under Standing Order 36 (2) which says:-

"The Speaker or the Chairman shall order Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of the day's sitting"

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked both hon. members to sit.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Order the hon. member to sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already made my ruling.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a part of what the hon. member has said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On what the hon. member complained, and I have now asked that the words complained of, "A mental case" be withdrawn by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. That is all.

Mr. CRAIG: He did not use the words "Mental case."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I rose on a point of order. I asked Your Honour to rule and you picked out certain words. The hon. member also used the words "Old Man." I objected to the hon. member saying "know your place, old man. You are acting in a way to destroy the community." I objected to all of that, but you have picked out only the first three words. I drew to your attention all the remarks used by the hon. member and you have not mentioned all of them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that those words are not unparliamentary.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Which words?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All the words complained of. I am asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If I said that the Chair is not impartial, you would get annoyed. You are ready to tell me that what is said of me is not offensive; but as soon as the Prime Minister gets to his feet (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the words "mental case" because I consider them unparliamentary.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I specifically mentioned all the words that I have complained of. Furthermore under Order 36 Rules 2, 3 and 4, the hon. member for St. Joseph has been guilty of gross and disorderly conduct and I am now inviting Your Honour to carry out the procedures of naming the hon. member because of this disorderly conduct. I am saying that the hon. senior member for Christ Church is jumping up and shouting at the top of his voice and every single week they come in here to destroy parliament in that way. I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw the words or otherwise have the hon. member named. The next member we want named is the hon. senior member for Christ Church who got up three times, although I am on my feet, and the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking on the sixth occasion the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the words complained of.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member has refused to obey the Chair, I suggest that the hon. member be named.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for any member of this House to direct you to name another member? And if you rule that it is not in order, I would invite you to...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the words complained of.

(INTERRUPTION)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit?

(ASIDES)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Before you do this, will you listen to me? I understand that words were used on both sides of the House. Words might not be unparliamentary; but they can be offensive.

(ASIDES)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member asked me what I am speaking on. I was on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: No debate is allowed.

(ASIDES)

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am trying to be a mediator in this.

(A VOICE: What I honestly want -)

(ASIDES)

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you give me a minute - I am trying to help; it strikes me at this stage that the words I heard might not be unparliamentary, but they might be offensive; if both would withdraw, we could go on with the business of the House.

(ASIDES)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Give me a chance. It strikes me that offensive words were used on both sides. I am asking both hon. members to withdraw the remarks and allow us to go on with the debate. That is what I am suggesting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled on that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the eighth time I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words complained of.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on a point of order, I do not think any Speaker in Parliament should have to ask anybody eight times to do anything.

Under Standing Order 36, Rule 2, it 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.

Furthermore, Sir, any person who persistently or wilfully obstructs the business of the House by abusing, under Order 36 Rule 3, the Rules of the House: that is by refusing to obey Your Honour and flouting the authority of the Chair, he shall be named.

I am suggesting at this stage that you do not invite the hon. member. This is an absolute disgrace. Every single time they come in here, they bring in a substantive motion of censure on the Chair.

(LOUD ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Standing Order 34 says:-

"The Speaker in the House or the Chairman in Committee shall be responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and Committee respectively, and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion."

What I am saying is that I have already ruled in connection with the words complained of by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and I ruled and asked the hon. member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words "mental case." That is what I am asking the hon. member to do.

(ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you withdrawing the words complained of?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Do justice to yourself and to the Chair!

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is challenging the authority of the Chair.

(LOUD ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rule 29 (2) states that

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman. I am on a point of order. There is gross disorder in this House, and they are trying to break up this House without getting the hon. member to withdraw. But there are certain rules for the protection of the Chair and members.

Under Standing Order 36, Rule 3, it speaks of members disregarding the authority of the Chair or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House.

I am inviting you under that rule to suspend the proceedings of this Committee and report the circumstances to the House, and the Speaker shall then take the appropriate action.

I have never seen anything like this in my life. I am saying that you do not have to ask the hon. member a dozen times to behave himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the last time, I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words "mental case."

(VOICES: Name him)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to name under Standing Order No. 36 (2) the hon. junior member - I am sorry - the hon. senior member for St. James. I am naming Lionel Craig for disorderly conduct.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: (To the Marshal) You have to put him out.

(LOUD ASIDES AND CONFUSION)

Mr. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. What is going on? Can we have the question put? Nobody is making a speech. Can we have the question put?

(Members of the Official Opposition picked up their papers and brief cases and then walked out of the Chamber.)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have quoted Standing Order 36, Rules 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

I have never seen anything like this in my sixteen years in here. I do not want to say anything about it now. Under Order 36 (2), this is a persistent course of behaviour. "The Speaker or the Chairman shall order members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of the day's sitting, and the Marshal shall act on such orders as he may receive from the Chair in pursuance of this order. But if on any occasion the Speaker, or the Chairman deems that his powers under the previous provisions of this Order are inadequate, he may name such member or members, in which event the procedure shall be as described in paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this Order." 4.55 p.m.

Now this is what paragraph 3 says:-

"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, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence has been committed by such Member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, "That.....be suspended from the service of the House"; and if the offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House, the Chairman shall forthwith suspend the proceedings of the Committee and report the circumstances to the House; and the Speaker shall on a motion being made forthwith put the same question, no amendment,

adjournment or debate being allowed as if the offence had been committed in the House itself."

That is the procedure which I have been inviting you to invoke. Furthermore, obscene, unnecessary, contumacious and unseemly behaviour can be seen on the part of every member of the opposition with the exception of the greying senior member of the City (*ASIDES*).

I want it on the records of this House that after you named the hon. member for St. James, Mr. Lionel Craig, and after on eleven occasions you have invited the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw certain remarks, certain member screamed, shouted and left the Chamber before the Marshal could intervene or before the sitting could be suspended. Under Standing Order 36 (2), (3), (4) and all the other relevant Rules, I am asking you to suspend the sitting and report the circumstances to the Speaker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has already been done. I have reported the matter to the Speaker through the Clerk of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are two matters which Your Honour has to report. The first is that the Leader of the Opposition persistently and contumaciously disregarded the instructions of the Chair; and secondly that Mr. Lionel Craig was guilty of grossly disorderly conduct, and he was named and he walked out of the Chamber along with the members of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition.

There are, therefore, two matters: The Leader of the Opposition has to be named, and Mr. Craig has to be named. Anyone who creates a state of civil war in this country should be dealt with according to the Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, owing to disorderly conduct on the part of the Opposition, I was able to name the hon. senior member for St. James, Lionel Craig.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, during the sitting of Committee, spearheaded by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Grantley Adams, Q.C., the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, there was gross disorder, challenging of the Chairman's rulings, unseemly conduct and disorderly behaviour. Loudest in his protestations and abuse of the Chair was Mr. Lionel Craig, senior member for St. James.

The object of these demonstrations was ostensibly to prevent the junior member for St. Joseph from being named. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has had a long, if not distinguished, period in the

Legislature of the West Indies, and he should set a proper example. I am not mincing matters; I am not going to sit here as Leader of the Government and see this country destroyed by the behaviour of people who have no sense of responsibility.

Every time a Ruling is made by Your Honour or the Chairman of Committees, if the members of the Opposition do not get their way, they bring a motion of censure. That is their parliamentary right. What the members of the Opposition are not entitled to do is to scream or behave in a disorderly manner at every sitting of the House. When you try to give Rulings, they challenge the Rulings of the Chair and so on.

We cannot allow Parliamentary debate to sink to this level. What ever one may say of the political philosophy of the senior member for the City, at no time when he was the Leader of the Opposition, although he might sometimes violently disagree with the Rulings of the Chair, did he inspire any of his members or did he himself oppose the Rulings of the Chair although sometimes the volume of his voice needed no assistance from microphones or amplifiers in making his point.

At no time when you Sir, were the Leader of the Opposition have you ever brought a motion of censure against the Chair. When you were proposed for the Chair, the Leader of the Opposition said that you were the best choice and that you had a longer experience of parliamentary procedure virtually than anybody else in the West Indies.

Because they cannot get their tentacles on the Government, by fair or foul means they attempt to destroy Parliament by their unseemly behaviour. 6.05 p.m.

The motion is that in view of the gravity of the offence not the nature of the offender, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to put the motion forthwith.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it would be unfair to the member who is being suspended if he did not know the nature of the offence. That is my view of it, but I would bow to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has always done that up to now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In view of the gravity of the offence I propose that Lionel Seymour Craig, the senior member for St. James, be suspended from the service of this House for a period of eight sittings.

Mr. SPEAKER: Five sittings on the first occasion.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I heard a motion made for the suspension of the member for eight sittings.

Mr. SPEAKER: It cannot be for eight sittings.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying what I heard.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is automatically for five sittings. If the motion says 'eight sittings,' we are still following the Standing Orders.

The question is that Lionel Seymour Craig, the senior member for St. James, be suspended from the service of the House. Hon. members who are of that opinion will please say "Aye" (MEMBERS: "Aye"); but hon. members who are of a contrary opinion, will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. By virtue of Standing Order 36 (5) "If a Member is suspended under the provisions of this Order, he shall be directed by the Speaker to withdraw." The hon. member is not present. "His suspension shall last for five sitting days on the first occasion." Mr. Clerk, is this the first occasion? *(After a pause)* I am instructed that this is the first occasion. It follows, therefore, that Mr. Lionel Seymour Craig is suspended from the service of the House, and as this is the first occasion, the suspension shall last for five sitting days. Automatically the House reverts to Committee of Supply.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before the sitting was suspended, you had invited the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the Opposition, on a minimum of twelve separate and distinct occasions to withdraw words which I have objected to during the course of debate and directly referring to me. The hon. member persistently refused to withdraw the words. It is therefore impossible for me to continue this debate until some action has been taken in respect of that hon. member. If the hon. member, in order to avoid the visitation of natural justice upon him, withdraws from the Chamber, he cannot oust the jurisdiction of the Chair or avoid the Standing Orders of this House or of any Parliament in the Commonwealth merely by his unilateral act of withdrawal from the House. The only way in which justice can be satisfied in a case like this is to let hon. members pay something more than lip service to parliamentary democracy. Since the hon. member's absence is voluntary on his part, he must accept the consequence of not taking his medicine. I have no hesitation at all in inviting Your Honour to invoke the provisions of Standing Order 36 (3) which says 'Whenever a member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after the commission of offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair

Not only did the hon. member disregard the authority of the Chair, but he said that he did not intend to follow the authority of the Chair and he invited his colleagues to behave in the most disorderly and contumacious manner. I say that a member

cannot remove the carpet from your feet by walking out. He has disregarded the Ruling of the Chair on twelve occasions - St. Peter only denied the Lord Three times; a cat only has nine lives - and then he walks out and takes out the rest of his members. It would be fatuous for the rule to give authority to a member to walk out whenever he is asked to observe the Ruling of the Chair and I suggest that the hon. member should be named. There is no other way in which this debate can proceed except by naming the hon. member, because if debate supersedes after a member has been asked to withdraw, there is no way by which this debate can proceed except by naming the hon. member, suspending the sitting, reporting the matter to the House and then letting His Honour the Speaker take the appropriate action.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say this - with my experience in here and reaching my age in Parliament - I think it is at this stage that I should move the suspension of the House so that tempers should be cooled off. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. MOTTLEY: Wait, do not tell me what to do. I am on my feet. Wait, do not tell me what to do.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. There is no question of tempers over here. Everything I said was in cold blood. I would talk about tempers, but not in the people's business. In my private business I might tend to get annoyed with them, but not in conducting the people's business. Get that out of your mind, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Just a Minute, Sir, I am not challenging the Chair now. I was not in here when the words were said but I heard what was said. I said that in my opinion they were not unparliamentary, but they were offensive.

As far as I am concerned, I am moving that this House be suspended for half an hour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before this motion takes place...

Mr. MOTTLEY: The motion is not seconded yet; it has to be seconded.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, do not fall into any trap. If a motion is put after somebody has objected to words, a motion can render nugatory everything that has gone before. Now the withdrawal of a member cannot render nugatory your invitation to withdraw words. I cannot continue unless the member is named.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am accepting your ruling, but may I be allowed just to say this. I am moving the suspension of the House for half an hour. All hon. members feel, I suppose, this is the right and correct thing to do. If it is seconded, well then.

Mr. LYNCH: I second the motion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That motion is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not out of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is a trick, Sir. This motion is out of order. (*ASIDES*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to say this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The junior member for the City has been sent in to put this trick on you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Without the invitation by the Hon. Prime Minister, it is my solemn duty under Standing Order 36 (2) to name Sir Grantley Adams for disorderly conduct.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think I have heard the hon. senior member for St. John.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There can be no point of order at this time. I ask the Clerk to report the matter to the Speaker.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But we can speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the Clerk to report the matter to the Speaker. There will be no debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is he saying at all?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing that can be done now until the Speaker comes.

(Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, on eight occasions I have asked the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw words complained of and he wilfully persisted, and disregarded the authority of the Chair and I therefore named him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the facts in outline are as have been reported by the Chairman of Committees. Those facts are substantially correct. 6.25 p.m.

I do not want to add anything to it, except that the Leader of the Opposition, as you yourself are aware - I am not asking for other offences to be taken into consideration, but the fact is that on each and every occasion since this country gained its independence, he has tried to demonstrate to the outside world that we do not have parliamentary democracy here. He has flouted the authority of the Chair and the authority of the Chairman. He is the only person in the history of British Parliaments who have brought in so many motions of censure against the Chair, and he himself said that you were the proper person to sit as Speaker.

We cannot run a Government on lawlessness. What I am drawing to your attention is not only the gravity of the offence and the nature of the offender, but the fact that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been named by Speaker Douglas Pile, on a previous occasion. In accordance with Standing Order No.

36 (5), his suspension will have to follow the natural consequence of ten sitting days and not five, because it is now a matter of public and general knowledge, but the Speaker has to take judicial notice of the fact that he was named. Speaker Cummins, a member of his Party, attempted to name him on a second occasion. Speaker Cummins did not follow the proper procedure, and therefore, the naming was null and void.

Officially for the record he has been named by Speaker Douglas Pile, but you will notice that he never brought any motion of censure against Speaker Pile. Now I do not want to go into recriminations because the level of debate since November 1966 has deteriorated to a level from which we have to uplift it. Members can make little taunts within certain limitations, but members should not be allowed to use abusive language, to scream, or encourage others to challenge the Ruling of the Chair. If the Chairman gives a Ruling which does not appeal to an hon. member, he can do what the hon. Leader of the Opposition does and bring in a motion of censure.

I am moving that Sir Grantley Adams, junior member for St. Joseph, Q.C., Doctor of Laws, be suspended from the service of the House.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, junior member for St. Joseph be suspended from the service of the House. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "AYE", hon. members who are of a contrary opinion, will please say "NO". I think the "AYES" have it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In view of the suspension of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it would be a grave disservice to the War Dead if he were to attend the ceremony at the Cenotaph. If he does attend, I will withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise. May I say this: it is my view - and it is my Ruling - that the hon. member is suspended under the provisions of....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said "divide".

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear you, and neither of the Clerks heard you. It matters who hears it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Perhaps your wig prevented you from hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Neither of the Clerks wears a wig, and they are both young men who hear well. Let the House divide.

A division was taken as follows:

Ayes: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon'bles E. W. BARROW, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, CORBIN, SPRINGER, Hon. G. E. SARGEANT; Messrs. WEEKES and HOPPIN - 11.

Noes: Messrs. MOTTLEY and LYNCH - 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven hon. members voting "AYE", and two hon. members voting "NO".

As a result, Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, Junior member for St. Joseph, is suspended from the service of the House, and it is my view, and I so state, that this suspension is in conformity with Standing Order No. 36 (5). So far as this sitting is concerned this will be the first sitting, and he will be suspended for five sitting days. I deem this to be the first occasion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to draw this to Your Honour's attention. I think that your Ruling must be that this is the first occasion in this Session of the House, because it is on record that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was first suspended by a former Speaker, George Douglas Laurie Pile, from the service of the House. If Standing Order No. 36 (5) relates only to this Session, then I will have to abide by Your Honour's Ruling. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was suspended by a former Speaker George Douglas Laurie Pile, for similar behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been a member of the House even before that happened under the Speakership of Mr. G. D. L. Pile, but I deem that Standing Order No. 36 (5) applies to this Session, and therefore I deem that the suspension shall last for five sitting days.

The House will now resume in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committees of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No. 22

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We will resume consideration of the Resolution to place the sum of \$80,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 22 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

The Resolution for \$52,750 was called.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to draw attention to the fact that the Speaker put the Resolution to the House while the Mace was not on the cradle. I think the motion would be out of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That should have been drawn to the attention of the Speaker.

I beg to move that the sitting be suspended and the matter reported to the Speaker again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 36 (3) I named Sir Grantley Herbert Adams for disregarding the authority of the Chair and for persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, there are certain irregularities which have transpired in this House when certain pronouncements were given by the Chair. I understand that they were not in order because the Mace was not in its accustomed and proper place. Is it possible for this House to continue and make irregularities worse, by now giving authorisation to deal with another matter? I understand that the Mace was not in its right place; it was hanging below the Table.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member is not entitled to make statements which are not true.

Mr. St. JOHN: The hon. member cannot interrupt anybody in here; so let him sit down. (LOUD ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended for fifteen minutes.

On re-assembling,

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 36 (3) I named the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, for disregarding the authority of the Chair or of persistently or wilfully obstructing the business of the House. It is for both disregarding the authority of the Chair and wilfully obstructing the business of the House. I called on him eight times to withdraw words complained of, and he wilfully refused to do so, and I named him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Chairman of Committees reporting to me that immediately after the commission of the offence or offences, the hon. member was named?

Mr. YEARWOOD: This is the second time I have had to name him, and I could have only named him at the time I did because he walked out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Was that immediately after the commission of the offence?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Yes.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the accuracy of that statement in point of fact. I ask you to call for the official transcript of this. I was present. It is not correct or factual to state that immediately after the offence was committed, the Chairman named the hon. member. At least a period of ten to fifteen minutes elapsed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am making this enquiry. Is this the first or the second time that this report has been made to you in the Chair? If this is the second time, why has this report had to be made the second time? Is it not a fact that this report was made to you already? Have you not been called from Your Chamber to attend to this business? What has happened now that this business is being gone over and that you are asked to listen to the report? Again, just before the suspension of the sitting, I rose on a point of order and pointed out that certain formalities had not been attended to when you were in the Chair, since the Mace, the symbol of the Speaker's authority, was lying under the Table, and not on the Table. I steal no thunder from the hon. senior member for Christ Church, but is it true that this is the second time that this report has been made? If that is so, why is it that it has to be made a second time? The Mace is quite visible to you in its proper position.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still making a point of order?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, just before the sitting was suspended, I rose on a point of order and I addressed you in the same manner as the hon. senior member for Christ Church did. I brought to your attention certain points which I have repeated, whether this report has been made a second time. Why is it that the Chairman reports the same lapse of parliamentary behaviour on two occasions in the same sitting to Mr. Speaker? That is something which is rather strange. Again I will remind you of the point of order which I made just before the suspension of the sitting, that is to say, that the symbol of your authority was found wanting after you made a pronouncement. I understand that you imposed a penalty: to wit, that certain hon. members would be suspended from attendance at this House for five sittings. You cannot be asked to do the same thing twice in one day. What Parliament is this? If Mr. Speaker, from his authority, says that Mr. So and So has been suspended for five consecutive meetings, you cannot be asked to do the same thing twice. If there has been an irregularity because the Mace was not in its proper position, you were not fully invested with the authority as Speaker, this thing has happened already in this Chamber, and I was very vocal on that occasion when a similar thing happened a couple of years ago. 7.00. p.m.

Therefore, Sir, I do not see how you can be asked to make a second pronouncement on a penalty that you have imposed already. If the first pronouncement should be abrogated and should be now null and void, why should we be asked in the same sitting of the House when we are cognisant that a member has been named, when you have been asked to impose a penalty to do the same thing?

Is the House now conscious of the fact that an error has been committed? You are now asked, Mr. Speaker, to accept a naming, so to speak, and to impose on the member a penalty for the second time. If a member has had a penalty of suspension for five consecutive sittings not half-an-hour ago, are

you being asked to do the same thing over again? This looks, in my opinion, like parliamentary tommyrot. We are not very serious creatures in this Place.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A report has been made to you. I rise to make a motion, but I would like to say this, to allay the fears of hon. member, that it is not within the knowledge of any member on this side that at the time when Your Honour was in the Chair, the Mace was not in its place. It was on that particular occasion, on that particular occasion only.

(ASIDES)

It is the definite recollection of members that on a previous occasion everything was in order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. member speaking on?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order. There are many Legislatures in the Commonwealth which do not have a Mace and who have only had Maces presented to them sometimes after a considerable life - 20, 30 or 100 years - after they began functioning.

There is no rule of this House which says anything other than the Speaker has to be in the Chair when certain things have to be done. There is no rule which says anything of the sort. A Crown does not make the Queen the Queen. The Shah of Persia has been Shah for fifteen years and only recently he has received his coronation. The Mace is a symbol of authority - and a symbol alone. There is nothing in our Standing Orders or in the laws of the Constitution of Barbados or any other British Protectorate, Colony or independent territory within the Commonwealth which says that the Mace has to be in a certain place when the Speaker is in the Chair.

That is Point number one.

Point number two is this. When the matter was previously reported, Mr. Speaker, it is now known that the Mace was not in its place, and none of us had the recollection of the Mace being there; therefore it may not have been there. Then out of an abundance of caution the Chairman named the hon. member immediately upon discovering this.

It is a question of supererogation on the part of the hon. member. If the Chairman now names the hon. member forthwith, without any debate, a motion can be put.

I rose to move a motion and that is that Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, junior member for St. Joseph, be suspended from the services of this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, no, no, no

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. The motion was not seconded.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Standing Order 36, Rule 3 states:-

that whenever a member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, without amendment, adjournment or debate the motion has to be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but the hon. and Learned Prime Minister rose on a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I want to know on what the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister rose?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister rose on a point of order. On a point of order, a motion may not be made. The hon. senior member for St. Peter may continue to address the Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister has unwittingly given me grist for my mill; he does it all the time. I dropped a hint that something must have been thought to be in error; else, Mr. Speaker, you would not be requested to receive a naming twice. If the hon. members who are alleged to have committed offences in the House when the House was in Committee of Supply, if the behaviour of these hon. members was in dispute there is no need - absolutely none - for Your Honour to receive a report the second time and name a person the second time. Absolutely none.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Hon. Prime Minister say that the Mace is a symbol, and nothing else but a symbol. It may be unfortunate that certain Legislatures in the Caribbean may not have had Maces. There may be no need for Maces in them. But this three-hundred-years-old Parliament has had one for quite a long time; and from time immemorial, since the time that Mace was given to the Legislature, we have respected it and regarded it as a symbol of the Speaker's authority, and we know where to place it at certain times. Mr. Speaker, to show that your authority remains, that Mace has remained in the House overnight. The House was suspended and not adjourned. But, Mr. Speaker, we had a Mace for years and years, before the hon. senior member for St. John went to school, and Presiding Officers of this House knew where to put that mace.

THE SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 7.10 p.m. The sitting of this House stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7.10 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, Sir Grantley Herbert Adams -

Mr. ST. JOHN: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion has not yet been made. The hon. member cannot raise a point of order on a motion which has not been made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, hon. junior member for St. Joseph, be suspended from the service of this House.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. This motion is not in order for several reasons. I am not debating the motion. *(Interruption)* I made a point of order, and anybody can rise on a point of order. Standing Order No. 36 (3) states:

"Whenever a Member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence has been committed by such Member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, "That be suspended from the service of the House"; and if the offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House, the Chairman shall forthwith suspend the proceedings of the Committee and report the circumstances to the House; and the Speaker shall on a motion being made forthwith put the same question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed as if the offence had been committed in the House itself."

Therefore it is vital for you to hear all points which relate to the validity of the motion. My point is that the conditions of Standing Order No. 36 (3) have not been fulfilled, because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has not been named in the Committee forthwith by the Chairman. It is my understanding that the Chairman never named him in Committee at all, and the Chairman cannot name anybody in the House. He can only name a member in Committee, and it has to be done immediately after the commission of the offence. It is my understanding that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was not named, by the Chairman in Committee, and it is to my knowledge that he was not named immediately after the commission of any offence. Mr. Speaker, I was present at that stage, and what I heard was this. *(Interruption)*

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order which relates to the validity of a purported motion. This motion cannot be put to the House unless a member has been named by the Chairman. The Chairman said to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to help the Prime Minister and the House. Believe me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not disbelieving the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas as to whether or not he is trying to help the House. But I am saying - and it is my Ruling - that the Chairman has reported to me that an offence was committed in Committee of the whole House, and that in consequence thereof he forthwith -

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, he did not tell you that. You can ask the Chairman if it was done forthwith; do not make a joke of the House.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking; sit down!

Mr. ST. JOHN: I will sit down, but do not shout at me!

Mr. SPEAKER: Let no hon. member, of however long standing, or however young a member of this House, feel that he can intimidate the Chair by shouting at the Chair. *(Interruption)* And let no one, who should assist in preserving order, set an example of creating disorder.

Now this is my Ruling. The Chairman has reported to me that an offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House. The Chairman has so reported to me. Of that there is no doubt whatsoever. The Chairman of Committees has reported that an offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House, and I am not concerned with holding an enquiry as to what occurred in the Committee of the whole House. All things are assumed to have been rightly done in Committee of the whole House, and that presumption holds. The Chair has no intention of conducting an inquiry as to what took place in Committee of the whole House.

The report having been made to the Chair, and a motion having been duly moved and seconded, I forthwith put the question to the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair may only be questioned on a substantive motion.

The question is now that Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, junior member for St. Joseph, be suspended from the service of the House.

Hon. members who are in favour will please say "Aye"; those of a contrary opinion will please say "No"; I declare the "Ayes" have it.
7.55 p.m.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon'bles E. W. BARROW, J. C. TUDOR, G. G. FERGUSON, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, CORBIN, SPRINGER, SARGEANT, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 11.

The CLERK: Mr. MOTTLEY.

Mr. MOTTLEY: *(Sitting)* A division is being taken but I would like to gather if Your Honour thinks that it would be advisable to ask for the report on the occasion rather than have this controversy on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: To the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, I state the moment is inappropriate.

THE CLERK: Mr. Mottley.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No.

THE CLERK: Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS: *(Sitting)*: A division is being taken and I am to ask if it is not right, reasonable, just, honest, and everything that this Hon. House would call for, on this occasion when objection has been raised to a report that has been made to Your Honour, - is it not fair and just for Your Honour to call for the report on the matter to ascertain whether or not you have received correct reports of the proceedings of this House? I understand that Your Honour said that you are not here to hold an enquiry into what went on, and that all things must be presumed to have been rightly done.

We are approaching a stage in this House when an hon. member on that side - Your Honour must show to the Government side that you must be fair and just at all times, as we are expecting it from you on this side of the House. The day will come when somebody will get up and move that you be beheaded and you will not be able to do anything about it. I am asking you not to let it be shown that because you want Knighthood from the hon. members on that side that you should rule in such a manner as you have ruled today. I am a junior member of this House, and I am asking you to act at all times to make me feel that I am in a happy and right place. The people of St. Peter have put me here to represent them, and I am asking that we should respect rulings from the Chair. In the parish of St. Lucy, you were voted for, and all hon. members have been voted for. We are asking you to do all you can at this particular moment.

The naming of any hon. member from the Opposition is not going to enhance your chances to secure a knighthood, and we are appealing to you at this most precious hour to uphold the dignity of this Hon. House. We are sure that we can expect you to uphold the dignity and if anyone like the Prime Minister borders on the lunatic fringe, we are appealing to you to use your stabilising influence to do whatever you can to bring the Hon. Prime Minister to understand that the rules of the House apply to him as to any other hon. member. Nobody in this House knows better the respect which is due to the Mace than the Hon. Leader of the House, because in this House he is on record as having removed the Mace from its cradle at a particular time, and we can only appeal to you to do all that is absolutely necessary under the circumstances I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 36 (3) which says this:

"Whenever a Member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence has been committed by such Member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or

debate being allowed, "That be suspended, from the service of the House."

At no time during the proceedings in Committee was any such step taken as is laid down in Rule 36 (3) Rule 36 (3) is couched in language which must command your attention and the attention of each and every member of the House. It begins from line 2 and it uses such a word as "immediately" and it goes on with "persistently" and "wilfully". It goes on to use the word "forthwith", and in the last line of page 32 it tells you what the Chairman should do.

At no time did the Chairman comply with these Rules, and if the Speaker should permit the Chairman to stand before this Hon. House and tell a falsehood - I charge the junior member for St. John, the Chairman of Committees, with stating a deliberate falsehood to you, Sir, before this Hon. House, and it has been challenged by hon. members on this side of the House. In the circumstances that a challenge has been presented to the Speaker, it is your duty to call for the Report or the Minutes of the proceedings and see to what extent right or wrong has been done.

It is not fair merely to hear Mr. Speaker say that it must be assumed that everything was rightly done. We are reducing this Hon. House to a farce, and we are appealing to you to rise to the occasion and let the world at large know that you are not going to uphold wrongdoing, whether it be by the Prime Minister or the Leader of the House or any Government member or any other hon. member on this side of the House. This is a case where we are to hear from you that the junior member for St. John has acted in accordance with Rule 36 (3) by which he says he named hon. members. While there is a motion for the suspension of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, a motion was also proceeded with against another hon. member and I happened to be present. On this particular occasion, on the question of the motion to suspend the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. senior member for the City was allowed to carry on a debate before any other member was told about a suspension. We cannot challenge your ruling or your authority; we are just here to abide by it and we would like to know that when we abide by a Ruling, that it is a Ruling of which our great-grand children will all feel proud.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to you. I am sure that you have read Rule 36 (3) and today you have heard it read repeatedly, and we must say that there is hardly any necessity for Your Honour to read it again. But what are we saying? We are asking you to do all you possibly can at this very critical moment in the history of this Island. Mr. Speaker, a knighthood should mean absolutely nothing to you.

If you want to get a knighthood, it will come in its own due time. You do not have to crush the Opposition to satisfy the Government in order to get knighthood. We are appealing to you, if a nitwit has been placed in the Chair as Chairman of Committees, let him know whether he is right or wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, am making this appeal to you to save the dignity of the House.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to draw your attention to Standing Order 36, Rule 3. At line 2, it says what the Chairman of Committees should do. It says that the Chairman should act immediately. At line 4, he says that the member has got, not merely to commit an offence but the member has got to be persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any report made here about the hon. member obstructing the business of this House. We are sure that if a wise Chairman had been in charge of this Committee, it would not have been drawn to Your Honour's attention that a member was wilfully obstructing the business of this House.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at this thing, we are saying that what the Speaker and the Chairman should do is to do as the Rule lays it down. You should act forthwith under the present circumstances. If Your Honour were to call for the record, you will find that nothing has been done in a forthwith manner, but what went on was this. The hon. senior member for the City got up and carried on a debate, and considerable time elapsed. We cannot call it less than a debate. If the Rule says that the Chairman should act immediately, and the Chairman has not done so, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House can only appeal to you.

Mr. Speaker, I say here and now that we on this side can only call on you to rule, to do all that is necessary to preserve the dignity of this House on this august occasion. It is not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Chairman of Committees had come into the House charged with a mandate. It would seem as if the Chairman of Committee has a mandate, for that Party seems to have a mandate on every possible thing under the sun that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees has demonstrated himself to us in no uncertain terms; and I say that the people of St. John must have been duped and doped when they were asked to cast their vote because, Sir, I am to tell you that they have elected to this Honourable House two great extremes, one who is so well educated that the best thing for him is to go in search of Dr. Lloyd-Still once again, and the other to the other extreme. It is a pity that this House has got to be saddled with them.

Mr. Speaker, I see under Rule 36 (3) there is an abundance of caution. Believe me, Sir, the Committee which framed those rules exerted great caution because line after line, they have laid it down in no uncertain terms what the Speaker should do and what the Chairman of Committee should do. Are we to assume, Mr. Speaker, all things have been rightly done? Are we just to come and sit down in this House and make a farce of democracy? This is a country to which you and I owe a great debt and on this occasion I can only call on you to rise to the occasion once more.

What is being done is not anything to shelve you from any motions of censure. What the Hon. Prime Minister is doing is using a lackey in the person of the Hon. Chairman of Committees by naming the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. They feel they are scoring a victory; but let me tell you that the people of St. John have made a grave mistake when they sent those two hon. members in here.

Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching the stage where hon. members would have to be searched by the Police before they come into this Chamber. We on this side of the House have to come here, sit and listen to whatever the Prime Minister has to say. We have heard more of threats from those hon. members to hon. members on this side of the House. Let the Prime Minister bear in mind, that I heard him talk of meeting fire with fire, and steel with steel. Let him beware; as from now on he has to meet it. 8.15 p.m.

We in the Opposition say that the Prime Minister can do nothing that is wrong. Anything that is wrong he wants to do we will undo it for him. Let him call on the Attorney General to close our mouths on this side of the House. We will tell the Prime Minister that today he has met his Waterloo.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given the hon. junior member for St. Peter a lot of latitude.....I am sorry if I interrupt the hon. senior member for St. Thomas..... I was saying that I have given the hon. junior member for St. Peter unlimited latitude..... I am sorry if I interrupt the hon. senior member for Christ Church..... When a division is being taken, an hon. member may only speak as the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has done. He may not, in the course of a division, make a speech which he could not have made if the substantive debate were not in progress.

As a matter of fact, our Standing Orders are seemingly silent on the point, and I could not agree more with the suggestion that they should be amended. I realised, since 1962, how bad our Standing Orders are in need of effective revision. Of that there can be no doubt. But the only guidance which one may get in this matter in respect of anything that may be said during the taking of a division is found in the latest edition of May's, at page 442, wherein it is stated that the only occasion, in both Houses, when a Member speaks sitting is when a question of order arises during a division. It is obvious that only a valid question of order may be discussed, and not a wide range of matters entirely outside a question of order.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter has been given the widest possible range and latitude - wider, I have no doubt in my mind, that any other hon. member is entitled - any new hon. member to this Chamber - because of the silence of our Standing Orders, and because of the fact that he may not have found any guidance in them to restrain him from so speaking.

It should be very clear, if one may not, during the course of a debate, discuss certain matters, that when a division is being taken, it is absolutely out of order, irregular and improper, for a member to proceed to debate it and make a speech which he could not have made if a division were not taken. In other words, when a division is being taken, only a question of order, such as the hon. senior member for Bridgetown made, may be taken when hon. members are seated.

I will tell the hon. member that I will not hear him any longer, as he was not making any point of order. The onus is on him now to give his vote.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*) : I am now speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is saying that he will now speak on a point of order. If he has a point of order, he must make it with proper conciseness, and I am sure he will make no attempt to filibuster. Let the point of order be made.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*) : Mr. SPEAKER, it has been reported to you by the Chairman of Committees that an offence has been committed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can hardly hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter because of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY (*seated*) : What am I saying? You do not like the look of my clothes?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*) : Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, standing before the full House, reported to you that an offence had been committed by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. The accuracy of the report of the Chairman of Committees has been challenged.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the point of order that the hon. member is making?

Mr. HINDS (*seated*) : I am obeying Your Honour's ruling, and I will never question it. Upon the challenge being made on the floor of this Hon. House, we on this side are to be guided by Your Honour at all times. We are wondering whether Your Honour could have overlooked in any respect the fact that the accuracy of the report as made by the Chairman of committees has been challenged. We know that any hon. member making a statement in this Hon. House or more so.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech. He has made a point, and I will deal with it. So far as the Chair is concerned, it is not interested in what took place in the Committee of the whole House. It receives a report; it assumes that everything was rightly done, and it does not enter into an inquiry or investigation as to what took place

in committee. I am seised of the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and that is my Ruling.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*) : In the circumstances, would it be in order for hon. members on this side of the House to get up and call the Chairman of Committees a liar to his face and let it go down in the debates?

Mr. SPEAKER: That would not be a point of order. Mr. Clerk, take the vote of the hon. member.

THE CLERK: Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*) : I am sure that the Clerk of the Table will take directions from Your Honour. Your Honour was just explaining to me what was right and what was wrong. Before you had completed what you were saying to me, the Clerk of the Table called on me to cast my vote. (*Interruption*)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL (*seated*) : Put the question to the vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken at length. I have explained what is his right when he is speaking seated. He has made a point; I have ruled on the point, and I am now asking the hon. member to vote.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: It is a question for me as to whether I will give a vote or else. We must concern ourselves with this: is an hon. member only entitled to make a point of order when he is sitting? I might have made a point and Your Honour might have ruled on it, and I might make another point of order. (*ASIDES*). I am being interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to make a speech. Let me remind the hon. member of Standing Order 37 (7) which says this:-

"When a member's name is called by the Clerk at a division, the Member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes". He is not entitled to make a speech.

Mr. HINDS: The Clerk has to be in order first.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, have you called the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown?

Mr. CLERK: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please record the vote of the junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. CLERK: Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS: I am addressing the Chair. It is a question of what is being done at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division is being taken and the hon. member's name has been called. The hon. member shall answer by voting for the "Ayes" or for the

"Noes". Let the hon. member vote. The Standing Order says that the hon. member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes", that he shall answer on being called upon.

Mr. HINDS: I am going to answer. This is not a light matter at all; this is a case of wrongdoing. I have to make up my mind whether to vote one way or the other on this question of wrongdoing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make up his mind and answer the Clerk.

Mr. CLERK: Mr. Hinds.

At this stage, it being now 8.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is now 8.30 p.m. of the Clock, the Moment of interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division is being taken.

Mr. ST. JOHN: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division is being taken; the hon. member may not rise.

Mr. ST. JOHN: (*Sitting*). Under the Rules of the House at 8.30 p.m. of the clock, there is the Moment of Interruption. 8.30 p.m. o'clock has gone. (*ASIDES*) I am being interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot be interrupted because he has not the right to speak.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Standing Order 5 (4) says: "At 8.30 p.m.", - I just heard the clock strike - "hereinafter referred to in these orders as "the moment of Interruption", the Speaker shall interrupt the business under discussion. If the House is in Committee at that time the Chairman shall interrupt the business and shall leave the Chair forthwith to report progress to the House and ask its leave to sit again."

I suggest that that time has passed. It says that the Speaker shall interrupt the business.

Mr. SPEAKER: For the benefit of hon. members including the most junior, that applies to the business under discussion. There is no business under discussion. A division is being taken. Business can only be discussed by hon. members standing in their places. (*ASIDES*).

Mr. ST. JOHN: May I be allowed the courtesy, as God did to Adam before sentencing him when he asked him if he had eaten of the forbidden fruit. (*ASIDES*) I am making a point of order and I am being interrupted. The Standing Order says that the Speaker shall interrupt the business.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order can be made during the taking of a division, but there cannot be any discussion.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The point I am making is that it is past 8.30 p.m. of the Clock.
8.35 p.m.

Mr. ST. JOHN: (INTERRUPTIONS) (ASIDES).

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am being called upon to vote by the Clerk. Under Standing Orders 37 (7) it says:-

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

Under the last part of this Rule, I do not want to vote in a manner inconsistent with any opinion I have expressed when the voices were taken collectively. I am going to appeal to Your Honour at this moment. I want to know if I can ask for the correct report of what went on read back for my benefit.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown face the Chair and not conduct conversations with persons, not members of the House.

Mr. HINDS: I would not like to answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion I expressed when the voices were taken collectively.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought it is universally known by hon. members that when voices are taken collectively, there is not, and cannot be, any record of voices being taken collectively; certainly no record by the Official Reporters; but if the hon. member is saying - and he is quite correct - that he would not vote in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which he has expressed when the voices were taken collectively, the hon. member may well recall how he answered when the voices were taken collectively, whether he voted with the "Ayes" or with the "Noes".

Mr. HINDS: May I only answer, Sir on a point of order, and I am to ask Your Honour's guidance on what is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, all I said, on a point of order, was that I do not want to answer in a manner inconsistent with any opinion which may have been expressed when the voices were taken collectively.

Mr. SPEAKER: This simply means that the hon. member may not vote now in a manner inconsistent with the opinion which he expressed when the voices were taken collectively. In other words, if he said "Aye" when the voices were taken collectively, he must not now say "No". If he said "No" when the voices were taken collectively, he must not now say "Aye." That is all that means.

Mr. HINDS: For my own guidance - only for my own benefit. I want to know which way I went; that is

all I want. That is why, Sir, I am very careful to get this matter right.
8.45 p.m.

Mr HINDS: (seated) I do not want to be assumed that all things were done correctly. That is Why I was very careful to read Standing Order 37(7). Mr. Speaker, I see that you are speaking with the Clerk, and I will wait until you are free to hear me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was listening to the hon. member with the ear from which I hear best.

Mr. HINDS: (seated): With regard to Standing Order 37 (6), it states:

"When a division has been claimed, the Clerk shall call the names of Members in the order of Sitting, and shall enter on the Minutes a record of each Member's vote.

Standing Order 37 (7) states;

"When a Member's name is called by the Clerk at a division the Member shall answer either by voting for the "Ayes" or for the "Noes".

At the time of the calling of my name, the Clerk was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That submission is overruled; the Clerk was in order.

Mr. HINDS (seated): I will proceed to read the remainder of the Rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rule has been read; it is before every hon. member. It is unnecessary for the hon. member to assume that anyone around this Table is not literate.

Mr. HINDS (seated): I have heard hon. members say that they do not understand them. For that reason I am going to read Standing Order 37 (7):

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

Mr. Speaker, I notice that you are engaged.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was listening to the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Will the Clerk take the vote of the hon. member for St. Peter?

The CLERK: Mr. Hinds, ...Mr. HUSBANDS
Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I intend to cast my vote. I would like to draw you attention to Rule 37 (7).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is saying that the Clerk was out of order when he called his name. The hon. member has been denied the privilege of speaking. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter make a point of order, and I heard the Clerk call the name of the hon. senior member.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL (*seated*): The vote has already been taken, and I do not intend to sit here the whole night and listen to this filibustering.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Must members be denied the right to speak? On a point of order. I have not yet voted, and I wish to have the right to vote. This is the first step to breaking down the constitution if members of the House are passed over. Filibuster or no filibuster, we must abide with the Rules. We do not have any Rule here that we have to vote within six minutes. In England you have to exercise a vote within six minutes, or you can abstain. There is no Rule here to that effect. (*LOUD ASIDES AND INTERRUPTIONS*).

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter has continued long enough. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter does not answer the Clerk now either by voting "Aye" or "No" the Clerk will be directed to record a vote in respect of that hon. member for the "Noes".

The CLERK: Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*): The Clerk of this House has already deprived me of that right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk has not by-passed the hon. member; he has waited on this hon. member longer than any other member has ever been waited on. I direct the Clerk to record a vote of "No".

The CLERK: Mr. Husbands.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. It is passing strange that I gave my intimation, just as Your Honour was about to give your Ruling, that I intended to raise a point of order. Your Honour went on and made your Ruling, and left me dumbfounded. I regard Your Honour as being more than letting me down in not allowing me to express my point of order. I think I was denied the privilege of a member of this House. I will continue when you have finished discussing your business with the Clerk. I will resume when you are free to listen to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member a point of order to make?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I was making a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you make it?
8.55 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I was about to stress the fact that what Your Honour interprets as matters in Committee being assumed to have been in order, I take variance with that, because I was in Committee at the time. Your

Honour was not in Committee at the time. I note that as far as the hon. senior member for St. James is concerned, he was not properly named, neither was the hon. junior member for St. Joseph properly named.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot arise now in the taking of the division. I have said that anything which took place in Committee may not be the subject of enquiry when the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker resumes the Chair. That is my Ruling which may be questioned on a substantive motion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: If I belong to a Parliament where the Chairman is *ipso facto* deemed to be infallible (*ASIDES*) The motion should have been proceeded with immediately after the alleged naming had properly taken place. Action did not proceed immediately in either case. Therefore, in my opinion, all these things have been out of order. To ask me to express a vote when I know that the sum total of these votes has been taken - my honest observations will go for nothing - is asking me too much. All I can say is this, that in making this point of order I was unfortunate enough to be denied utterance today. Now that Your Honour is calling for a division, where the Rules are silent, there is absolutely no penalty attached to my not voting. I do not know about Your Honour's interpretation, as to instructing Mr. Clerk to record a vote for me; that is unconstitutional and I will revert to a point of order at the conclusion of the time limit regarding the same. It is now 9.00 p.m. of the clock, and no Rules of the House can change 9.00 p.m. of the Clock.

Mr. CLERK: Mr. Husbands.

Mr. SPEAKER: I direct that a vote "No" be recorded for Mr. Husbands.

Mr. CLERK: Mr. Adams.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (*SITTING*): Mr. Speaker, it is my submission to you that this division is being wrongly taken. My submission is based not upon what happened when Your Honour permitted the Prime Minister to move a motion that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be suspended from the service of the House. I take it that that is the term of the motion. Before I go any further, I would be obliged if Your Honour could tell me if the motion has been duly seconded and by whom? Before any hon. member should be called upon to vote in a division, it must be established that the motion is properly moved and seconded.

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

MEMBERS: He has already voted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion was seconded.

MEMBERS: By whom?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.
(*ASIDES*)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. (ASIDES).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. (ASIDES).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.

MEMBERS: He cannot speak; he has already voted. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the grave disorder, this sitting now stands suspended until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon.
9.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the division was being taken.

The CLERK: Mr. Adams.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (*seated*): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a point I was trying to make at an early stage when I was standing on my feet saying the words "On a point of order." You, Your Honour, was engaged in putting the motion, despite the fact that hon. members including myself - I seem to remember the hon. senior member for Christ Church - were on our feet saying "A point of order".

The point of order relating to the division which I was at that stage seeking to make was that although you had interrupted my earlier point of order by stating that you were giving your Ruling on the motion, you, Mr. Speaker, did not state when putting the motion that the Chairman of Committees had named the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

If you care to refer to your Ruling, you will find that your Ruling embraced only the fact that the Chairman had reported that an offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair had been committed. You did not in giving your Ruling continue, as I submit is required by Rule 36(3), to state that the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair had been committed in the Committee and that the hon. member having been named, then the motion was put before the House and no amendment, adjournment or debate was allowed.

The point of order which I was making when Your Honour actually put the motion, in fact, related to that very point; therefore, I think Your Honour will rightly agree when I say that I was not in any way questioning the ruling of the Chair when I remind Your Honour that, upon the Chairman's report being made, you asked the Chairman whether the provisions of Rule 36(3) had been carried out, namely, that the hon. junior member for St. James was named immediately after the commission of the offence.

The Chairman of Committees made no reply to Your Honour's question. I, therefore, take it that Your Honour's question is still open, and it is still

open to any hon. member to make submissions to Your Honour, especially now that a week's time for cooling off has intervened - especially now that hon. members, I think, have had an opportunity of considering carefully, calmly, and in cooler circumstances, what has taken place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now proceeding to make a speech. He has made his point of order, and I am seised of it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (*seated*): This is the first point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out this: I cannot allow any abuse, or apparent abuse, of the privilege of an hon. member, during the taking of a division, to proceed to make a speech. As I pointed out on a previous occasion, according to May's at page 442, the only occasion, in both Houses, when a Member speaks sitting and covered is when a question of order arises during a division.

It is a fact that I gave a tremendous amount of latitude, maybe too much, on a previous occasion; but, in the interval of the week to which the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas has referred, I have given further careful consideration and done much research and have satisfied myself beyond all doubt that particularly in relation to this matter the Standing Orders lay down that no amendment, adjournment, or debate be allowed on the motion. Even less so can a debate be allowed during the taking of a division, and that is my Ruling.

I will ask the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to vote when the Clerk calls his name.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (*seated*) I accept what Your Honour has said about it being undesirable or inappropriate to make a speech during a division. I will again point out that Your Honour has not ruled on the essential points of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling that this division shall proceed, and there is no other point of order which has been made which calls for any Ruling other than that I have given previously. I cannot allow this division to go on interminably. Hon. members are well aware that if they disagree with or disapprove of my action, steps may be taken on a substantive motion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (*seated*) The first point of order I made.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already said that he has made that point of order. That is taken for granted.

Mr. Clerk, please take the vote.

Mr. CLERK: Mr. Adams.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (*seated*) On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not allowing this to continue. If the hon. member does not vote "AYE" or "No".....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: *(seated)* Mr. Speaker, you cannot stop me from making a point of order which has arisen during a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point of order? It must not be a speech.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: *(seated)* The point of order relates to whether or not a vote in the House can be interrupted in the manner in which it has been interrupted. The specific Rule 36 (3) states: 'no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed.' I submit that what happened last week was that a point of order was being made, the House was sitting, there was an adjournment and that has invalidated everything.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. Mr. Clerk, will you now take the vote?

The CLERK: Mr. Adams.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS *(seated)*: Mr. Speaker, it is customary to rule when a point of order is raised

The CLERK: Mr. Adams.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: *(seated)* I am trying to make up my mind as to how I should vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will allow what I consider to be a reasonable time to vote. A reasonable time will expire 30 seconds from now.
12.10 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: *(seated)* If Your Honour is determined to follow the unconstitutional practice of casting my vote, I am asking Your Honour to cast the vote consistent with the point of order, because that is the opinion I expressed when I was asked to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, I direct you to record a vote of "No" for the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

The CLERK: Mr. St. John.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* During the course of the division before this motion was put, a point of order had arisen which I should like to talk on. I drew Your Honour's attention to the fact - in fact, on page 32 of the Standing Orders - I ask Your Honour to advert to the records of the House where it would be clearly seen that the Hon. Prime Minister, the hon. senior member for the City and other hon. members spoke, and therefore the Chairman of Committees gave this House facts which are not correct. I ask Your Honour, as is usual and customary, to ask for the record as taken by the Clerks-at-the-Table. The Rule that all things are presumed to be done correctly is only a presumption, and, in my view, it is an illegitimate

use of it. I therefore submit to Your Honour especially when there is clear, specific, and unquestionable evidence, that the action taken by the Chairman was illegal, void, unconstitutional, dictatorial, spiteful and vindictive.

Your Honour, for reasons best known to yourself, has not allowed the facts, and you have not followed the usual custom and practice of referring to the proceedings. I also pointed out that under the Rules of the House - and I submit to Your Honour on a point of order - that this division which is being taken now is illegal and unconstitutional, in that this House is sitting today having been adjourned in accordance with the rules of the House automatically at 9 o'clock, and I ask Your Honour, as is usual and customary again to refer to the records at the Table. My clear and distinct recollection of the matter is that 9 o'clock struck, there was no disorder in the House at the time, and, in my humble opinion and submission, Your Honour had no power to do anything. The House automatically stood adjourned at 9 o'clock. It is usual and customary for us to refer to the Clerks.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member finished?

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I have not yet finished my point of order. It seems to me that the Rule says quite clearly that: "At 9 p.m. notwithstanding that there may be business under discussion, the Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put". There can be no doubt, unless people are dishonest to themselves and dishonest to facts, that 9 o'clock came. Nine o'clock came last Tuesday night before this division was completed. Discussion was taking place; a member was speaking; so that when 9 o'clock came the House was adjourned, in my humble opinion. We are asked today to participate in a division in which it has been clearly and distinctly pointed out, and repeatedly pointed out, that the Rules of the House have been broken by the Chairman. They have been broken by other people, and we are asked to participate in this illegality by voting when any of us who has a conscience or slight understanding, or any of us who can read, knows quite clearly that the whole thing has been an illegal procedure, and it has been engineered by certain people and their lackeys to pervert the Rules of this House in order to satisfy some petty, spiteful, and vindictive instinct which they cannot get rid of, however they try.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I am saying that the adjournment of this House was not called for as usual. That is the question I am speaking on. It is clear that Your Honour has been misinformed as to what, in fact, took place, and the record would show clearly in my humble opinion, that this Parliament.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* On a point of order. It appears that the powers of Your Honour are non-

existent, and the procedure which is in accordance with the exercise of Your Honour's powers has not been carried out. The Rule says this: "Whenever a Member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the Rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence has been committed by such Member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being allowed."

It is a lie to say that this was done. The Journal of the records would prove that this is not so. Naming forthwith is a condition precedent, according to the Rules. There is no evidence before Your Honour that that has been fulfilled. In these circumstances, the whole of this process must be an illegal process, and I am sure that Your Honour would not give your assent to the obvious flouting of the Rules, and the obvious breaking of the Rules by no one, however powerful he may appear to be.

Mr. SPEAKER: No one member of this Chamber is any more powerful than any other member, except the Presiding Officer at the time. Is the hon. member..

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I have not finished my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow this to continue indefinitely. Two points have been made.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* It is the custom, and it is customary for Your Honour in the past, and I am sure it will be so on this occasion, that if a member rises on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: A speech is being made. I do not intend to enter any debate with the hon. member. I have every intention of answering the two points which have been made, but the division will have to be completed.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I humbly submit to Your Honour that if a point of order is taken which affects the validity of the division, the time for that to be ruled upon is before the division is completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the view of the hon. member, but in my view, it does not affect the taking of the division.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I am trying to point out to Your Honour why it does affect the validity of the division.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. member and I am seised of his point. I have no intention of descending into the arena and having a debate with the hon. member. I will give my Ruling immediately after the vote is taken.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* As Your Honour may well know, it is the right of a member to raise a point of order, and I am asking Your Honour - I am drawing

Your Honour's attention to the fact that I am making a point of order with respect to the validity of this division. I am asking Your Honour to give Your Ruling on it, and I go further and on another point of order I ask Your Honour to inform this House why it is that Your Honour has seen fit to depart from your usual practice of calling for the records of the House, the records of the Clerks-at-the-Table, when a point has been made, and there is doubt as to what has taken place.

12.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the third time that the hon. member has made this point. Repetition does not necessarily strengthen the position in this case.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* On a point of order. I have to consider this matter as I do not want to participate in any illegality. I am convinced in my whole mind that the whole thing is illegal. Even the Ruling from Your Honour showing reasons why - Your Honour specifically said the provision of the rules, when I pointed out to Your Honour.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is repeating himself - not for the first time.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I was pointing out to Your Honour that the whole thing is unconstitutional and illegal. The fact is that dictatorial methods were employed on certain positions of power. I must consider this seriously, and I must have time to consider it.

Mr. SPEAKER: As every lawyer has to do, even the most junior. A reasonable time has almost elapsed within thirty seconds that time would have elapsed.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I am still on a point of order. I would like again to draw Your Honour's attention to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, please call the hon. member's name.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I am making a further point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now up to the hon. member to indicate how he is going to vote. As I understand it, the point is taken.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* It is not going to be undertaken lightly.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not going to be prolonged one minute longer.

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* Your Honour, with all due respect to you.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for Christ Church indicate how he is going to vote?

Mr. St. JOHN: *(seated)* I desire to vote, but I do not want to participate in any illegal matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said that several times. Mr. Clerk, record a vote of "No" for the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

While the votes are being counted, I will make this observation. I have no intention to continue a debate with the hon. member who may wish to do so on what he previously said.

I make two points. The sitting of last Tuesday was validly suspended by virtue of the appropriate Standing Order before the first of the nine strokes of the Public Buildings clock. This sitting was suspended, and it was suspended by me; and after I had so declared, the Public Building Clock struck the first stroke of nine. That was the case despite what a certain daily newspaper stated. That will be the subject of other action in due course. The sitting was suspended before the first stroke of nine.

Secondly, in respect of the other point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, I do not deem it the duty of the Chair when it is called upon to receive a report from the Chairman when he had suspended the proceedings of the sitting in order to report certain circumstances to the House - I do not deem it proper, correct, right or in any way desirable that at the request of any one the Chair should open an enquiry as to the validity or the rectitude of what took place in the Committee. So far as the Chair as at present constituted is concerned, if the Chairman makes a report to the Speaker, and particularly in view of the language used in this Standing Order: "The Speaker shall on a motion being made forthwith put the same question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed" it should be manifestly clear that if the enquiry were to take place, that would be impossible without debate because different hon. members would be so likely to express different points of view. There would then be a full debate and that would be against what is clearly stated in the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER then called on the Clerk to report the division that was taken.

The Clerk reported 11 Ayes and 5 Noes.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. I am taking exception. When the suspension of the House took place, that was completely out of order because as I sat in my chair on a matter of a point of order, I then argued that 9 p.m. of the clock had already arrived. I was speaking and the vote had not yet passed me. If at 9 p.m., I was speaking and had actually mentioned to the Chair that it was 9 p.m., of the clock. I cannot see how the House could have been suspended at 9 p.m. o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps, the hon. senior member for St. Peter did not hear me. I have just said that I declared that the sitting of the House was suspended by me before the first stroke of the hour of nine o'clock p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. I hope the Clerk, and the Reporters themselves would have

noted that I was in my seat and when I made the point of order, I distinctly mentioned that it was 9 p.m., of the clock and up to that time you did not make that announcement. I want that crystal clear and noted in Hansard. The Clerk did not deny it at that time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The division.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am making my point, Mr. Speaker. It was not denied by you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The division has been taken. Is the hon. member speaking - on what? Nothing?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no point of order arising at this stage because nothing is happening at this stage.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I have not got the rule in front of me. If you look at paragraph 9, it states that a member may rise on a point of order after the members' votes have been announced but before Your Honour has declared the results. You have been in the House all these years and you say that a point of order cannot be made at this stage when the rules says that this is the time it must be made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member now seems to be making a speech.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am making a point of order that there is no provision in any Parliament carried on, so to speak, under the Westminster Rules, in which the Chair can cast a vote for any member or direct the Clerk to record a vote for a member; and it having been done, that entire division is of no validity whatsoever.

No person can cast a vote for the man that the electors of St. Thomas has sent here as senior member. Nobody can do that but that man. It has not been done in 700 years of Parliament - not in any Parliament carried on under the Westminster Rules. It cannot be done.

12.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk has reported to me that 11 members have voted "Aye" and 5 members have voted "No".

Mr. ST. JOHN (seated): That is not true.

Mr. HINDS (Seated): On a point of order. I have just heard Your Honour say that 5 hon. members -

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that 11 votes have been recorded for, and 5 votes have been recorded against the motion. I, accordingly, declare the motion duly carried.

Mr. HINDS (seated) On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking and I cannot be interrupted on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*): I took it that Your Honour might not have heard my point of order. I think it is my duty to draw to Your Honour's attention, in whatever way I possibly can, and to make it audible for your Honour to hear, my point of order. I am sure Your Honour will respect my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. HINDS (*seated*): I was making a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage no alleged point of order can possibly be relevant. My attention has been drawn to Standing Order 37(9) which states:

"If a Member states that he voted in error or that his vote has been counted wrongly, he may claim to have his vote altered, provided that such request is made as soon as the Chair has announced the numbers, and before the Chair has declared the result of the division."

Mr. HINDS (*seated*): You have just referred this House to Rule 37(9).

Mr. SPEAKER: I referred to the Rule to which the hon. member has drawn my attention.

Mr. HINDS (*seated*): On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing before the House. The result of the division has been declared. The motion was moved, and the motion has been carried, that Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, The Hon. junior member for St. Joseph, be suspended from the service of the House. That motion having been duly carried, I declare, in accordance therewith, that the hon. member is duly suspended from the service of the House.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No. 23

A Resolution for the sum of \$52,750 was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is a Resolution to place the sum of \$52,750 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 23 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution for the sum of \$52,750 under Head 20 - Civil Aviation - Part I - Current of the 1967-68 Estimates -

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is that the Resolution upon which the hon. Prime Minister was speaking when the points of order arose which led to the unfortunate incidents? Has that Resolution been finished with?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has a right to be in his seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That Resolution has already been passed. Let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Shut up, man!

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. The Hon. Prime Minister has looked me straight in my face and told me, "Shut up, man." I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot allow the hon. Prime Minister to make such asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. HUSBANDS: If you were in my position you would not stand for that, and you would have expected the Chair to defend you. I am pointing out to you, in a most direct manner, that you should speak to the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is duly made.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I want you to give a warning to the Hon. Prime Minister to desist from such behaviour in this Chamber. I am asking or requesting you to do that. You are here to defend us, not the Government; you must not defend Ministers only. I want you here and now to give a precise warning to the hon. Prime Minister about that sort of conduct. If you do not, then you have admitted the coward you are.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two wrongs cannot make a right. The point has been made; let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am a Parliamentarian of long standing. I want to know that, in accordance with the dignity of the Chair, you are interested in decorum in this House.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. senior member for St. John says something which I have heard, and I deem it to be out of order, I will tell him so. Let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Do you discredit what I have said? You said or did not say you want to hear it? If I heard it and you may not have heard it, do you discredit what I said?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. senior member for St. John to proceed with the Resolution which is before the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The shout of coward

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you were on your feet and you were being interrupted by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who has just sat down. If he had any respect for the Chair, he would not be interrupting the Chair. The Chairman was on his feet. The hon. member has come in here deliberately to break up the proceedings in this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will not let it go out that I interrupted the Chair. I rose on a point of order in my own defence. I rose legitimately and brought something to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If this continues, I will act according to the Rules of the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: And I will act according to something else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is challenging the Chair, I think he will find an Order for it. I say: let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This Resolution, Mr. Chairman

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has not said anything on the Resolution which calls for a point of order. I will not go on with these points of interruptions.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Standing Order 36(3) says this..... "If the offence has been committed by such member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I enquire from the hon. senior member for St. Thomas if since we have resumed, he is stating that something has gone wrong in Committee?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Since we have resumed, something has gone wrong in Committee. We have resumed what happened in Committee - something which happened at five o'clock last Tuesday.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is speaking on the Resolution for \$80,000, that has already been passed. I will hear the debate on a Resolution for \$52,750 now to be introduced. I will ask the hon. senior member for St. John, who has got up to speak on this Resolution, to proceed with this Resolution.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, you cannot really handle hon. members like that. There is no heat in what I am putting forward to the House. I am not getting up to quarrel. We can quarrel, but I am not quarrelling. That is not the motion on which I got up. Last week the suspension

of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph passed through the House twice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow at this stage what happened last week to be the subject of debate today. I want the hon. senior member for St. John to proceed with the Resolution for \$52,570.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: May I be permitted to make a point of order. Can't an hon. member make a point of order now? You have said that the Resolution for \$80,000 has been passed. If there was some technical error in the passage of that Resolution, in the same way that the House went into the suspension twice, the Committee will have to go over the Resolution twice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I read for the hon. member's benefit this Standing Order 35? "The Speaker in the House or the Chairman in Committee shall be responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and Committee respectively, and his decision upon any point of order by the House except upon a substantive motion....."

Therefore I rule that that is not a point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I have not put anything forward to the Chair which can be ruled upon. I know that the passing of the Resolution is not a point of order. The proceedings of the Committee had to be suspended when hon. members were named, and anything which happened after that must *ipso facto* be improper. Certain consequences must follow. This is a Resolution for money. The Standing Order says that you should forthwith report the naming to the House. We have only just finished the result of your Report, and therefore there would be no valid proceedings in Committee. You and the Speaker cannot be challenged in the House, and you are responsible to the House. I am assured that the expenditure of this money might well be illegal, if the Resolution has not properly been passed, and that is something which can be challenged in the Court. This is a matter of public monies. I am submitting that nothing can be done in Committee until the House has accepted or rejected your Report. Nothing can be passed. No doubt it will be suggested that we should leave this out. You can do whatever you like with the Rules because you cannot be challenged in the House. On the passing of the Resolution there can be invalid proceedings in Committee and you can go through the Court.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.
12.50 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to say this. I am going to speak quickly relative to the two Resolutions in Committee, even though it might cause a repetition of some of the points that have been made on points of order which I made.

Mr. Chairman, all of us in this House, I really do believe, are anxious to see that the position of good government of Barbados is maintained. I believe there are members from both sides of this House to whom I can appeal. I think, when they really think about it, that they can agree to criticise the tactics of the Opposition to raise the standard of debates, to observe the rules and bring them up-to-date because they cannot be challenged in the Courts. I think that hon. members because of their past experience in Opposition - and those with future experience in Opposition - would agree that we are going a little bit too far.

Now, you were asked at the end of the Committee to report the passing of two Resolutions. We, Mr. Chairman, cannot pass this on the grounds that only one Resolution has been passed. The House has rules. It has been discovered during the last two weeks that these rules can be flouted with impunity by the majority. The Standing Orders have gone through the eddies, thrown through the windows and trampled.

The most that the Speaker can say is that he has nothing to do with what was wrong in Committee and he does not want to hear that. This is all he could say, on some point that the hon. senior member for St. Peter made on a point of order, that "two wrongs do not make a right". This is what we have been arguing. There are wrongs. We agree that two wrongs do not make a right. Both members should be punished.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Rules of this House are really quite clear. Standing Order 36, Rule 3 says:-

"Whenever a Member shall have been named by 'the Speaker or by the Chairman, immediately after 'the commission of the offence of disregarding the 'authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully 'obstructing the business of the House by abusing the 'rules of the House, or otherwise, then, if the offence 'has been committed by such members in the House, 'the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a 'motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or 'debate being allowed, 'That so and so be suspended 'from the service of the House', and if the offence 'has been committed in Committee of the whole House 'the Chairman shall forthwith suspend the proceedings 'of the Committee and report the circumstances to 'the House; and the Speaker shall on a motion being 'made forthwith put the same question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed as if the 'offence had been committed in the House itself."

Mr. Chairman, it is within all our memories that the Prime Minister was speaking on a Resolution for \$80,000 dealing with Feasibility Studies. I do not believe any hon. member on this side would have spoken on this. We believe in Feasibility Studies. In

fact, it was a bit embarrassing to the Prime Minister and members of his side that he was evidently so little prepared to talk to the members of the House - so really surprised in contrast to himself, that he did not realise and appreciate that speaking of Mr. Percy Sledge and President Frei of Chile were irrelevant to the Resolution which was before the House.

But it is not about that I got up to deal with. The sequence of events, as I recall them, is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up and drew to the Prime Minister - or your attention - the irrelevance. You, Mr. Chairman, said "Point taken", and the Prime Minister said something like "Why has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up?" The hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up again and the Prime Minister said "Man, know your place, old man." This was ruled not to be unparliamentary. I am not going to address you on that. I take it that he was addressing you.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to point out that the hon. member is distorting the history of Barbados in attempting to review what is a vote of the House already. On every single matter, on every single motion brought in here, the hon. member is going to make a perversion of what is already in the records of the House under the pretext of making a point of order. I think that the time has come to call a halt to this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to remind the hon. member of Standing Order 31 Rule 2:-

"The debate upon such a motion shall be confined 'to the matter of the motion; and a Member who has 'made or seconded such a motion shall not be entitled 'to move or second any similar motion during the 'same debate."

At the same time, I expect that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would confine his remarks to the motion of the passing of two Resolutions.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to remind the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on a point of order, my recollection is that on the motion on the passing of the Resolution - "that the Resolution do now pass" - it was passed without any contradicting. In other words, *nem con*. The motion which we have before us is that Your Honour report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee. There is no question of the hon. member being asked to speak.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, what I was saying was that one Resolution was not validly passed. We had an example of that as I said already when Sir Grantley Adams was suspended twice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not listening to that at this time. I am listening to what the hon. member says on the motion for the passing of two Resolutions.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I take it that Your Honour views such expression as "partiality of the

Chair" in the edition of Sir Erskine May and other authorities. As far as my recollection is, the first Resolution was not validly passed. It does not matter if we say "*nem con*". You then said: "I am going to name Lionel Craig" - I do not now recall that you named Sir Grantley Adams. It was your duty afterwards forthwith to suspend the proceedings of the Committee. The Speaker has said that he must presume all things are rightly done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All that has already been expressed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can I not speak? We have reached the stage where the Chairman can interrupt an hon. member!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have no idea of getting down to the arena because it may be a very low arena to get down to. I am asking the hon. member to confine himself to the motion under discussion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Do you understand what the motion is that you are saying that what I am saying is not relevant to it? Mr. Chairman, I am opposing the motion that you report the passing of two Resolutions, because I am saying that one Resolution was not validly passed. I noticed that every time the Opposition gets up, you tell us to sit down. The electors will pass judgment on our actions sooner or later. What is this, Mr. Chairman. You must have some understanding of what is said. 1.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member were in the Chamber when these things were taking place, he would not now be speaking in this manner.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I asked for elucidation at an earlier stage, and nobody said anything to me. I heard you say, "I am going to name Lionel Craig." I heard that said. After that was said, there could be no other proceedings in Committee. It is simple if these words meant the naming of a member immediately and the suspension of the proceedings in Committee.

You said, "I am going to name Lionel Craig." I presume that, although I have heard otherwise, you named Sir Grantley Adams. There was no room for a Resolution to have passed, in the circumstances, after there was the interregnum between the naming of Mr. Craig and the naming of Sir Grantley Adams - that would have been improper in any case.

We must assume that things were correctly done when you named the members. If you named Mr. Craig and Sir Grantley Adams, we must presume that you did so forthwith. I know that Sir Grantley left the Chamber without being named. I heard Mr. Craig being named when Sir Grantley was walking out of the Chamber. I am in a position to know that, and the Journal of the House will show that it was impossible for this Resolution to have been passed.

Let us consider the time sequence. A member must be named forthwith. If anything intervened be-

tween Sir Grantley Adams' alleged offence and his being named, then it must have been out of order. A member must be named forthwith. Sir Grantley Adams was not in the House during this period under review; he was not named before he left the House, because I saw when he left and I was with him.

After Sir Grantley was named and the matter was reported to the House, there could be no proceedings in the Committee until after a report had been made to the House. That would have been impossible under the Rules of the House. We can challenge the sequence of things here, but we cannot challenge your ruling. I say that you are wrong, but I cannot challenge your ruling. We can always say that. We cannot challenge you in the Courts, although I know you are wrong. Hon. Members know that you are wrong. At some time when it is expedient to you, you may realise that you are wrong. We cannot challenge you in the Courts because of the Act passed to protect the Chairman and the Speaker from the very unduly severe legal consequences that will follow what we term the trampling of the Rules of the House. You are wrong, but we are not challenging you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will never accept that from the hon. member. He says that something happened in Committee and that it was wrong, but he is not challenging the Chair.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Would Mr. Chairman be kind enough to show me the Standing Order which forbids a member from saying, "I am not challenging the Chair, but I do not agree with it?" I said that, as far as I am concerned, it is wrong. The House says it is right, but I say it is wrong. The electors sent me here to say that it is wrong. They sent the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to do this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not confining yourself to the motion. Please confine yourself to the motion. (*Asides*)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We know that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is not encouraging what is going on. I know that the Clerk has to take advice from the Hon. Prime Minister before he can advise you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hope that the Journal will reveal everything clearly. If you had suspended the proceedings immediately and reported to the House, then how could the Resolution be passed? We must bear in mind that circumstances led to the suspension of the proceedings. We must bear in mind that we cannot take the Speaker or yourself into Court but we can take the Hon. Minister of Finance there, if he acts on an illegal Resolution. If he acts on an illegal Resolution and spends money, he can be taken before the Court.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not like dishonesty; I do not like lies. One of the reasons why I cannot support this motion is that the facts you are being called upon to report are not correct. I want it

to be positively clear to you, Mr. Chairman, that we regard it as the duty of the Chairman, when he is reporting to the House, to report the true facts and not distortions of the facts.

In this case, the position is, as has been pointed out by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, that Mr. Chairman, is going to be called upon to report to Mr. Speaker the passage of two Resolutions in Committee in accordance with the Rules. You have cited the Rule, that it is your duty in the Chair to uphold the Rules. How is it going to be possible for Your Honour to uphold the Rules and forthwith name members during the course of the debate on the passage of a Resolution for \$80,000? That Resolution could only have been passed this morning.

How can you satisfy your own conscience as to what is true, when the naming took place during the discussion on that Resolution and the hon. Prime Minister got up here and raised the matter? The Resolution could only have been passed today.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will remind the hon. member of Rule 26(4):

"It shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or attempt to reconsider any specific question upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission."

The hon. member is speaking about what has already taken place, and what has already been passed.

Mr. ST. JOHN: There are two answers to you, Mr. Chairman, on that point. I know that there used to be an old Q.C.'s practice in here to state that many people read the law, and many people could not understand it. The second one is that I am not reflecting on anything that took place. I am speaking on the motion where you are asked to report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee. I am saying that one Resolution has not yet been passed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There has been a lot of filibustering. I want to come here and discharge public business and do so in accordance with the Rules of this House. Hon. Members have challenged the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.
1.10 p.m.

Neither member was in his place, and they are always complaining that I am not present in the House.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I ask Your Honour to rule whether the hon. member is making a point of order or a speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am doing both.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I draw to Your Honour's attention...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am hearing the hon. senior member for St. John on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The matter is very simple. If the hon. member is challenging that two Resolutions have been passed in Committee, all Your Honour has to do is to ask the Clerk of the House whether the Resolution for \$80,000 and the one for \$50,000 were passed. The hon. member did not do Your Honour the courtesy of remaining in the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already drawn the attention of the hon. senior member for St. John to Standing Order 26(4).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. John?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. ST. JOHN: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am saying that the two Resolutions have not been passed. I am asked to vote in favour of the passage of two Resolutions, and it is our contention that two Resolutions have not been passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: (After consulting with the Clerk.) I have been advised by the Clerk at the table that the two Resolutions have already been passed, and any reflection on the vote of this House I cannot allow.

Mr. ST. JOHN: As I understand the procedure, the real essence is about a reflection on the vote of the House. But we are not in the House; we are in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is now reflecting on a vote of the House.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I respectfully draw to Your Honour's attention that we are in Committee and these Resolutions are to be agreed to with the Speaker in the Chair. I submit that we are in Committee. We can speak several times in Committee provided that it is relevant. I am speaking and explaining my reasons why I cannot support the passing of these two Resolutions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No hon. member.....

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am speaking; and if Your Honour stands, then I will sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the hon. member, I will read Standing Order 37 (2) which says this:-

"No Member may speak to any question after the same has been fully put from the Chair. A question is fully put when the Chair has taken the voices collectively both of the "Ayes" and the "Noes". That has already been done.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Your Honour has taken the vote on the passage of these Resolutions in Committee.

We are now speaking on the motion that you do now report the passage of these Resolutions. If Your Honour is saying that you have taken the vote already, then one of two things has happened. It is either that I am a madman or Your Honour does not understand what is going on. Your Honour has not called for any of these votes yet. If Your Honour must uphold the dignity of this Committee. Your Honour must know the Rules and administer them. Your Honour must not distort the facts. Things must happen in accordance with the dignity of this House. It is incorrect to say that the vote has already been taken. The Rules are continually being broken.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already said that the "Ayes" and the "Noes" have been taken and that the Resolutions have been passed.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am dealing with another motion, not the motion that Your Honour has spoken on. I am dealing with another motion that you do now report the passing of these Resolutions. The "Ayes" or the "Noes" have not been taken. I want to make sure that Your Honour reports to the Speaker honestly and correctly.

The question that the Chairman do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. LOWE, Hon'bles E. W. BARROW, J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs CORBIN, SPRINGER, SARGEANT, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 12.

NOES: Messrs LYNCH, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, HOLDER, HUSBANDS, SMITH and ST. JOHN - 6.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a second time.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

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

NOES: Messrs LYNCH, HINDS, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, HOLDER, HUSBANDS SMITH and ST. JOHN - 7.

1.20 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these resolutions be now agreed to.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. E. W. BARROW, 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 and Mr. HOPPIN - 13.

NOES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HINDS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. HUSBANDS, Mr. SMITH and Mr. ST. JOHN - 7.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders, 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45.

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

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I object. No reason has been given as to why the Standing Orders of this House should be suspended. Absolutely no reason. The Standing Orders are here for the protection of the Government as well as of the other side, and in the absence of any satisfactory reason, we on this side of the House must object.

There is a tendency by some people in this House to believe that the Standing Orders and the Rules of the House means what the Government and their lackeys think. We on this side want to make it positively clear that we do not intend to participate in anything where it appears that this has taken place. There can be no justification, no valid reason which would lead to the suspension of the Standing Orders today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to object to the remark made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church about "Government and lackeys." Presumably, he is referring to non-Ministerial members on this side of the House. It is offensive and unparliamentary, and he has to withdraw it.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House object to any attempt being made -

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Your Honour well knows that when objection is taken to an offensive remark, the objection has to be disposed of one way or the other without any further debate taking place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I am waiting the necessary Volume. (A PAUSE) On consideration, I do not regard the word "lackey" as offensive so as to contravene the relevant Standing Order.

The Oxford Dictionary states that a "lackey" is a "common fellow." "He was not a lackey and he is not someone that is waiting on her." But I do express the view that it is an unfortunate word to use in that it may tend to rouse or aggravate the passions, and it is not in the best interest of smooth debate.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Yes, Sir, as I was saying. It is remarkable that the Government did not find it necessary at the beginning of this sitting to ask for the suspension of the Standing Orders. What has happened is that they realise that this is not an adjourned sitting but a suspended sitting, and they can only deal with what is on the Order Paper. It was suspended for their own convenience, so that they could carry on with their spleen. Now, that they have found themselves in this position.....

1.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "spleen". The reference is manifestly to hon. members of this House, and "spleen" has a very derogatory and offensive meaning. I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I will withdraw that and ask Your Honour to substitute a different word which would be parliamentary. As I was saying, they have found themselves in a position where they now know that they have not suspended the Standing Orders, and they cannot proceed with the Order Paper. They are the people who want to use Parliament to satisfy and gratify whatever desires they have.

We object to that sort of thing. The Chair is here to uphold the rights and privileges of the minority in this House. I submit that the mover of this motion has given absolutely no valid reason why we should proceed with it today. He thinks that he can make a motion, Your Honour puts it, and by the use of the votes of hon. members on his side, who must obey his dictates and command, ride roughshod over us.

It is Your Honour's duty to protect the Standing Orders of this House, and to see that no unfair advantage is taken of the other side of the House. It is your Honour's duty to see that valid reasons must be given for certain things. The only reason to be given now will be *ex post facto* rationalisations, and they will be concocted.

This question can only be put with Your Honour's consent, and I ask Your Honour not to put the question. No notice has been given. This House has not assented because we on this side have not been given proper notice. I ask Your Honour not to put the question.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose -

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am asking the hon. member to give way.

It is certainly not true that this motion has been sprung on the House. Standing Order 62 states:

"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 have complied, or was in the process of complying, with two of these requirements. I have given Your Honour notice before I moved the motion, and

the general assent of the House is now sought. I will remind you that it is not the unanimous assent of the House, but the general assent of the House which is required.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. Leader of the House - I think is still the official designation of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. This is a suspended sitting. At the beginning of this sitting the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was not in his seat. If the Government, on the last occasion, knew that the business of the day would be heavy, it was their duty to ask for the suspension of the Standing Orders in order that they could continue with the business of the day. No such thing was done at the beginning of the sitting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Rule 62 reads 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....."

If that consent was not given for the suspension of the Standing Orders on the last occasion, do you think it should be given today? Let us take a commonsense view of the matter. This is a suspended sitting; the sitting does not begin today. If it was the intention of the Government to continue with their business unobstructed - if they are not dolts - they should have asked last Tuesday for the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Let me continue with the Standing Order:

".....either after notice given or after the expression of the general assent of the House."

I refer to the modification or clarification of the consent. Mr. Speaker, you know what is due notice - not just notice, but due notice.

Mr. HOPPIN: On a point of order. Is the hon. Member reading from Rule 62?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am not giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid you will have to give way, if I say so.

Mr. HOPPIN: I would like to know if the hon. member is reading from Rule 62. He says "due notice", but my Standing Orders say nothing about "due notice".

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made.

Mr. HUSBANDS: We all assume that we are conducting our business with commonsense. Some of us, of course, are not endowed with commonsense. This is a continuation of the modification:

"or after the expression of the general assent of the House." Who is to determine or define what is meant by the general assent of the House? Certainly not the one seeking the consent of the House. The one who is seeking the consent should be the least compe-

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is also true, too, that some members were not in their places. The hon. member is correct.

I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that. 2.00 p.m.

The question that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

CAPITAL ESTIMATES HEAD 102, ITEM 8

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister: To move the passing of a Resolution to amend the Note to Capital Estimates Head 102, Item 8 - Additional Roadworks in the Approved Estimates 1967-68.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us is to amend the Capital Estimates Head 102, Item 8 - Additional Roadworks in the Approved Estimates 1967-68. You will see, from the Capital Estimates Head 102 under the Approved Estimates 1967-68, that the sum of money voted was \$25,000 for additional roadworks, highways and transport and so on.

We have been informed by the Director of Highways that it is unlikely that we may be able to carry out all of these roadworks during the coming year, and the substantial work for which the sum of \$250,000 was voted would therefore lapse. I should say that the works which we have approved were in respect of Cave Hill and the Bow Road area. As far as the Bow Road area is concerned, we will not proceed with it until we have completed the re-alignment of the National Stadium. The re-alignment cannot be done before the end of the financial year.

So far as the Cave Hill area is concerned, the \$250,000 will include the amount for widening the pavements along the Cave Hill Road itself. We are now asking that some of the money be transferred to complete the projects at the University and the Urban Development Corporation areas. We are more or less ready to get on with the construction of middle-and-lower-income houses in the Cave Hill area. It is necessary that we complete the roadwork so that we can do the ancillary work which will be under the direction of the Urban Development Corporation. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this addendum reads as follows:-

"Included in the provision of \$536,000 in the Capital Estimates 1967-68 under Head 105 Home Affairs, Item 3 Urban Development, is an amount of \$10,000 to complete construction of the Cave Hill Project Access Road No. 1.

It has been found that this allocation of \$10,000 is inadequate and that a further sum of \$86,519 is required to complete the construction of the road including the provision of footpaths, curbs, retaining walls and excavating and laying ducts for utility services.

Accordingly, it is proposed to meet expenditure of \$86,519 from the provision of \$250,000 in the 1967-68 Capital Estimates under Item 8, Additional Roadworks, Head 102 Communications and Works (1) Highways and Transport."

Now, we are going to excavate and do all sorts of things. I am not against this Resolution, but what strikes me is that you asked for \$10,000 and you are now asking for \$86,000. I do not know much about figures; I am not posing as any financial expert, but I know that two and two are four. From \$10,000 to \$86,000? This estimate has me puzzled. The person responsible for making this estimate either belongs to the mad house, the poor house, or some kind of house. Do not tell me that you were estimating to spend \$10,000 and you now want \$86,000. I cannot understand it; it does not sound wise to me, but the work must go on.

Cave Hill, Lodge Hill and all of the other hills up there are in order up to now. I drove along there this morning. I drove from Haggatts to Chalky Mount, and I would have liked to get to Coggins Hill, but the bridge is still out of commission for over a year. I want this House to know that I am representing those people up there.

This Government, or the hon. introducer of this motion, is representing the people at Cave Hill. The people at Cave Hill can still go to and fro to market; they can still stroll along; they can have weddings, funerals and excursions, and they are not suffering for a road or bridge. The poor people in St. Joseph and St. Andrew are suffering materially. They have been suffering for over a year for the want of roads and bridges. How can I vote for a Resolution of this sort? These people are not in dire need.

I am supposed to be representing the people up there who cannot get in or get out, and you are asking me to vote money to put more roads on top of good roads! What are the members of the Government doing for the people in St. Joseph and St. Andrew? If I vote for this motion, those people will say that Smith is taking sides this time; that he has joined the D.L.P., and is supporting the D.L.P.

Talking about roads, you can find very good roads in St. James. I am in a very unfortunate position because I am the "shadow man" for highways. I will have to tell the people something. I will put my case in such a manner that the people in Barbados will really think that I am a real Minister of Highways. It will appear that we really want one when I have finished having my say.

I was promised and assured by the hon. Prime Minister that as soon as the Victoria Bridge was

finished, the roads and bridges in the areas of which I was complaining would be started. The Victoria Bridge was finished long ago, and they have now started on one somewhere else. The bridge in Holletown is a first-class bridge.

2.10 p.m.

The tourists, the big shots, everybody can pass and they are still passing. There are no accidents.

Mr. SPEAKER: A paradise for lawyers.

Mr. SMITH: That is why I have no use for lawyers. Now when it comes that you have a paradise for lawyers in Holletown, we have nothing at all for the poor, downtrodden people. There is nothing for the people in the country. How can one say that that is fair? These roads have been out of commission for over a year. The money is there and you have gone to Cave Hill, there is a lawyers' paradise in Holletown and these people for whom the D.L.P. have no use, are still down there without any roads. Yet you are asking me to vote this amount of money, but the hon. introducer has not made any mention of what he is going to do about these roads in St. Joseph and St. Andrew. In an aside somebody has asked me if I am a representative of St. Andrew; well, I am a representative of the island and I must be a representative of St. Andrew as far as Coggins Bridge is concerned. I am appealing to the Government to stop doing what could be left off; in other words, first things should be done first. The people up there have to get to Church and they have to get to the market. I am getting a fast one pulled on me by being told that these roads would be started, but when will they be started? If the Holletown Bridge had been abandoned on account of the storm, then I would say that you should put up the Holletown Bridge before Coggins Bridge. Holletown Bridge is a paradise for lawyers and I know that the big shots live happily down there. At Cave Hill, we want everything to be fixed right, and it will be fixed right in the process of time; but fix me right too in the country in places where some hon. members do not know. If you were to tell some members about St. Joseph and St. Andrew, you would be making sport. I am sure that if Joes River Bridge were out of order, this member of the Government would have it done, because it would inconvenience and embarrass him in some way or other.

I am not voting for this because I am not getting a square break. The roads in St. Andrew and St. Joseph have been abandoned for too long. The people expect me to put up my case, and I have to report back to them. The time will come, and it is coming when I will have to report to them in another way. I will have to beg them. They are begging me now and I am begging the Government now. The Government will not listen to me; they are only thinking of pulling a fast one on me. I believed the Prime Minister when he said that as soon as the Victoria Bridge is finished - they were waiting for some things to carry on with Coggins Bridge and that will be one of the projects which we have never yet seen. I even asked him if he was going to spring the Bridge in the air, but up to now nothing has been done. All over the place they

are working, and they would not even send a gang to make a start down there. If the Government was short of money, they are working on roads on which they are not supposed to spend any money. It is not to say that you are not going up there because you have not got any money. I drive along there regularly and I do not see any accidents taking place there. The Prime Minister is driving, the Ministers are driving and the big bosses are driving and passing on, but in St. Andrew a black-bird cannot even alight down there. In St. Joseph the people are walking on their hands and, Mr. Speaker, must I always be hat in hand begging? I am not against begging; but when I beg, you should give me what I beg for.

I know that you are trying everything to hurt me politically; but while you are doing that, the poor people are suffering. You should not hang one man for so many hundreds. The time is coming when I will be able to put my case. There was a time that whenever I talked about the people in St. Joseph being short of water, an hon. member used to call me a standpipe politician. When I asked for a tenantry road for the people, he would call me a tenantry road politician; but in the next election the people in the North knocked everything completely off him, and I am still a politician in here sitting and talking, and he can only come in here if he brings a message to somebody. (Laughter).

2.20 p.m.

He talked himself completely out of this House by criticising me. I was speaking for my people. I went down there and put the matter to them. Amen, so let it be.

I think it is the subject that they sent me in here to do. Give me a hearing. Fix-it-Right and you will be right.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I would say first of all that I listened to him very carefully.

I can understand his trepidation and his insularity, but he is not exactly right when he says that we are completely ignoring his request and doing those things which ought not to have been done and leaving out those things which ought to be done.

I will give the hon. member the assurance that we will start working on the Coggins Bridge as soon as all the plans are completed and it is unfair for the hon. member to make the statement which he made. The washing away of the Coggins Bridge was an act of God. The statement that rich people drive over the Holletown Bridge and that is why we are doing it is unfair to us. It is not because the rich people live down there. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether rich people would vote for this Party.

After the heavy rainfalls we had quite a number of landslips down there. We started to repair the Chamberlain Bridge long before; therefore, because of the lack of sufficient equipment we decided that we would carry on with the work on the bridges in

Bridgetown and then carry the equipment down there to do the bridge.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not say anything of stopping or starting. I said that since starting they have stopped without completing.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but I deem it a point of elucidation.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I did not accuse him. If he would go by the Chamberlain Bridge he would see that we are still working on the bridge. The truth is that we never had enough of these piles here to do the bridge, and since my Ministry is unfairly criticised for taking too long, I have decided that we would never start on other bridges before we had the proper plans.

Therefore, we have decided that plans must come out first and let us know what is to be done. After that is done, I would be able to tackle the problem.

I have already given the hon. senior member for St. Joseph my assurance and he knows that my word is my bond. We intend to start as soon as possible. I had partly given my instructions.

We then heard an hon. member say that the engineers at the Highways and Transport Department said that we did not do that one and we had put down another one. We are making sure that when we put down the Coggins Bridge it would be a proper bridge.

We are waiting until they provide the appropriate plans. We also intend to do repairs to the Rock Hall Road. I have examined it already, but for some reason none of the stone around Rock Hall seems good enough to be suitable. As soon as they put in the necessary piles and make a drainage, we would make it possible to start.

Therefore, I would assure the hon. member that I realise that he must raise this point because if I were in the Opposition, I would have done the same thing. However, I am asking him to abide with me for the time being until he can get this pump to stroke. He is not the only person whose request is suspended. I have been getting some trouble from the Minister of Agriculture, but I am saying that while we are doing the things in St. Michael we have not forgotten the things to be done for the people of St. Joseph.

Mr. Carmichael asked a question about it when he was a member of this House, and we are just asking you to vote for it as it is downright necessary as you can see. There is a shortage of greenheart, but we are trying to get the project constructed.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this completes Government Business for today, and as we intimated, replies would be made to certain questions.

I now beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before you put the Question, I think it is fair if the Hon. Leader of the House would move a motion for the adjournment; and then let us come back and deal with this matter. Something may be out there for us to partake of. Move the adjournment for half an hour and then let us come back in here.

2.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There are only four Questions that we would like to deal with, and I think these four Questions can be disposed of immediately.

The question that this be now Question Time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

DISREPAIR OF ROAD AT FOSTER HALL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 1, Page 3, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: This Question was put down since the 13th December, 1966, and I am now trying to find it.

"To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that Foster Hall in the parish of St. Joseph, is rapidly becoming a heavily built-up area, and that daily residents are experiencing hardship through the absence of a proper road leading from Tent Bay, Bathsheba to the same Foster Hall?

Can the Honourable Minister have this bit of road done as soon as possible, and before the 1967 crop season begins?"

This would be wrong now, Mr. Speaker, Would I be in order to amend it? Should I change it to 1970?

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot amend it, but you may ask an appropriate supplementary question.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The reply is as follows:

- (1) No, Sir.
- (2) Government is at present considering recommendations for the improvement of this road.

Mr. SMITH: As a supplementary question. For the improvement of this road in which area?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said that Government is at present considering recommendations for the improvement of this road.

Mr. SMITH: You will understand that the 1967 crop season to which I have referred is now over. I would like the Hon. Minister to be good enough to let me know for which reaping season and in which area. The time for this Question has long gone by. He can do it, if he wants to accommodate me.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am not trying to be facetious. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is aware that in the Scotland area we cannot put in bridges before we have the approval of the Soil Conservation Department. We are waiting to find out whether it will be feasible to improve the area. That will have to be provided for in the 1968-69 Estimates.

Mr. SMITH: As a supplementary question. Since this question was asked on the 13th December, 1966, was it not possible for the Soil Conservation Department to give a report on this road before today?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is possible, but it may not be probable.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Hon. Minister saying that the Soil Conservation Department will be unable to give an answer as to whether the road could be built within the area? This Question was asked since last year. We had better put a Question asking the Minister to change his Department.

PRICE STABILISATION RESERVE FUND

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 44 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, on page 5, the right hand column.

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

1. Will the Minister state the total amount of money in hand in the Stabilisation Fund from the levy on each ton of canes yearly from 1956 to 1966?

2. Will Government consider the advisability of placing some of this money at the disposal of the cane growers of Barbados so as to help them offset some of their losses sustained during the 1967 reaping season?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The reply is as follows:

1. No levy is collected on sugar cane for the benefit of the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund or any other Fund. However, if the Honourable Member is referring to the annual levies collected on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in the island the amount standing to the credit of the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund at the 31st October, 1966 was \$7,672,164.25, with commitments amounting to \$5,547,694.21.

2. As final payments to cane growers for cane delivered to factories have not yet been made, the Government is unaware that they have suffered any losses during the 1967 reaping season: consequently the question of the Government considering

the advisability of placing monies from the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund at their disposal to offset some of their losses does not arise.

Mr. SMITH: As a supplementary Question. Is the hon. Minister aware that the majority of people in St. Joseph and St. Andrew suffered heavy losses by land-slips and slides, and their canes were concerned?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, money paid out from the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund to growers of canes in this country is conditioned by the amount of canes which they send to the sugar factories and not for any losses by land-slips or anything else.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister has not answered my Question. I asked him whether he is aware of the losses sustained by those people during the 1966-67 crop season.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that people in the Scotland district suffered losses as a result of land-slippage, but I am not aware of the extent to which they have suffered losses as a result of the land slips.

Mr. SMITH: Would the Hon. Minister let us know the amount that he just said was committed - the commitments of this particular fund?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have already said that the commitments amounted to \$5,547,694.21.

Mr. SMITH: Will the Hon. Minister qualify these commitments?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am at a loss to understand what the hon. member means.
2.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I have two files here and I have to check. If the hon. member will agree, I would suggest that we go on with the Reply to another Question while I peruse the files to give him a breakdown of the amount committed.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. I will accommodate the Minister in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: That concludes the consideration of Replies to Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

HARDSHIP EXPERIENCED THROUGH LACK OF SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question to which the Reply has been laid, stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will Government seek to alleviate some of the hardships experienced by several householders

the floor has been treated to obviate further slipping, there has been no other incident such as that which the hon. member complained of.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Will the Minister give the facts why the plastic solution was used, also, will he give the facts why the caustic solution was used?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have thought it would be necessary to clean the floor first to take the grease or whatever was there off in order to put on the plastic solution. The obvious thing is that slipping had to be prevented. The plastic solution had to be applied and, therefore, a solution had to be made for that.

3:00 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Hon. Minister gave me an answer that he did not give my colleague.

Mr. HINDS: As a supplementary question. Can the Minister tell us what caused the grease? I want to enquire whether the Minister can tell us what caused the grease that resulted in the use of the caustic soda solution?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid I cannot, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister telling us that the floors of the kitchen were kept constantly dirty?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing.

Mr. HINDS: Would the falling on the floor of food be termed a greasy substance? Are we to understand that a thorough cleaning process was undertaken after each such occasion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is difficult for me to say that. The hon. member has asked a question about persons employed who sustained falls in the kitchen and what has been done about it. He has been told what steps will be taken to prevent further slipping. Whether grease was there before, cannot come within the competence of this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Perhaps the hon. member misinterprets the term kitchen.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to Question No. 84, I am reminded that supplementary questions were being asked when Question time expired on the 12th September, 1967. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas may now proceed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. Prime Minister has already answered all the questions satisfactorily. There is no further supplementary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore that Question will come off the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to amend the Note to Item 22A of Head 22 of the 1967-68 Estimates.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is asking leave to give notice.

Mr. HINDS: Before Question Time is over?

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more answers laid in respect of hon. members who are in their places.

Mr. HINDS: We were waiting on you to make an announcement to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for reminding me of that.

The hon. and learned Prime Minister has asked leave to give notice of a Resolution, and if there is no objection leave will be granted. I hear no objection, and leave is granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is a Resolution which is being circulated, and I should like to proceed with the cyclostyled copies. We do not want to come here after the House is adjourned and find that the Resolution has not been printed, because it is a matter of some urgency. The Resolution of which I am asking leave to give notice today is one to amend the Note to Item 22A of Head 22 of the 1967-68 Estimates, and to place the sum of \$25,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 28, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The addendum to the Resolution, which members will have received by now, will show sufficient detail as to the planning for the celebration of our National Independence from the week beginning the 26th November, and the Resolution which is being sought is for the sum of \$25,000. I do not wish to say any more at this stage.

With the introduction of the Resolution, there are two requests being made to the House: One is for a supplementary vote of \$25,000, and the other is only a formal Note to amend a Note. We will ask leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be automatically on the Order Paper.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We will ask the House to move into Committee of Supply to deal with these matters.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, hon. members were told earlier of the suggestion that the House

should meet again on Friday this week to dispose of the matter of which notice has been given. Of course, any other matters outstanding on the Order Paper will be dealt with.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 17th November, 1967, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: If we are going to do Private Members' Business next Friday, when we adjourn until 2.30 p.m. there is the possibility that, with the Government introducing Resolutions, Bills and things of that sort up to 3.30 p.m., we will not be able to do Private Members' Business.
3.10 p.m.

I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to give Private Members' Business its full time. There are only two and a half hours allowed to Private Members' Business and all the remainder of the time would be for Government Business. If the Standing Orders are suspended.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give way, I wonder if this compromise will meet with the approval of hon. members. Suppose we meet at 2.15 p.m., there would be fifteen minutes' grace and the House will start its business at 2.30 o'clock p.m. Will that be alright?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am wondering if the House will agree to allow the Government to deal with this Resolution in all of its stages today.

Mr. SPEAKER: *(After a pause)* Methinks there is general assent.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If we can deal with this Resolution today, the necessity will not arise for us to sit on Friday.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.
(VOICES)

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am calling for order.

Mr. SPEAKER knocked the Gavel.

Mr. SMITH: It appears that hon. members are in favour of dealing with this Resolution today. I am not against doing this Resolution now. I am only going to register my protest against it. I cannot vote for anything until I get Lammings. *(Laughter)*. I cannot sit here on the floor of this House and agree to vote \$25,000 to be spent on a spree when the people in St. Joseph cannot get anywhere to live and they are living on the brink of disaster.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us decide what is engaging our attention. The question is whether the House should now adjourn until Friday or whether, before the House adjourns, a Resolution which has been cir-

culated should be dealt with. We will go on with that matter if we decide to do so.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I think that what hon. members want to know is this. If we dispose of this Resolution today, will the House be also meeting on Friday? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No.) If we do not come back on Friday, I do not think we will have unanimous approval *(ASIDES)* If the House is meeting on Friday, the members on this side are not desirous of disposing of this Resolution this afternoon. They have been informed by the Deputy Clerk and they will not yield. We are not so minded.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I do not understand the hon. member. We did not ask that this Resolution be done in all of its stages today because they are always complaining that they do not have sufficient time to consider these things. November 30 is our National Day and the programme starts on the 26th and we will have to have this Resolution passed before then so that the expenditure would be authorized before it is entered into. It is a question as to whether hon. members want to do this Resolution today or if they want to come back on Friday. I thought that hon. members would want the House to be adjourned to the normal day of the week when the House sits. I am not in any hurry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter was on his feet.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Am I given the assurance that the House will be adjourned until next Friday?

Mr. SPEAKER: If this Resolution is not dealt with today, then the House will be asked to come back on Friday.

Mr. HUSBANDS: If it is dealt with, we will not be asked to come back. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that I gave way to the Hon. Minister.
3.20 p.m.

I was appealing to the Hon. Minister not to interfere with Private Members' Time. Let us keep to the Standing Orders and adjourn the House until 12 o'clock. Let us get along with our business.

I do not know how the Government is looking at it. I think that is a fast one on us. You will notice that Private Members' Business is going off the Order Paper in a smart way. By introducing Resolutions, and so on, this Government would be able to do their business in such a way. They are democratically cutting off Private Members' Time.

It is not fair. I would say that the Government is tricking us. Let us be fair. The Opposition has its duty to perform, the Government has its duty to perform. We are all working in the interest of the people. Governments Business is in the interest of the people, as well as our business is in the interest of the people.

The Opposition is doing nothing to do the Government any harm. Why try to prevent us from getting along with our business?

As Standing Orders read, I have to appeal to Your Honour, with respect to the suspension of Standing Orders. Do not let the suspension of Standing Orders interfere with Private Members' Time. The suspension now will be a clever way of getting around it. We are quite willing to accommodate the Government. We have shown our willingness here today; so the Government must try to accommodate us.

From the time this present Government was in power, I was appealing for harmony. All of us must live like brothers when it comes to doing the people's work; but when we are on our business - on a political platform - that is a different thing.

I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to adjourn the House until 12 o'clock on Friday. The Government would be able to do the people's business and the Opposition's business would be done also. Again, I am appealing to you to adjourn until 12 o'clock.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The reason why I cannot accept the 12 o'clock amendment is that the time really would be inconvenient to the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. I am sure the hon. member would not wish me to force an inconvenient time on the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker.

The Public Business would be taken up at half-past two, but I am sure that all of Private Members' Time would be left. There is nothing really to be afraid of.

Mr. SMITH: We all in here are strong men. Let us try a night sitting. Let us adjourn until 4 o'clock next Friday. By this time business would be finished, and the atmosphere would be cool and airy. It is likely that we would be able to go on with some Private Members' Business.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am putting it to the hon. member. They are always complaining about Government encroaching upon their time. As a matter of fact, I was doing some research over the past seven years about his complaint, and the results of my research would be given to this House over the next fourteen days. It will make very interesting reading as to how Private Members' Time is used by them.

At the present moment, normally, according to the rules, the House meets from 12 (noon) and it should go on until 9 p.m. There is provision for the suspension at 2 p.m. On the other hand, when we meet at 2.30 p.m., we have fifteen minutes grace and begin at a quarter to three, and Questions, Notices and so on will normally go on until fifteen after three when Private Members' Business normally begins.

I have known of only one occasion during this Session at which there was such a long list of Supplementary questions put, not by members of the

Government or its backbenchers, but by members of the Opposition. That was two weeks ago. So, there is no encroachment on Private Members' Time.

The 2.30 p.m., meeting has been carefully designed not to encroach on Private Members' Time as such. From the same quarters in which you get these criticisms of encroachment upon Private Members' Business, we have a proposal that the House should meet at 4 o'clock which means that Private Members' Business, if there are no Government notices, would only last for fifteen minutes instead of one hour and a quarter.

How sincere are they on the other side? I do not understand the hon. member. He now proposes that we meet at 4 o'clock at which time they will only have between 4.15 o'clock and 4.30 for Private Members' Business, if there is no Private Members' Questions and Notices of Motions, and so on. Then he will be left 33 or 34 seconds to do what we give him an hour and a quarter to do now.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I had given way, as you know. I thought the hon. member was trying to clarify something, or something of the sort. I did not know that he really wanted to make a speech and, in other words, to criticise me.

When I said 4 o'clock, I did not mean that we would be thinking about Private Members' Business; I was trying to accommodate everybody. We heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that Their Honours the Speaker and Deputy Speaker may not be able to arrive in time for the meeting at 12 o'clock. We want to accommodate everyone of us; every one of us has to pick a berry. When I said 4 o'clock, I meant that we come inside here, then we could suspend the Standing Orders, and Government would do their business and the Opposition theirs. We could meet until 9 p.m., or 10 p.m. An hon. member kept me inside here until three o'clock one morning. We could run again until then. So I do not want to be any humbug.

The Hon. Prime Minister wants to make out now that I was not robbed of any time, but I am now saying to meet at 4 o'clock, only to get fifteen minutes for Private Members' Business. The Hon. Prime Minister really was not thinking or he thinks so small of me that he does not credit me with any common-sense or intelligence at all. If he looks at it that way, he is making a big mistake.

We all do our business; we all fix-it-right. If we meet at 4 o'clock, we all would come in here refreshed. It would be good for the Prime Minister to be away from home some nights. Let us come in here at 4 o'clock, suspend the Standing Orders, so that Government would be able to do their business and we would be able to do ours.
3.30 p.m.

When we come here at 2.30 p.m., we are doing wrong. I want the Government to see that. This will make me tell the people that Government does not

want us to do our business. The people will believe me; the way I am going to put it to the people, they will believe me.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter has already spoken.

DISORDER IN THE PUBLIC GALLERY

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, there has been disorder in the Gallery on two distinct occasions. On a point made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I heard distinct laughter. I do not want you to tell me what to do. I can say that "I spy strangers" and every member will have to leave the Gallery. You had better remind the people in the Gallery that, when hon. members are addressing the Chair, they must remain silent. They are only here on tolerance, and I must not hear them.

I am addressing you, Mr. Speaker, so that you will give them a very solemn warning. During the speech or address made to you, Mr. Speaker, there have been distinct outbursts of laughter, and that is not good enough for this House. If members of the Gallery think that they can come here and deport themselves in that manner, let me tell them that they can be put out now by my just uttering three single words.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has made his point.

The question that this House do now stand adjourn until Friday, 17th November, 1967, at 2.30 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare this House now stands adjourned until Friday of this week at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
3.34 p.m.