

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th February, 1968

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker) Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); 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; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.) (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P. and Mr. J. B. SPRINGER.

Prayers were read.

Messrs MOTTLEY, SMITH and St. JOHN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 30th January, 1968, and of Friday, 2nd February, 1968 are, according to my advices, duly circulated and unless there is any objection, I declare firstly, the Minutes of Tuesday, 30th January, 1968, duly confirmed. In respect of the Minutes of Friday, 2nd February, 1968, I hear no objection, and I declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE SENATE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to announce to the House that I have received a letter from the President of the Senate dated 31st January, 1968, and it reads as follows:-

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I have been informed that on Tuesday last, 30th January, 1968, certain Hon. Members of the House of

Assembly made use of the Senate's Lunch room between the hours of 2.00 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. without asking my permission.

I now write to bring to Your Honour's attention that under the Standing Orders of the Senate I am charged, as President of the Senate, with the responsibility of granting permission to the Press and strangers to make use of the Senate Chamber and its precincts. I also have power under the same Standing Orders to order the withdrawal of the Press and strangers from any part of the Senate Chamber and its precincts.

My permission by certain Hon. Members of the House of Assembly to use the Senate's lunch room was neither sought nor asked for, and in the circumstances the use of this room without my permission was, in my opinion, a breach of parliamentary privilege by those Hon. Members involved.

I would thus be greatly obliged if you, Mr. Speaker, could convey to those Hon. Members involved my displeasure of their action, and trust that this act of discourtesy to the Senate will not be repeated in the future.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

E. S. ROBINSON

President of the Senate.

In acknowledging receipt of that letter, I addressed the following to Mr. President of the Senate.

Mr. President of the Senate:-

Dear Mr. President,

I hereby acknowledge receipt of your letter to me dated 31st January, 1968, and I thank you for same.

I have carefully noted contents of the said document, and particularly your expression of "displeasure" therein contained. Your communication will certainly be read by me to the House, and thereby will be conveyed to Hon. Members - as you request - your feelings, Mr. President, in this matter. The last mentioned I fully appreciate; and it is hoped that you will never again be "informed" of any apparent "act

of discourtesy to the Senate", or of any alleged "breach of Parliamentary Privilege".

I am,
Mr. President,
Yours faithfully,
J. E. T. BRANCKER
Speaker, General Assembly

LETTER FROM THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have also to acknowledge receipt of a letter from the Hon. Leader of the House wherein he states:-

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to enclose a copy of a letter which I have sent to His Honour the President of the Senate in respect of an incident which occurred in the precincts of the Senate Chamber on the 30th January, 1968.

Your Honour may wish to apprise hon. members of its contents.

Yours sincerely,
J. CAMERON TUDOR
Leader of the House.

The letter, a copy of which has been submitted to me and of which I am now apprising hon. members, reads as follows:-

Dear Mr. President,

Mr. Speaker has informed me that he has received a letter from Your Honour protesting against the use without previous permission, of the ante room of the Senate Chamber "by certain members of the House of Assembly" on Tuesday, 30th January, 1968.

The fact is that the majority Party in the Assembly found it desirable to hold discussions during the luncheon recess, which, according to our Standing orders, is only thirty minutes, on certain matters affecting the public business of the house on that day. For the sake of convenience, the room used appeared the most suitable, but through an oversight prior intimation of this desire was not given to Your Honour.

This omission, for which I now express regret, was in no way intended as an invasion of rights or privileges of the Senate. I must state, however, that on that occasion there was no intrusion into the Senate Chamber and that no such action was ever contemplated.

On behalf of the majority Party I wish once again to express regret and to request that the Hon. Senate be informed accordingly.

J. CAMERON TUDOR
Leader of the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is that letter intended, Mr. Speaker, to speak on behalf of the House? Your

Honour, of course, makes a statement as Speaker in the normal routine way, but is the letter intended to be an apology to the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not in a position to say whether it is intended to be an apology to the House, but I have been asked to apprise the House of this document which has, according to my understanding, been sent to the President of the Senate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should just like to find out this for clarification Sir. Is it not traditional that a member of the Government would make a statement to which no member can reply unless he gave notice of it? I think that that was the procedure. A member presents a petition, but the House does not consider a letter which is sent from a member as a member of the House. It is not sent on behalf of the Government; it is sent by a Party. This House does not consider letters; it considers Petitions.
12.25 p.m.

I just want to be clear on this. I have a little experience; I have not had sufficient legal background or anything of the sort to say that I am absolutely right, but I have heard it so often argued by such parliamentarians, by such legal luminaries in this House, that this House must consider Petitions and not letters. But the Minister of Government can make a Statement to this House and we have to sit. If we want to debate that Statement, we would have to give notice of a motion to debate that Statement. I do not think anybody would want to worry to debate that Statement.

I would like to know if this is creating a precedent, then it would be possible that I can write a letter to you, Sir, and we claim the same rights and privileges that you have to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: And if the circumstances were similar, the claim would be laid without hesitation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But it is not in the same circumstances. As far as this letter is concerned, I can see the President of the Other Place writing Your Honour a letter which you draw to the attention of this House, but not a member of this House who can make a Statement. It is a matter for you.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is absolutely improper. An insult to a single member of this House is an insult to the House, and an insult of one member of this House to the Other Place is an insult of the whole House. And it is extraordinary - I have to try to use mild language - that the Leader of the House should take it upon himself to speak for only half of the House in apparently what was intended to be a letter of apology. It is an insult to the House what he has done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am satisfied that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is now making a speech. He has made his point of order and I would remind hon. members that the first business to be done today is, of course, this motion of privilege.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. Before dealing with this motion of privilege, I am speaking directly in relation to a letter which was read to this House and purporting to have come from the Leader of this House, I suppose, Sir, in his capacity as a member of this House, not a member of Government.

I do not think there can be a precedent even for members writing to the Speaker of the House, save on the question of resignation. It is not done on the question of asking for leave because that is done in the House by the member himself or by another hon. member speaking on behalf of that member. But if a precedent is opened that members are allowed to write letters, Mr. Speaker, well, the gap is being opened and no one knows what confusion will arise after that precedent is made.

Again, Sir, if we notice what occasioned that letter. Mr. President of the Other Place brought it out that in his opinion a breach of privilege had been committed by certain - not by all - members of the House. Again, to show the absurdity of it, the Leader of the House is not a Speaker, or part of the House, but for the entire House he speaks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will I point out to the hon. member that he is now proceeding, apparently, to make a speech, and also in that speech to deal with a letter which I received from the President of the Senate.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am dealing with the beginning of a dangerous precedent - the fact that a member of the House is writing to Mr. President on behalf of the House.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir. I am saying very calculatingly and I am expressing the same sentiments expressed by the hon. senior member for the City. A member of the public cannot address a letter to Mr. Speaker. Yes, he can in Mr. Speaker's capacity as an esquire but not in Mr. Speaker's capacity for it to reach this House. A member of this House is not allowed to do it.

That letter is absolutely out of order, Mr. Speaker, and if that is entertained as a document to be read to the House, a dangerous precedent is being made. There is no doubt about that; and what actuates me more, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that as a member of this House I am concerned. How can we speak as members of this House? Are we the Government? He must not be allowed.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, our ancient rights and privileges must be maintained and must be upheld by Mr. Speaker always. I speak of Mr. Speaker quite impersonally.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. member has transcended a point of order and is making a speech.

Mr. HUSBANDS: In order to elucidate a point of order. I just cannot get up and say: "Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. member came in here and read a letter and it is out of order." I think that I should be allowed to do much more than that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter has the gift of concise explanation which, perhaps, may be denied to certain other parliamentarians.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I accept the compliment, but I hope that I have made myself crystal clear and pointed out to the House the danger of such an opening. Thank you, Sir.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I called on Your Honour to rule when I made a point of order and said that that letter was an insult to the House and out of order. I am awaiting Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour rules on the point of order from the Letter which Your Honour has read here as coming from the Leader of the House and Leader of the Majority Party, I am sure that Your Honour would not like to show yourself as the Speaker of the Majority Party of this House. That is the first point. You are Speaker of the whole House.

One would think that the letter which Your Honour has just read was officially released - the contents thereof - for the first time to all hon. members of the House at the same time here this morning. Are we to understand then, Sir, that the Leader of the House is some superman to get through the key hole or whatever it might be to have known the contents of a letter in Your Honour's possession before all other hon. members so that he could write to Your Honour?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me deal with that point at once. This letter which I received from the President of the Senate has not to my knowledge been shown to any member of the House and this is the first occasion that I am aware that any member of the House has heard or heard it read to him. I have heard - and I gather from this same letter of the President of the Senate - that he has informed members of the Other Chamber of the contents of this letter or even may have read the same to them. Whether publication of such or information about such appeared in the Press. I am not in a position to vouch; but this letter, as far as I am concerned, should have been kept a secret as any other document of the House, not in my personal possession, but in the office of the Clerk of the House.

12.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Well, Sir, I have not completed making my point, but I thank you for the explanation you gave; but then Your Honour is putting yourself in the position of entertaining a reply to a communication which has not been officially released to the House. That is what Your Honour has done this morning, and has created a precedent. Sir, I am being bamboozled by every action that is taken here when I have to rely on Your Honour to bring me out of it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am still asking Your Honour for a Ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition would have received my Ruling if he had not given way to the hon. junior member for St. Peter who also rose on a point of order. So far as the letter from the Hon. Leader of the House is concerned I regarded it - and in fact I still do regard it - merely as a covering letter containing in the envelope what was intended for my consideration. If I had merely received a copy of the letter written to His Honour the President of the Senate, I would have been in difficulty to know what to do with it or how it had come into my possession. The covering letter I regarded merely as a document explaining why this document was sent to me and from whom it had been sent to the President of the Senate, and thereby vouching for it as an authentic copy of that which went to the President of the Senate.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, you have not yet ruled. I ask you to rule as to whether an insult to or by a single hon. member of an Assembly is not an insult to and by the whole House and that it is wholly improper. Suppose we had done it on this side. It is wholly improper for this side or that side to speak as though they are speaking for the House, and the point made by the hon. member who has just sat down, I ask you to rule on this. We saw it in the Press. Until a few minutes ago, we had no official intimation of a complaint by the President of the Senate; and here is this side of the House to be treated as though they are not part of the House. I ask Your Honour to rule - it is too important to slide over - as to whether it is not wholly improper and against the privileges of the House for a single member of the House to purport to speak on behalf of the whole House. I repeat it is against the privileges of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like that letter read again, because if I understand it correctly, it says "Mr. Speaker has informed me".

Mr. SPEAKER: It so states.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, then, he is a liar. You have said that as far as you are concerned the first time it has got out of your hands is now, and that letter says "Mr. Speaker informed me".

Mr. SPEAKER: I have said that I did not show or read it to any member of this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like this to go into Hansard. I believe you, Mr. Speaker. You said you did not show anybody; therefore a letter which says that Mr. Speaker has informed me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not show the letter to anybody. I read the letter to nobody.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I heard you, but the letter to you from the Leader of the House says "Mr. Speaker has informed me". Read it again if I am wrong, and if I am wrong I bow.

Mr. SPEAKER: It says: "Mr. Speaker has informed me". It does not say "he has read to me" or that "he has shown to me". It says "he has informed me."

Mr. MOTTLEY: You see, I am very dense. I am not a lawyer, but how do you mean "informed me"? If a letter is written to His Honour the Speaker in respect of something which is a breach of the privileges of this House, for the first time you said officially it is read here. I am contending that the Leader of the House can make a Statement to this effect, and not one of us can get up in here and reply to him. I might be wrong. Perhaps precedents have changed, but now he has written a letter saying "Mr. Speaker has informed me." This is what I do not understand. This is wrong. This is a letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: "Informed" means "told".

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand English very well. A lot of people who receive certificates in English do not know how to analyse or parse, but I know what "has informed me" means. It does not mean "informed me yesterday home or last night home"; he might not have seen the letter, but he has informed me. I was not informed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, does not the letter read "has informed me of the contents"? Is that what is in the letter? If so, is not the gravamen of the complaint of the junior member for St. Peter truly substantial merely that the Leader of the House was informed of the contents of a communication from the President of the Senate to this House before the House was informed, and was not only informed of it, but committed a breach of privilege of this House by purporting to reply to it? He was not only informed of its contents but purported to reply to it before it came to this House. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter complain that the letter was shown or read. He complained that its contents were made known, as the letter itself said. So to say it was not shown to or read, Mr. Speaker, you may have a very long secret document and you tell somebody what the contents are. You may not show or read it to him, but you nevertheless have informed him of its contents and created the occasional complaint which we now seek to bring to the attention of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me go further. In no way were the contents of this communication conveyed to any member of the House by me or by my authority or with my knowledge, consent or permission.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, will Your Honour read the letter again? Is Your Honour calling the Leader of the House a writer of untruths?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not propose reading the letter again, but it will be printed.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the thing that disturbs me, sir, and I ask Your Honour

to rule is whether it is proper to have read a letter written by the Leader of the House on behalf of this House. It says "on behalf of the members of his Party in the Chamber". In my submission, and I ask Your Honour to rule on that point, that forms no part of the business of this Chamber at all. I want to ask Your Honour to rule as to whether it is proper for any member's letter with respect, not to the conduct of members of the House as a whole, but with respect to a particular Party to be read to the House. If that is correct, it would mean that Your Honour in here is recognising different Parties, and Your Honour is recognising that the Leader of the House can write to other people in connection with their Party's business, and that is the business of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now I would just mention for the benefit of hon. members that at a previous session, the then hon. junior member for St. George, Mr. F. E. Miller, wrote a letter to the Speaker and that letter was read in this Chamber.

12.45 p.m.

Members may recall that that letter which he wrote was to state that he had changed his mind about moving the vote of censure in the House, or a vote of no confidence. It was a letter written by a member of the House, whilst he was a member and whilst he was not in a state of suspension, which was read from the Chair of this House. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a different matter.)

Mr. HINDS: I am asking for Your Honour's guidance on this point. Is a communication from the Other Place, addressed to this House through Your Honour the Speaker, proper as a communication to this House as a body, or is it a communication to His Honour the Speaker and the Leader of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: My answer to that generally is that if the communication is addressed to Mr. Speaker and if Mr. Speaker is asked to convey certain sentiments or views to hon. members, I regard that as a communication to the House through me.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, was the letter which you read this morning such a communication coming from the Other Place asking Your Honour to convey certain sentiments to this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I regard it as such.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, was the letter from the Leader of the House a letter to Your Honour the Speaker asking Your Honour to convey certain sentiments to this Hon. House, or what?

Mr. SPEAKER: That was a letter to Mr. Speaker wherein it is stated:

"Your Honour may wish to apprise hon. members of the contents of the document which was submitted....."

Accordingly I apprised hon. members of the contents by reading the document which was submitted.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am just seeking your guidance. Is it proper for any member of this House to communicate to this Hon. House in that manner?

Mr. SPEAKER: This communication I do not regard as improper, and any other communication will be considered on its merits or demerits, and will be considered proper or improper according to the merits or demerits of such communication.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Am I now at liberty to write to the President of the Other Chamber and say that I consider the behaviour of the Prime Minister on the occasion of which the President complains disgraceful? Will that letter be read out, if I wrote it on behalf of the Minority Party?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. If hon. members want advice, or counsel, or guidance, and they seek it from the Chair, that is sought in the privacy of the Speaker's Chambers.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has Your Honour yet replied to the letter submitted to you by the President of the Other Place?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have in writing acknowledged receipt of that letter, and I read to the House my letter of acknowledgment.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Am I to take it, Sir, that you acknowledged that a breach of privilege had been committed?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a matter for the hon. member how he cares to take it. I understood the hon. member to say "Am I to take it". I apologise to the hon. member, if I misheard him, but it is intended as none other than a formal acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter and regretting any concern, or any disquiet, or whatever else the President may have suffered as a result, without expressing any opinion thereon.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Your Honour, as soon as you regret, you admit that a breach of privilege had been committed by certain members of this House. You do not regret, or you are not sorry for something that does not exist and is not worthy of censure. As soon as the word "regret" is used, you admit that something had been done that deserved censure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The word "alleged" was used in the letter, and that is a word which an experienced lawyer never fails to use.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, we are very serious in this place, because breaches of privilege are very serious matters. Since the letter written to you by the Leader of the House explained what had happened on that particular day, I deem it that that matter is now the property of this House and a debate can be initiated on it as a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not now.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Your Honour, when does the privilege arise but now?

Mr. SPEAKER: A debate on this correspondence as such cannot arise now by virtue of points of order being raised. That is how I understand every hon. member who has risen to preface his remarks. I reminded hon. members earlier that the first Business of the Day is, of course, after notices are given, a motion in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is a motion to resume debate on a motion relating to a breach of Privilege.

Mr. HUSBANDS: If I am not in order now to raise it as a matter of privilege and have it debated right now, I will give notice to initiate a debate on the letter which was received by you, a copy of which has been sent to the President of the Other Place, on the motion of adjournment of this House. I will give notice of that.

Mr. HINDS: That is one point. Would it not have been the proper thing to do in any reply, whether by way of acknowledgment or otherwise, to Mr. President that Your Honour should have informed him that there was presently a motion before this House regarding the alleged breach of privilege arising out of the incident of which he complained, and that Your Honour would inform him as to the outcome of the debate on the said motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot suggest to you how you should reply. I want to suggest, Sir, and I think it is in the best interest of all concerned - (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Sit down.) I wonder who over there can tell me to sit down?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening to the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that, but I want to tell some of these rats in here - they may be strangers. They cannot tell me to sit down! I cannot tell you how to reply to the letter, but I am suggesting - it is unfortunate that I asked the Clerk to ask you to allow me to see the letter, and he said that you were using it. I made another request to have it read over, because I made some notes here. I personally, feel that, whatever faux pas has been made, the second letter written to the Leader of the House should be taken out and not put into the Minutes, or the Hansard, or anything at all. I am serious about this, because this really is tantamount to.....
12.55 p.m.

I know that the Hon. Leader of the House can play with the English language, but because of that, there are those of us who have commonsense. (Asides) If I was getting your salary I would get up there and bark like a dog too. You know you have got some people like them who always want to control a member in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, yes Sir. Sometimes you catch a dog and give him a bath and he will shout for murder. The reason why young dogs..... (Asides) I am sorry, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point in directing my attention to canine speeches because I am not in a position to rule thereon. (Laughter).

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to suggest.....
(Asides) You cannot contribute to this kind of debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not intend to contribute to this debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know you would not. I say it is unfortunate. I know you were using the letter. I asked for it and you said that you were still using it, but I would like to suggest that you withdraw it. What is the point of allowing another breach of privilege to come up because that is what it is. There is no question about it. You may have the majority of people in here to vote against it, but you have the majority of the public to think what is right from what is wrong.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, Sir, this is a point of order..... (Asides) I beg your pardon, sir; I apologise if I have overstepped my bounds. You know when you are drowning puppies and you wet them, how they smell. Do you see them, how they get on?

Mr. SPEAKER: What further alleged point of order is this?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with these wet puppies; do you hear them?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suggest to you, I am not making a motion yet. Let them stand down, mangy cats. (Asides) Mr. Speaker, you must not only hear my asides; you must hear asides from the other side too.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not hear asides from an hon. member who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know, I know; well, you did not hear me say anything about any hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening with such rapt attention to the hon. member that it is difficult for me to hear asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not saying "You"; not at all, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am looking at and listening to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who is on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate that. You were thinking at the same time and turning over things rapidly in your brain; but I suggest that this second letter be withdrawn. I have asked that it be re-read. Your Honour says that you do not propose to re-read it, you were using it and I could not have it. I do not know if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted to

have it. I am not the Leader of the Opposition. If he wanted to have it he could have it, but I suggest that this letter be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard and noted the point made by the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suggest it now and I will see what will happen.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I join with the hon. member who has just sat down on a point of order. I am drawing to your attention - I shall give it to the Clerk in a minute - a motion against this breach of privilege. I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 68 (2) which says this:-

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

I am making that motion now, and no notice is necessary. If a notice is necessary, it is sufficient to hand it in to the Clerk. I would remind Your Honour and the House that the motion of privilege with which we are dealing, which is on the Order Paper today itself has been given by me orally and proceeded with straightway. That was in order. I join with other hon. members and point out that it is a gross breach of privilege of the House for one hon. member, whether he is the Leader of the House or not, to purport to speak on behalf of the House, and I join with the hon. senior member for the City in asking Your Honour to re-read that letter.

Need I remind Your Honour that Your Honour is the servant of the House and not its boss? You read a letter to us, no copies of it have been circulated, no copies of it have been printed beforehand, but we can have it as soon as Your Honour has finished reading it! It can be got to somebody, to one member of the House or it may be the whole lot over there, but when we say that we cannot possibly remember every word that Your Honour read out and we ask that it be read again, we do not get it? This is treating us with contempt. It is bad enough for an hon. member around the Table to treat other hon. members with contempt, but for the Speaker to do it.....

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am continuing on a point of order. I am asking that we be informed of the contents of that letter again because this point of privilege has arisen suddenly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is raising another motion of privilege under Standing Order 68 (2) which, of course, he is perfectly entitled to do. I suggest that that takes precedence over other matters, but there is already a motion of privilege to be further debated. That ear-

lier motion, in my Ruling, will take precedence over this second one, which second one will follow immediately after the first. That is my Ruling. If there are two motions of privilege, the second one will, so far as I am concerned, come after the first, and if hon. members would like copies of the correspondence and they can be made available, I am prepared to have such made available. I assure hon. members that I am not parting with what is in my file; else I would be without a copy. I am not parting with the copy from my file; otherwise I will be at sea when hon. members are making comments and I will have nothing on my file. I do not intend to denude myself of my file and the contents thereof. (Laughter)

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suggest that rather than you denude yourself of the contents thereof, you have them printed now so that we can have copies of them right away.

Mr. SPEAKER: That can take place so long as the matter is not yet under discussion because I am not parting with this. It cannot be taken from me even physically.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you suggesting, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas cannot take that from you?

Mr. SPEAKER: Neither hon. member from St. Thomas can get it from me.
1.05 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. However, Your Honour, may smooth this thing over, is Your Honour ruling that a document sent to you as Mr. Speaker and not as J. E. T. Brancker, Esquire, is not a document of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not making any such Ruling. I am saying that so long as a particular matter, or any matter, is under discussion, I must have in my file the document or a copy thereof of that which is under discussion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is anybody a lunatic suggesting that the original - if the Speaker likes to keep it in his personal file - should be taken out? Nobody is suggesting that. But what we do say is that they should be handed to somebody who can type copies to hand to members of the House. That is all we want. But this outburst about not even political violence. It is unworthy of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That is unworthy of who suggested it.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That I have a point of order which is unworthy of who suggested it, Mr. Speaker? How can you tell me that, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I challenge the hon. member to have addressed me. Am I correct?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Your Honour is correct, as Your Honour invariably is.

I am asking that Your Honour's remarks upon this debate be also circulated to members, especially those parts of it which said that you never read or showed the letter to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, the Leader of the House, because it will form an important part of our debate. If Your Honour's remarks and the context of the letter can both be true, that would form an important part of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that is not a point of order. That is an enquiry.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am asking that the earlier proceedings of today in the House - today's words - be made available to hon. members. This is not an earlier debate; this is today's words. We are calling what Your Honour said "words".

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no doubt that everything that is said today would be made available at the earliest possible time to hon. members.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. This is a definite matter. The fact that a question of privilege takes precedence over other matters; it is that motions before Orders of the Days are called or it is that motions before any business whatsoever is done. I wish to know that because Your Honour has read out that letter, but you stopped - I think it is No.3 of the A.B.C. - under Standing Order No.8.

- (a) Formal Entry of the Speaker,
- (b) Prayers,
- (c) Announcement by the Speaker.

Sir, you stopped there and you said that the next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the Motion of Privilege. Well, (a) is necessary; (b) is "Prayers". But then Your Honour proceeds to go on to "Announcements by the Speaker". Is that in order? Or the resumption of the debate on the question of privilege should not be (R) or between (Q) and (R)?

I am asking Your Honour for a Ruling on this because when Your Honour began to read this letter, I took it that Your Honour was going down the line until you came to Orders of the Day. The debate on the question of privilege is just before Orders of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also was - to quote the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition - going down the line, and although I proposed going down the line, I have had to tarry because of certain points of orders being raised. I proposed going down the line and to have treated as the First Order of the Day, the first motion of privilege; as the second Order of the Day, the second motion of privilege; and after this any other motion of privilege, and then to proceed with the Order Paper as it stands.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. Is Your Honour in a position to tell us if copies of the letter which Your Honour read out here today or copies of the letters which Your Honour read out today will be made available to us sometime during the course of today's sitting?

Mr. SPEAKER: Every effort will be made by the office on my instructions so to do. As I said, quoting the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's phrase about going down the line, there are no other announcements to be made. Let Mr. Clerk call the other Orders of Business. Proceed Mr. Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. I am very serious about this matter. I am suggesting now so as to avoid any embarrassment to the Hon. Leader of the House that the only thing to do in this is to withdraw this letter. This is one of the worst things that can be done, for either members of the Opposition or anybody else, to have to speak disparagingly about the Speaker. This letter should be withdrawn so as to prevent any embarrassment; otherwise, I am going to deal with this thing if it takes my sitting here until midnight on it.

I feel that this is an insult.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Whatever it is, I apologise. It is intended to be a point of order, and if Your Honour so rules that it is a speech, I apologise. I suggest to the Leader of the House to withdraw the letter and to let the matter drop. I also suggest to members of the Opposition, if it is withdrawn, to stop it. It has no right in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made that point.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am apologising, Mr. Speaker, because nobody wants to get up in here and to be criticising the Speaker. There are a lot of things in that letter which the Leader of the House would have to get up and say. It says: "that I have been so informed by the Speaker." Were you informed by mail, aeroplane, submarine, tug boat?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. I am sorry. I know that I am not on a point of order, but you will be surprised to see what would come out of this. I suggest to the Leader of the House to withdraw this letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may seek, either personally or by party Whips, to convey his suggestions to other members of the House. I am asking the Clerk to continue with the Order of Business.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am asking Your Honour to rule as to whether precedence over public business means - I did not intend to push this - all public business. I was really drawing to Your

Honour's attention, when Your Honour made that non-sensical statement, that you were breaking that rule. 1.15 p.m.

I did it as softly and politely as possible, but I was not suggesting that the public business which the Chair purports to deal with now is in order. It is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion, and so far as my opinion goes, it is the opinion of this Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order,

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already called on the Clerk to continue with the Order of Business. Is this a point of order apropos the continuation of calling the Order of Business?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir. Your Honour yourself, if I heard Your Honour correctly, told the House not very long ago that matters of privilege would be taking direct precedence over any other Business of the Day, and I expect now and Your Honour stated that we would be dealing with the continuation of the debate on a breach of privilege, and then the second instance that pointed out that a breach of privilege was committed, and debate on that would follow immediately. Am I to understand that we are doing Government Business now?

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind hon. members of Standing Order No. 8 - Order of Business: (a) Formal entry of Speaker; (b) Prayers; (c) Announcements by Speaker; (d) Messages from the Governor; (e) Papers; (f) Petitions; (g) Government Notices; (h) Private members' Notices; (i) Notice of Questions; (j) Reports from Select Committees; (k) First Reading of Bills; (l) Statements by Ministers; (m) Congratulatory and/or Obituary speeches; (n) Personal explanations; (o) Motions for leave of absence; (p) Oral replies to questions; (q) Notice of motions for the adjournment of the House on matters of urgent public importance; (r) Orders of the Day.

Let this be perfectly clear: under (r) - Orders of the Day - the first Order of the Day is the first motion of privilege; the second Order of the Day is the second motion of privilege, and any other motion of privilege subsequent will be dealt with in order as Orders of the Day.

Mr. Clerk, will you please continue?

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is utterly and absolutely wrong. Last week I did not care to do what would be an exposure when Your Honour refused to let this privilege debate take place. Your Honour says that you have done profound research.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making a speech?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am asking Your Honour to rule. To rule notices now is out of order. Your Honour said you did profound research, but if you look casually at Hansard, you will find that if even on a specific day the House decides to do so-and-so, privilege comes before that. To put it bluntly, I did not want to expose Your Honour, but now Your Honour repeats it. It is absolutely out of order for notices to be given now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that it is in order for notices to be given now and that the first Order of the Day is the outstanding motion of privilege. The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition has spoken of my stating that I did deep research. That is perfectly so. Would to God other hon. members had done equal research. And when reference is made to exposure, it would not have been myself who would have been exposed.

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

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1968.

The Customs Duties (Amendment) Order, 1968.

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

Statements 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 to the various Post Offices at the 31st August, 30th September and 31st October, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to place the sum of \$242,400 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 47 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$362,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 48 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$19,380 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 49 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$6,485 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 50 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$7,910 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 51 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1967-68 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Resolution for \$7,910, I wish to give notice of my intention to proceed with it in all its stages at today's sitting. Copies are here available for hon. members, and I think when they see it, they will understand the urgency.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the other Resolutions, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with those Resolutions of which notice has been given.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 76 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 90 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Also, on my own behalf, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 114, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready. 1.25 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 95 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James is ready.

Also that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 107 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is ready.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Are we skipping H, I, J, K, L, and going down to Oral Replies? Mr. Speaker, all of us make mistakes. A man is not a man, if he does not admit when he makes a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are under Government Notices and Government is giving notice to Oral Replies to certain questions which are now being laid.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter. The notice of his Resolution re incidents in schools.

INCIDENTS IN SCHOOLS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the motion reads as follows:

WHEREAS recent incidents in schools involving certain parents of children tend to show there is a decline in the standard of parent-teacher relationship especially at Primary School level;

AND WHEREAS such disregard for law and order as exhibited by such parents who enter upon school premises and misconduct themselves by cursing and swearing, using abusive and insulting and threatening language to teachers, challenge them to duels on the premises, threaten to lay-wait and ambush them out of school hours, tend to have very far-reaching effects upon both the physical and mental performances of the teachers and upon the children before whom such parents demonstrate their bad tempers;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges upon Government the necessity to act speedily in stamping out this growing spate of lawlessness amongst parents so inclined, with a view to restoring the equilibrium of teachers, who have become increasingly perturbed at such known acts of assault upon teachers whilst-at-work, and cultivate amongst them a greater sense of security and protection from fear and ensure that children in classrooms are not further made victims of these frightening, harassing and embarrassing outbursts by unbridled parents.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition re invasion of the precincts of the Senate by some members of the House.

INVASION OF THE PRECINCTS OF THE SENATE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of this Resolution. I, too, will stress the word "invasion" which I notice appears in the Leader of the House's letter. It is not only Your Honour's letter that saw the light of day before it came to the House, but hon. members who hand in Resolutions seem to suffer the fate of letting the matter be known before it reaches the House, and the whole House will see when I finish reading this why that letter was sent. The Resolution reads as follows:-

"This House being distressingly aware of the disorderly invasion of the precincts of the Senate House by some of the members of this House express to His Honour the President of the Senate and to other

hon. Senators their profound regret at the flagrant violation of the privileges of the Upper House."

This was not to see the light of day.

"In tendering their profound apologies for this insult to His Honour the President and to the Senate this House place on record their destestation of conduct by the Prime Minister and other members of this House which tends to lower the dignity of Parliament."

Having read this, that letter appears. This is how things are done in this House. That is why the letter came in. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is how the letter got here, Mr. Clerk, did you hear that?)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In giving notice of his Resolution the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, while in the course of doing so, made certain remarks, the indication of which is that the text of the Resolution of which he had just given notice was somehow, in some fashion, known to me and communicated to me, and that I was informed about it before the moment of his giving notice. I wish to state categorically this is not so, that like myself who had only heard of Mr. President's letter when it was read by Your Honour, I only knew about his notice when he himself gave notice of it. I wish to make this perfectly clear, that the reference made by innuendo is completely unjustified. That is all I have to say on the matter. When the second motion of privilege is debated, I shall have a lot to say in defence of myself.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition caught my eye first.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the House were capable of always having his statements believed, we would not be in doubt on this side of the House as to whether Your Honour's statement this morning or the hon. member's is true. We are still in doubt, though some of us shrewdly suspect what really happened. All I said is this: The use of the word "invasion" - it is not worthwhile talking about, and I accept his word.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House rose on a point of order, and the point has been made.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the Hon. Leader of the House now, at this stage, say which is true, since he is answering things, out of the remarks that Your Honour informed him, and his remarks that you did not inform him?

Mr. SPEAKER: (a) That is not a point of order; and (b) even if it was so thought by the Hon. Leader of the House, I would not allow a debate or a dialogue now, or questions and answers.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir. What the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has just said, to

my mind, while not a point of order as ruled by Your Honour, is a serious reflection on the veracity of the Leader of this Hon. House. I am sure the Leader of the House would like to avail himself of an opportunity if given by Your Honour, to offer an explanation in his own defence.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, and there could be no alleged point of order apropos of that which has been ruled not to be a point of order, and the Hon. Leader of the House may not avail himself of an opportunity to be a third apparent transgressor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. No one likes to think that the Hon. Leader of the House has any antipathy to the truth, nor would anybody attempt to feel that Your Honour's word could not always be taken.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The discussion cannot go on. That is not a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph; his question re subsidisation of essential commodities.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that the increased cost of imported foodstuffs on the local market, has had the effect of raising the cost of living to heights beyond the reach of the incomes of the working class people?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Government consider immediately the advisability of reintroducing the subsidisation of essential commodities which are used mainly by the poorest class of working people?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas; his question re car parking spaces surrounding the Law Courts.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications:

1. Will the Minister direct that provision be made for car parking spaces to be reserved in the general area surrounding the Law Courts and the Registration Office for employees of the Courts and for Barristers and Solicitors attending Court?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member; his question re party political Broadcasts on CBC.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Has the policy of a regular system of Party Political Broadcasts on the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation been abandoned?

2. If the answer to the above is "yes", is the reason therefor that under the Corporation's pub-

lished formula the Barbados Labour Party would now be entitled to a much larger proportion of broadcasting time than prior to November, 1966, when the formula was in force?

3. What is the Government's policy on political broadcasting?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member; his question re day-to-day control over the operations of the C.B.C.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. What measure of day-to-day control is exercised by the Minister responsible for broadcasting over the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation?

2. Is it a fact that the Minister directed that an end of year function planned by the Corporation to entertain representatives of advertisers should not take place although the function had been requested by the General Manager and approved by the Board?

3. Will the Minister make a statement as to what, if any, reasons were given by the General Manager of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for his request for re-assignment of duty?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member; his question re high quality rice imported for Muslim wedding.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Trade:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the consignee of a quantity of high quality rice imported from St. Vincent for the purpose of festivities surrounding a Muslim wedding due to have taken place on January, 25, 1968, has been refused permission by the Ministry of Trade to import it into Barbados and that the rice - which has been already paid for by the consignee - has for some months been held in an airline warehouse?

2. In the special circumstances of the case, will the Minister give permission for the importation of the said rice?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member; his question re queueing at bus stands and stopping places?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

How soon does the Government plan to enforce the system, for which the legislative framework already exists, of queueing at bus stands and stopping places?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member; his question re shortage of staff at the Government Information Office.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is there a shortage of staff at the Government Information Office?

2. Will the Minister state why the normal and correct practice of revealing information on Government activities and plans through the medium of the Government Information Office has recently been broken in that Press Conferences have been conducted by Ministers at the Headquarters of the Democratic Labour Party?

3. Is the Minister aware that no invitations were issued for these Press Conferences to the "Beacon" and the "Truth" newspapers?

4. Will the Minister agree that the moneys being spent to carry out the activities and plans of the Government are the taxpayers' money and not the funds of the Democratic Labour Party?

5. Will the Minister make representation to the Cabinet that the Government Information Office is fully capable of publicising Government activities and that Ministers' first duty is to Government and not Party organs of information?

1.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His question re report of Select Committee.

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

Will the Government take urgent action to implement the Report of the Select Committee of this Hon. House on the payment of pensions to Members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His question re facilities for holding parade.

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

1. Is the Minister responsible for the Barbados Regiment aware that, notwithstanding the recent resurfacing of a part of the Barrack Square Headquarters, the Barbados Regiment is still without proper facilities for holding large parades?

2. Will the Minister take steps to improve the Regimental parade area on the Garrison Savannah, whether by filling and draining or by providing a hard surface?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter. His Question re Standpipe at Rock Dundo, St. James.

Mr. W. C. B. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Will Government seek to have installed a Standpipe at First Gap, Rock Dundo, St. Peter for use by residents in the area?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member. His question re parent-teacher bodies.

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. What is the policy of Government relative to parent-teacher bodies or groups functioning at Primary, Senior Elementary, Secondary Modern or Comprehensive or Secondary Grammar School level?

2. Does Government consider parent-teacher relationship an indispensable link in any system of education for the upbringing of the youth?

3. How many parent-teacher bodies are at present functioning amongst Government-maintained Schools; how many amongst Government-assisted and approved schools?

4. What assistance of any kind, except the availability of school-buildings for meetings, has Government rendered to any parent-teacher body or bodies during the school-year ending 1966, and the school-year ending 1967?

5. How many meetings held by these bodies have been addressed by Education Officers of the Ministry? And if addresses were given was the initiative taken by the Ministry or was it merely in honour of a request from the parent-teacher body so addressed?

6. How many teachers and how many parents are actively involved at Primary, senior Elementary, secondary Modern or Comprehensive school or Secondary Grammar School level in the parent-teacher movement in this Island?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter. His question re Barbados Housing Authority.

Mr. HUSBANDS: To enquire of the Minister of Housing:

1. Who was the previous holder of the job at the Barbados Housing Authority now held by the Organising Secretary of the Democratic Labour Party, Mr. Howard Roberts, and what was his salary?

2. What is Mr. Roberts' salary and what are his normal hours of work?

3. Will the Minister state on what basis Mr. Roberts is permitted to absent himself from his duties at the Barbados Housing Authority in order to be present at Press Conferences held at the Democratic Labour Party's headquarters in Roebuck Street, during normal working hours on a number of Fridays during this year?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John. His question re Foster Hall, St. Joseph.

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

1. Is Government aware that the road leading from Foster Hall, St. Joseph, by way of New-castle to Bath is in an acute state of disrepair?

2. Will Government, bearing in mind the importance of the said road as a medium of tourist traffic along the St. John coast and as a medium for plantation owners and peasants in the area for transporting their canes to factories during the crop season, treat the repair of the said road as an urgent priority?

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition. His notice of motion re a matter of public importance.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand my position in this matter. I have got from the Clerk Your Honour's acknowledgement of the receipt of my letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I contacted the Clerk and I have considered the subject matter of your letter in respect of discussing a matter of a definite matter of public importance, and I allow the claim as I am satisfied that the matter is definitely a matter of public importance.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a motion of public importance. It reads as follows:-

This House being deeply concerned at the present grave crisis that has arisen in this Island as a result of the breakdown in negotiations between the Barbados Workers Union and the Sugar Producers Federation on the question of out-of-crop wages in the sugar industry, calls on the Government to take immediate steps to forestall the threatened dislocation of the everyday life of the community and to the very economy of Barbados which will be the inevitable result if the General Strike threatened by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union takes place;

The House draws to the attention of the Government that, apart from the questionable legality of a General Strike the existence of prolonged disorder and undisciplined conditions envisaged by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union in his reported public utterances are matters of such profound significance as not to brook further delay on the part of the Government in declaring its policy in this national crisis and any action it proposes to take to anticipate island-wide disruption of the national life;

This House calls on the Government, in the absence of agreement by the contending parties to have their dispute settled by arbitration to send down to the Legislature a Bill, with *ad hoc* effect, to secure a settlement of this impasse by arbitration having among its sections provision for safeguarding the interests of those persons who are willing to work in the coming sugar-crop reaping season by inter

alia guaranteeing retrospective payment of any sum, of money that may be awarded them by the findings of an Arbitrational Tribunal.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Standing Order No. 16 (3) either leave of the House has to be given, or at least nine members rising in their places.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is seeking the leave of the House to deal with this matter as a matter of urgent public importance, in which event, if leave is granted, it shall stand over until 6.15 p.m. today.

If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, leave is not unanimously given.

The alternative is under Standing Order No. 16 (3) (b). If at least nine members rise in their places to support the request, that will suffice.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Mr. ST. JOHN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. HUSBANDS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HINDS and Mr. LYNCH rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am satisfied that nine members have risen in their places to support the request.

Accordingly this motion shall stand over until 6.15 p.m. today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say in the light of that, that the majority Party will neither participate in this debate nor will feel itself bound by any of its conclusions. (VOICES)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: Fortunately I do not have to suspend this sitting for grave disorder. The time for suspension has arrived until 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

On resumption:

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, let the Bell be rung for a quorum to be summoned.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON MOTION OF OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. SPEAKER: Normally this would be Question Time, but in respect of Orders of the Day, a motion of privilege, as I have stated, is entitled to take precedence. I almost called Question Time, but on consideration, in view of the fact that in my opinion

privilege precedes every other Order of the Day whether private or public, we are now about to start business and the motion of privilege is before the Chamber. When this was last being discussed, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this is a debate on a motion of privilege, and I think it may be appropriate for me at this stage, Sir, if I were to read the text of the Resolution. It states:

BE IT RESOLVED that House views with the utmost gravity and consternation a breach of the privileges of members of the House committed by the Prime Minister in invoking the aid of a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force to restrain the freedom of movement of Hon. members;

That this House calls on His Honour the Speaker to take the necessary steps to punish this breach of privilege committed by the Honourable Prime Minister;

That this House desires to place on record its profound detestation of the conduct of the Prime Minister as being disruptive of the dignity and good order of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that I can hardly hear, I rely even more than ever on members not to transgress any Standing Order.

Mr. HINDS: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is a debate on a motion of privilege, and I think it may be appropriate for me at this stage, Sir, if I were to read the text of the Resolution. It states:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House views with the utmost gravity and consternation a breach of the privileges of members of the House committed by the Prime Minister in invoking the aid of a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force to restrain the freedom of movement of Hon. members;

That this House calls on His Honour the Speaker to take the necessary steps to punish this breach of privilege committed by the Hon. Prime Minister;

That this House desires to place on record its profound detestation of the conduct of the Prime Minister as being disruptive of the dignity and good order of the House."

Mr. Speaker, since the debate on this motion was entered upon, much has taken place which, I am sure, has not in any way tended to lessen the gravity as complained of in the text of this Resolution. In every way we have seen that it worsens the situation. What do we find? Above all, the pace has been set whereby the Prime Minister is being encouraged to come back into this House and to repeat his performance of what led to a row for food! What has brought me to that conclusion? You will find, Sir,

that this House exercises no control over the newspapers, but if one were to see the way the daily press treated an incident of this sort, one must come to the conclusion that the Prime Minister well knows that he can behave inside this Hon. House as he likes, and if the public had to depend on the daily Press to make his bad behaviour known, it would never be known. It can do him no good, and I am to say now that it can do this country no good. So much for the newspapers.

Now, Sir, there is no doubt that the Prime Minister invoked the service or the aid of Sgt. Herbert of the Barbados Police Force. Let us ask ourselves at this stage: For what purpose did he call on the Police Sergeant? Where the Prime Minister and his other members and his guests, including a lady guest, were about to dine on that day in question, you will find, Sir we were to see this: the Police Sergeant being brought to the door of the banquet hall of this Hon. House. Inside the banquet hall were all hon. members of this House, with the exception of a few Officers and the caterer.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister sought to draw to your attention that the caterer was being detained against his will. He submitted further, as if in a court of law, that the caterer was being falsely imprisoned. Now, Sir, what was an hon. member in the banquet hall on that occasion entitled to? Are we to understand that if an hon. member is inside the banquet hall, and the occasion demands it, there is something to prevent that hon. member from closing or barring a door? So when the Police Sergeant was brought to the door of the banquet hall with a view to having him enter the banquet hall, one must come to the conclusion that the Prime Minister feels within his mind that he can so reduce the dignities and privileges of this House to what might exist in his opinion as being within the confines where he lives. There may be no freedom there for anybody, but it is not so in this Hon. House. So when the Police Sergeant was brought there, it must be accepted beyond all reasonable doubt that the Police Sergeant was brought to restrict the movements of somebody whether it be by laying of hands, or otherwise. The Policeman in uniform could hardly be expected to act in any other manner than by taking into custody the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who, according to the Prime Minister's report, was at the time acting in a manner which did not find the approval of the Hon. Prime Minister. It meant this: the Prime Minister had had a lady in his company. 2.45 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should just like that corrected. The lady was more in my company than in that of the Prime Minister. The lady was my guest and not the Prime Minister's.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust that we will not have too much play with the lady. It is admitted on both sides that it was a lady. May it rest at that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is accepting the

responsibility today because the Prime Minister happens not to be present. We have learnt.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I am saying specifically and definitely that the lady was my guest sent here to me by Lieutenant Fairweather from the U.S.A. She was my personal friend. She was unknown to the Prime Minister or to any of my colleagues here or anybody in the House of Assembly for that matter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it happens to be very unfortunate for the lady guest; the weather was not at all fair on that day inside this Hon. Chamber. This Hon. House has been told by the Prime Minister that one reason for going into the dining hall of the Other Place was because Government members had something to discuss. It was only a short period of half an hour and they thought that they should take the opportunity while eating to discuss the matter in the presence of the lady guest of the hon. junior member for Christ Church. That is the point, to discuss Government Business. For instance, I have found in the banquet hall, of this Chamber, that there are two tables. One table was usually occupied or reserved for Government members. That is what I think I can say I found.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not reserved.

Mr. HINDS: It may be set aside then. We find that, apart from Government members in the banquet hall, there would be members of the Opposition; but here is a case where the business of the Government is to be discussed in the presence of the lady guest of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, rather than within a respectable distance away from the Opposition even in the same room. But, Sir, that side of the story has been given, and, as Your Honour must have heard, is all right if we were only to hear the report from one hon. member of the Government. The Prime Minister got up in this House, however, and said that he would rather eat with South Africans than dine with members of this Opposition. He said that he would rather sit and eat with South Africans, and that was his reason for going below there. In other words, it is either not true that something was to be discussed or it is true that the Prime Minister is using his numbers, his helpless numbers at times, to show and set the pattern of division in this country, and I pray God that the Prime Minister - and he alone - will pay that price when a total division is called.

It cannot be denied that if one were to walk the streets of this island, wherever you go, you will find that people are being separated one from the other politically. There is no question of my belonging to a political Party and another person belonging to another political Party, each person expressing his own political view or belief and shaking hands and going on saying: "Hail fellows, well met; you are entitled to your belief and I am entitled to mine." That is not the case now. When the Prime Minister of this country can take those hon. members over there and lead them when he is about to commit his

breach of privilege, when he is about to do every act that trespasses upon the dignity of this Hon. House not one single member of them has enough pride and honour left to let the Prime Minister understand: "Thus far and no further:" when they know what is right from what is wrong. We are approaching a very dangerous situation in this country, and what must we say when this Hon. House is to be used as a pattern for such ill-behaviour, such an exhibition of bad manners, the principal character being the Prime Minister of the country? What must the youth of this country look to? Which way must they go?

In many of our schools today it is accepted by the children that what the Prime Minister of the country does is right. If the Prime Minister comes in here and behaves so badly as to cause a row in the House of Assembly for food, do we want our children to accept it as a standard that, when they come to occupy the seats of members, they have a right to come in here, behave as they like and fight and row for food? I say: "No", Mr. Speaker. I will tell you this, that the Prime Minister needs some priming.

2.55 p.m.

He needs some priming and the one regrettable feature is that he has around him numerous spineless people.

Mr. Speaker, money is a very useful thing. But money can be put to very dangerous use and I am charging, Sir, now judging from the behaviour of some hon. members that side, the salaries being paid to them, I want to say, Sir, are not being put to the best use of this country. They are not being put to the best use for the benefit of the country.

Mr. Speaker, if your position, in politics or otherwise at any moment of life prevents us from discharging a clear and honest conscience, the best place for us is the grave. I want to say right here and now that the time has come when members of the Government ought to be seriously examining themselves. They might prefer the assistance of a psychiatrist, but it is time in any case that they be told that two wrongs do not make a right, and above all, that having been elected to this Hon. Chamber they are supposed to have reached some stage of maturity and are expected to act and to discharge their consciences - I cannot say for their own personal benefit - but whenever they act, whoever is involved, they should so discharge their consciences that although it might not find the favour of every hon. member sitting around this Chamber, it is a discharge of conscience which would bear an examination anywhere, in any audience and before anybody of people in this Island.

Mr. Speaker, this motion before this House calls on Your Honour to discharge a duty. That duty is to take the necessary steps to punish this breach of privilege. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, you will say that before you can punish any such breach of privilege, it has got to be established that there was a breach of privilege.

Now, Sir, if from amongst the members of this Hon. House you had felt or had cause to feel that there was any essential ingredients lacking to prove that there was a breach of privilege, you have had it, I think, in a communication from the Other Place. That is before this Hon. House. That is the situation.

It was never right for the Prime Minister to have led Government members in the lunch room of the Other Place. The thing is, Sir, that good shepherds follow the sheep - I mean good sheep. The Prime Minister has to lead and, Mr. Speaker, you are satisfied that a breach of privilege was committed. You must be satisfied now, Sir, that that breach of privilege was committed by none other than the Prime Minister of this country, and that the Prime Minister set about to convey to a policeman and to the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force and to the world at large that the situation in Barbados under his regime is such that whenever he feels that a member of the Opposition is delaying his food and he must eat, he can have his policemen come in to manhandle an hon. member.

That is what it amounts to: and you, Mr. Speaker, have got at this stage to do all in your power, all that lies within your power, to remove all that stain that the actions of the Prime Minister have caused. We are willing to admit, Sir, that to be here debating a motion of this sort is not pleasant. It is very unpalatable.

3.05 p.m.

We are willing to admit that debating a motion of this sort is not pleasant; but, Mr. Speaker, you have good food and you have bad food, and if the Prime Minister adds bad taste to a good meal of food, in what realm must we put it? The Prime Minister would rather have us here debating actions which one should say would be expected to have fallen far beneath the standard, showing or performance of any hon. member of this House, far less the Hon. Prime Minister, but that is not the case. The Prime Minister today reminds me of some boy or girl who had been kept strict by the parents, and the parents one good day turned out from the House leaving the keys in the larder door. The little boy turns up, unlocks the larder and sees sugar, salt, lard oil, butter and pushes everything in his mouth, because that is his only opportunity. The behaviour of the Prime Minister from the day he was made Prime Minister has done everything to drag the dignity of this country down, and then he lays the blame on others, particularly on the Opposition. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, when at the opening of the College of Arts and Sciences just last week the Prime Minister was then functioning in the capacity of Dr. Errol Walton Barrow, that the television cameras promptly brought on Dr. Who.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must be careful not to contravene Standing Order No. 26 (6) which reads:-

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

Mr. HINDS: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I have no intention of contravening any Standing order. I would like to see and to know that never again in the history of this House will there have to be any debate initiated over the Prime Minister or any other hon. member rowing over food. I am sure, sir, that the Prime Minister ought to hang his head in shame when the boys and girls who now attend our schools see him go up and down the streets as the man who caused a row in the House for food.

Mr. Speaker, you are asked to punish the breach of privilege. The President of the Other Place was not slow in drawing to Your Honour's attention that there was a breach at his end. If there was a breach at his end by going into the Senate dining hall without permission, then there was a breach by bringing a policeman to the door of the dining hall of this House. You will remember, sir, that it was not a case where the Prime Minister came in any mood which demonstrated that he was for peace. The Prime Minister came armed with a policeman, with his jacket off and out for a fight. He had backed his jacket and brought along two body guards in addition to the policeman, one of whom seized two dishes of salad and challenged any man to touch him. That is the exhibition that hon. members of this Chamber are to put on, and they expect that the public must not be told the reason. They will repeat it and will go from bad to worse. We have a duty, Mr. Speaker, to the public, and it is our duty to focus attention on these things. If hon. members who form the Government in this House headed by the Prime Minister do not know how to conduct themselves in a proper manner over a meal of food, can you expect them to conduct themselves in a proper manner over greater things? Their exhibition is bad, however one might look at it. And, Sir, this is what we must say: that in punishing a breach of privilege by yourself.....

Mr. SPEAKER: In punishing a breach of privilege by me?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is that this House calls on His Honour the Speaker to take the necessary steps to punish this breach of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was merely pointing out that the hon. member said "a breach of privilege by me".

Mr. HINDS: It is to be punished by Your Honour. Your Honour might as a human being have committed a breach of privilege, but in this particular motion before us, Your Honour certainly has not. It is the Prime Minister, and as if to prove that Your Honour must not be held party to it, when Your Honour's attention had been called by the Prime Minister, seeing the mood of the Prime Minister, Your Honour called him by his first name as if in searching vein you wanted to let the Hon. Prime Minister know that you did not approve there and then of the action he was taking.

3.15 p.m.

What was that action? That action was bringing Sgt. Herbert to the door of the banquet hall in readi-

ness to lay hands upon an hon. and elected member to this House, because the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was being then accused of preventing the caterer from getting out from the banquet hall to carry food to the Senate's dining room for the Prime Minister, his Government members, and a lady guest.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house feel hurt. We are sad to see our Prime Minister behaving in such a manner and choosing such a place and occasion for such exhibitions of bad manners. There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if any hon. member of this House has had proper parental training, he cannot depart to the extent to which the Prime Minister sunk on that occasion. It is a grave reflection on this Hon. House. It is something, I am sure, that of all the incidents that have been sparked off during Your Honour's presence in this Hon. House, this incident, the rowing for food, will go down and rest indelibly on Your Honour's mind. It is not something that can easily be forgotten.

We know that Your Honour would much have preferred if it had been on account of some hon. undertaking, or some hon. incident in this Chamber that was leaving its impression on Your Honour's mind. We regret it, Mr. Speaker; we cannot help it; we have to let it be known that it is the Prime Minister of this country whose conduct in and out of the House and his behaviour here, there and everywhere else that is dragging this country down. We in the Opposition will not allow him one day after today to get away with these things, and then try to place the blame on the Opposition for damaging the reputation of this country.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, politics make some strange bedfellows. Today we are seeing the St. Peter baboon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is, of course, not referring to any hon. member of this House?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Of course not, Sir. I was referring to the baboon trying to represent the Spooner's Hill ape. Later on in my speech I will clarify what I mean by those two remarks. There is an old saying that "power corrupts", but I say that the loss of power corrupts absolutely; for the exhibition that we have been seeing in this Chamber for the past two weeks has prevented us from attending to one scrap of the people's business, because people, who are discontented at even the results of a fair election, who have been obsessed all of their lives with power, and who have made statements to the effect that they would destroy their very mother to remain in power, are giving trouble. All of these things we are seeing because the loss of power corrupts absolutely.

The matter before this House, Mr. Speaker, is one dealing with privilege. You, as the Speaker, have allowed a debate on this. We on this side have no intention of challenging Your Ruling. Even if we do not agree with it, we will abide with it, and that is different from the people on the other side of the bench.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that there is no reference to hon. members, when you refer to people on the other side of the bench.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: If you take it so, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. The hon. member is either addressing the Chair, or he is referring to hon. members on this side of the House, or he is not addressing the Chair, and he should be made to sit down.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, before I get through they will be much hotter. Now the Resolution that has taken up all of the time of this hon. Chamber is that the Leader of the Opposition said on more than one occasion that he would join with the devil in hell to get the Democratic Labour Party, this wicked Government, out of power.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that he is not speaking the truth. I never said anything of the sort. I am sorry that I am in the House; otherwise I would have characterised him with the only words that suit him.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, the junior member for St. Joseph, said that he would join with the devil in hell to get the Democratic Labour Party out of office; that it is a wicked Government, and he is not going to rest until he has done that. Just a few days ago, when they were coming back in here dropping remarks, he said out there that his intention is to cause an election before the five-year term is out. But I agree with senility; when one gets old, one is not responsible for one's actions. I will get old some day, too, but I hope I will not make myself a public nuisance as some old people have done.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the Resolution that has taken up all of the time of the people's business and has prevented us from doing our work, I was not there: so I cannot speak as authoritatively as other members on the other side who all seemed to be there at the precise moment. I am not trying to explain what happened, but I am going on with my speech. I saw Mr. Jones, the caterer, in a state of desperation, I should say; he was actually crying. To see a big man like that in a state of hysteria you will know what it means - he was really upset. I asked him what was the matter, and he said that somebody in the Mess room would not allow him to bring out the food for other members.

Now, I heard a lot of talk about people fighting for food. I want this point made explicitly clear here and now. From the time we had the last Election on the 3rd November, 1966, I have not eaten a meal in this House of Assembly, and I have no intention of so doing. I ate in here on a Friday night when Your Honour invited me here, because it was the twenty-fourth anniversary of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Say what you may about the hon. senior member for St. Joseph - I sometimes treat him very roughly, and he in turn treats me the same way, but I

have found him to be a man. The Leader of the Opposition did not see fit to attend that function on the Friday night.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I was suspended from the House, and if the hon. member who has just sat down, if I can call him honourable, knew the slightest thing about the Rules of this House, he would have known that I could not have attended the precincts of the House. Why have the dinner at a time when I could not be there?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, he could not attend the function, but the other hon. member who was suspended attended the function. Do they not cook at the other hon. member's home?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should be glad if hon. members would refrain from making any more speeches about that very pleasant function.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I only mentioned it, Mr. Speaker, just by the way, to set the record straight. I have not eaten a meal in this House since I was returned in November, 1966. I was returned to this House on the 3rd November, 1966.
3.25 p.m.

So when hon. members are trying to give the impression about somebody snatching up food, I am the person who took up the two plates of food, but I will tell you why. I did not go in there to take up the food; I went in there with the intention that if the members of my Party could not eat, then nobody in the House of Assembly was going to eat. I intended to throw away all the food. That was my intention. (Laughter) If we are not to eat, you are not to eat; so do not try to give the impression that somebody snatched up food, because they cook at my home every day. I can vouch that I left here at 2. o'clock, went outside in the verandah and talked to my friends. I have not eaten. I have no intention of eating.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in his debate says that he was hurt because we would not eat with him and all the rest of it. Apparently, they are not worried because we eat somewhere else, but because we are not eating with them; but the hon. senior member for St. Joseph (Asides) I can repeat what I said; it was nothing unparliamentary. I said that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph says that he was worried because we would not eat with them. I said that that seemed to have been the problem. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph ought not to be unduly worried for the simple reason that for the former five years that we were in this House, we all ate together. Nobody has imposed any embargo on me; I have imposed an embargo on myself. I am making this statement here and now. I do not hope to be seen in Westbury Cemetery dead with some members on the opposite side. I have absolutely no use for them and I am expecting them to have the same for me. There is no love lost.

Now the Resolution, or a part of it, states this; when I look at this Resolution, I am convinced that

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not referring to any conduct of a Senator?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, Mr. Speaker; I am talking about the Senator's kettle in which a potato was roasted and, as a result, it burnt out the element. I did not hear any talk about breach of privilege then. Cooking was going on in the Chamber of the Other Place. No breach of Privilege. I would not be surprised if salt fish was not thrown in for good measure, but I know about a potato which burnt out the element of the kettle and I did not hear any fuss then. The whole place smelt of roast potatoes. It was no breach of privilege. But I would say this in my opinion. My opinion is not bound to be right. I would say that it is a breach of etiquette. Do not tell me who had been playing to the moon and the papers or that it was a breach of privilege because you are not talking to village idiots.

Now, getting back to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, everybody in the country, those who wear clothes and those who do not wear clothes, can see the motive of this Resolution. This Resolution has been brought in specifically to retard the progress of this country because even if it were a breach of privilege as is claimed, what can Mr. Speaker do? You cannot name the Prime Minister for it. All that you can do is to tell the Prime Minister that you do not like this kind of happening to take place within the precincts of the House and you would ask that it does not happen again.

You get all of this nonsense, just wasting the taxpayers' time; but I hope that the people of Barbados are not asleep any more, and that they can see who are the people that set out to retard the progress of this country.

The Resolution goes on to state:-

"That this House desires to place on record its profound detestation of the conduct of the Prime Minister as being disruptive to the dignity and good order of the House."

Now, I am going to ask about the conduct of the Prime Minister. He did this in the House of Assembly. Did the Prime Minister lie down on the floor and they had to bring policemen to put him out as they did a time when a member from this Chamber, when he was playing to the Gallery, had done? What conduct are you trying to tell me about? If the Prime Minister called on the policeman to maintain order according to the policeman's office, what conduct is this that we must talk about and must take up two weeks of the taxpayers' time?

I am wondering if some people do not have any conscience. They are getting on platforms and they are trying to impress the masses that they are looking out for their interest. Two weeks have been completely wasted; we have done absolutely nothing of the people's business, but they have come in here to argue about who eats food from who does not eat food. All of them, in fact, all of us are getting money and I

feel that we should eat, either at home or bring our meals with us; but if we feel that there is a bread line where we must dine and that as soon as there is an adjournment, you see a stampede of members of the opposite side trying to get into the dining room...

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not going to sit here and let the hon. member carry on how he is carrying on. What is he saying about stampede and when it is time for dining and all this sort of thing? Mr. Speaker, you must call on the hon. member and tell him that he is making himself look very ridiculous. This is an hon. Chamber; we are not dealing with children. Call the hon. member to his senses. I want to know if he went out at the "Old City". He is not talking like a man whom I believe to have awakened this morning and only took his meals home and did not go somewhere and drink something wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has transcended what he prefaced as a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, you see what I said?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You have read from the section, and so on and so on, of the conduct of members. Here is the hon. member saying "stampede". "Stampede" is about the strongest word that you can use. Nobody is accusing him of stampeding but he is the only member who went and snatched up two plates of food.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is transcending the point of order. I do not regard "stampede" as unparliamentary. It is not offensive or insulting. In the context in which the hon. member used the word "stampede", I do not regard it as transcending the Standing Order, but I would ask the hon. member to keep to the point and try to let us get on.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the Chamber sat and allowed almost all the other members of the other side of the Chamber to speak without interference. All sort of things were said about us by members of the other side. They even accused me. They said that I snatched up two plates to give the impression that I snatched up two plates of food and ran outside.

Well, I will put the record straight. It was my intention to throw away the food. "I was not eating, so nobody eating;" that is my motto. You bring punishment on me, I bring punishment on you. But do not talk about snatching up food because I took the food outside of the dining room and passed it on to somebody else. The senior member for St. Joseph, as I said to him before, has nothing to worry about. He has seen us eating in there with him on divers occasions. I have gone up at his place, Mr. Speaker, and he always invites me to have a drink. I take his drink. I am not afraid of him. That is why I say that a man should be able to choose his friends. Well, I have chosen my friends. Nobody is going to tell me whom I

the tax-payers some time down in 1917 or 1919 I think it was, were completely hoaxed because you cannot believe that a Resolution like this would be drafted by somebody who is supposed to be this big criminal lawyer, special lawyer and all of this kind of nonsense. As I was saying, Sir, a part of this Resolution reads as follows:-

"That this House calls on His Honour the Speaker to take the necessary steps to punish this breach of privilege committed by the Hon. Prime Minister."

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister is a man soon to be forty-eight years old. I have a penknife here in my pocket and I am prepared when I go out side to cut a tamarind rod and bring it back in here so that you can punish the Hon. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Punish the Speaker?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Prime Minister, Sir, because this is what the Resolution is asking you to do, to punish the Prime Minister. I will bring a tamarind rod so that you can punish him at the next sitting. I would not waste any time with the first part of the Resolution. I am proving to you that, in my opinion, and my opinion counts at some time or other, there was absolutely no breach of the privileges of this House. Let us assume, for instance, that the Barbados Labour Party has a pimp by the name of "Slims" who is always running about the island. Let us assume that the House of Assembly and the Senate are opened daily with the exception of Sundays and Bank holidays. Let us assume that "Slims" walked into this House this morning at 10 o'clock and sat in your Chair; is that a breach of privilege? You could only charge him with trespassing and I doubt if you could charge him with that. This is a joke; this is only an idea that they have set out upon themselves to waste the time of the people. Anybody can walk into the House of Assembly on any day of the week and sit in your Chair and nobody has elected him there. That is not a breach of privilege; I would say that it is a breach of etiquette, but not a breach of privilege. Whereas it has been alleged that the Prime Minister brought a policeman and asked the policeman to remain outside, even if he brought a policeman to apprehend somebody, who was the somebody that the Prime Minister brought the police to apprehend? It would be a breach of parliamentary democracy, of parliamentary privilege and all the nonsense that we have been going on with for the past two weeks, if he brought a policeman to arrest somebody. It was the Prime Minister's right as well as mine, your right or the right of anybody else in this House if he wanted to call upon a policeman, and if he wanted anybody apprehended, he could ask the policeman to apprehend the person, if he wants to do that. It is a matter for the policeman now; it is a matter for you now, but do not tell me that it was any breach of privilege. If I saw in the newspaper that the President of the Senate said that he considered this to be a grave breach of privilege in the Senate, that is a joke. (Laughter) Of course it is a joke. The Senate was not in session. If we were to say that it was a breach of privilege.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the hon. member who has just sat down, a member of the majority Party which sent that letter, bearing in mind what the hon. member has just said?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is no point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. The hon. member, a Minister, who is addressing the House, has made disparaging remarks of a member of the Other Place, no less a member than His Honour the President, in that he said that what the President of the Senate referred to as a breach of privilege is a joke. Under our Standing Orders we are not allowed in this Place to make that kind of comment of a member of the Other Place. I would therefore ask Your Honour to point out to the hon. member who knows quite a few things that are known to most of us, that that in itself, constitutes the sort of behaviour which has never been allowed to be indulged in under the ancient Rules, Standing Orders, privileges and customs of this Place. I hope Your Honour has understood me well.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am still on my feet; I am addressing the Chair. The hon. member has referred to a member of the Other Place disparagingly, that hon. member being no less a member than the President. I am asking Your Honour to point out to the hon. member the error into which he has allowed himself to fall, speaking parliamentarily.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 26 (9) states that the conduct of Her Majesty etc., members of either House of the Legislature etc., shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion. I will advise the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to bear that in mind.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I never said that the President of the Other place is a joke. What I said was that what is said is a joke. I am not even saying that he said it because I know that the newspapers have a way of playing up things. But since we cannot refer to things which we see in the newspapers when we are in here, I know how to get around these things.

What I am saying is this. The Senate, is open like the House of Assembly, from Monday until Saturday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member is referring to the Other Place?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The Other Place. The Other Place is open from Monday until Saturday. Anybody, Mr. Speaker, can walk into the Chamber of the Other Place at will. Not only that they can, but they do: and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a statement which was in the Press said that this was a breach of privilege; but when the messenger over there roasted a potato in a kettle belonging to Senator Odessa Gittens, there was no breach of privilege then. (Laughter)

must eat with. That is why I am insisting that everybody should pay for their meals, and we would not have all this trouble. You will see then how many people would be running over to the dining room to eat.

3.45 p.m.

In this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, we have heard all sorts of vilifications levelled at the Hon. Prime Minister and members on this side. I want to make this explicitly clear. The Hon. Prime Minister is a lawyer, and I have no intention now or at any time of sticking my neck out defending lawyers, because lawyers have their own little cult. The basic training of law starts off with this sort of thing. But let us get the record straight. As a member of this Party, I am not going to sit over here and allow people to use such remarks as about parental training and the rest of it. If we on this side had the same parental training as some members on the opposite side, our names would have been changed to numbers. We would not be fit for human society in my opinion, but this is the price one must pay for democracy. Whenever you look back at the comics, Mr. Speaker, you read about Matty Square, Mr. Bribery, the Chinchillars and all these people, and whenever you hear them argue, they argue about constitutional rights. The biggest criminals in history, as soon as you arrest them, the first thing they talk about is their constitutional rights being infringed.

It is quite easy, Mr. Speaker, for members to get up in this Chamber and try to fool the general public about the last straw of democracy and that this is the thin edge of the wedge. Democracy, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, is here already and will say again, is as much a joke as any of the other "isms" and "ocracies". The meaning of democracy, as I know it, is the views of the people, by the people, for the people. How many people have any say in this democracy? Look at democracy in Great Britain, the biggest or one of the biggest democratic countries in the world - if not by size, at least they always play they are more upright than anybody else. Democracy went through the eddies when they were dealing with the South African problem; so you see, Mr. Speaker, it is all right to talk about democracy when it suits our purpose, but do we believe in this democracy we are talking about? We believe in the democracy of my taking from you, but we never believe in the democracy of my sharing with you what I have. You hear now about democracy; but the Labour Party never saw fit for the seventeen years they were in power to make it possible that the agricultural worker's child could go to a free Secondary School. That is the type of democracy that these people want to perpetrate. As Malcolm X has said, Mr. Speaker, and I fully endorse every word, there is nothing so dangerous as the negro man with the Ph.D and the B.Sc. behind his name, because he always feels that the moment he gets this kind of thing, he is uplifted from his fellow man who is down there. He is not the kind to bring his fellow man up.

You, sir, have been in this longer than I have been, and you could see for yourself the snob class that obtained in this country prior to 5th December, 1961, when we came into power. However, I do not want to waste too much time of the House on this Resolution. They went on to say - and the gist of their conversation was that the Prime Minister was in a fight for food. The people today, Mr. Speaker, in all of the African countries, the people in Vietnam, Cambodia and India have at some time during the day to fight for food. When a man is hungry you do not know what he might do, and as I have said before, to prove our point apparently we on this side can withstand hunger much better because apparently it seems as though we are better fed than members on the opposite side.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not unparliamentary, but it is not really good enough.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I did not say it is so. I said apparently. It is not a statement of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: I realise that appearances may be deceptive.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You know English even better than I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the compliment even better than the hon. member. I thank the hon. member.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Getting back to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I have on more than one occasion appealed to members on the opposite side to remember that we came in here specifically first to do the people's business, and that should come before us at all times; but it would seem to me and to all of us on this side that the Opposition is bent on retarding the progress of this country as much as possible, and then going to the people and saying that we did not do anything, trying to make out a case that when we should be doing business we are in a food row. Well, Sir, you have all sorts of rows in the Chamber of the Legislature, whether it be here in Barbados.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, Garfield Sobers' score is 98.

Mr. SPEAKER: Explanation of what? I apologise to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas for that interruption which may well have got him off his stride.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am batting like Sobers, Sir. We will still make a century. I am glad for the information, notwithstanding the interruption. It is good news to me. However, I have spoken on more than one occasion admonishing members on the other side of the Chamber that the business of all of us is to see that the people's business is done first; but as we can see from this Resolution if it can be so called, this misinformed Resolution, they would place you in a most invidious position if this Resolution were to be carried, because it is asking you in very strong language to take necessary steps to punish this breach of privilege committed by the Prime Minister. I will reiterate the statement I made before. I am prepared to bring a tamarind rod and lend you to castigate the Hon. Prime Minister for this alleged breach of privilege to this august body. Before I sit down, I will repeat what I started by saying, and it is that power corrupts, but the loss of power corrupts absolutely.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anybody on either side of the House is in any doubt about the nature and purpose of this debate, and like my colleague who has just sat down, although I shall raise different reasons for supporting our stand on it, I am convinced that it has been a device of the Opposition to delay the proceedings of the House in respect to Government Business.
3.55 p.m.

To me it is all of a pattern with the numerous obstructions, the numerous delays, the tactics, some of them I admit to be very clever - parliamentary tactics which have been used from time to time since this Session began to slow down the Government's work. (Applause)

Mr. SPEAKER: It is rather premature to applaud the speech of the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think hon. members were applauding something much better than that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Sobers has gained his century, Mr. Speaker, which I am sure you will be pleased as I am to hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will be pleased so long as we get unanimity in this Chamber.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On that score you do have it, Mr. Speaker. I may say, secondly, Mr. Speaker, that there ought to be no question of resisting this motion, because it has no significance really outside of the very compass of this Chamber. Like any other motion before the House, it is a good opportunity for both sides to indulge in a sliding match, and I think that the other side should have really enjoyed themselves to the full. It must be noted that we on this side sat in perfect silence while they were having their go at us.

To my mind, however, only two speeches in this whole debate, and I exclude even my own, have attacked the gravamen of this whole debate. Although

speeches were given from differing points of view and from differing sides of the House, only two came to grips with the issue. I refer to the speech of the Prime Minister and the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, because from those two speeches anybody who have not been aware of the incident, either in its entirety or in part, would certainly have come to understand what the argument was all about. The remarkable thing to me about those two speeches was how the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seems to bear out quite truly the contention which the Hon. Prime Minister was establishing in his speech.

When I examined the two speeches and what was said in them, I certainly came to the conclusion that, while we all have a good idea and a perfect understanding of what transpired, we all know that it did not transpire in this Chamber; we all know that the occurrence took place at a time when the House was in recess; we further know that no harm came of it, either physically or otherwise, to anybody; and we know best of all that the charge, which is the main contention of the motion that the privileges of this House have in some way been breached by the occurrence, just could not stand examination.

One peculiar feature of this debate, as, perhaps, of other debates which have taken place, whether on special motions or in the course of the business of the House, has been the - if I may say so without disrespect, Mr. Speaker - diligence of personal attacks upon the Prime Minister. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, of any other Parliament - I am not saying there is not; I am merely saying that I do not know of any other - in which it would be said that the Head of the Government is a lunatic; that he has to receive at frequent intervals psychiatric treatment. I do not know of any Parliament in which it would be said - there may be one such Parliament, but I do not know of it - that the Prime Minister in order either to circumvent, or to promote a given policy, connived at the murder of one of his own servants. I do not know of anywhere else where this would be said, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know in what Parliament anywhere in the world it could be said that the Prime minister is a self-confessed destroyer of public documents. Yet, all of this we have heard from the other side of the House. Now, I am not saying that the Prime Minister does not know how to defend himself. He certainly in the course of the debates in this House, in my opinion, and he knows my opinion about it, uses language and remarks which I think ought not to be used by a Prime Minister in the sense that when you are the Head of a country you can afford even more to 'let slide' a lot of things which are said. This is how I feel about it.

I sit here in my seat and I hear some hon. members, not all opposite, say the most disgraceful things about me. What am I to do? I take them, be-

cause if this is the level of their debate; if this is the contribution which such hon. members feel that they can purposefully make to a public debate in or outside of this Chamber, and if this is the only way they know how to gain debating points, this is all right with me.

I, occasionally, clash swords with the Leader of the Opposition, because I think in a Parliament the Leader of the House and/or the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition ought, from time to time, to exchange fire. I do it with him because I think it ought to be done sometimes and, certainly, for a better reason; whenever he makes a public statement, it requires tremendous restraint on anybody's part not to take him to task for it. But even with him I restrain myself, because I think that there are certain things that you ought to let slide.

I, certainly, do not think that when attacks are made on the Head of the Government, whether those attacks are made in Parliament or not, that the Head of the Government should not defend himself and reply; and for this reason I know that the Prime Minister is fully capable of answering unjustified, or justified, true or malicious, attacks made upon him. But I do not think that the matter before us should even be debated in that region at all. There is, after all, the commonsense view you can take to this problem. It suits hon. members opposite to castigate the Prime Minister merely because he is a public figure of some deserving repute; he is the sort of person who stands out in a crowd, and certainly has made a tremendous contribution to his life and times; he is the leader of the political Party which runs the Government and, therefore, he is significant enough to be attacked. I do not think that even they believe that when they attack him that this is all their motivation can manage, or this is the real reason for clashing with the Government.

I think hon. members on both sides of the House must understand that basically this is a question of power: who gets it, and who enjoys it. This is at the root of the whole question. Now, our country is a democratic country. Although I appreciate the point of view of my colleague, I do not share the conclusions which he has reached on this matter of democracy, because it is the real thing. I would rather have it than not have it. That is how I feel about it. 4.05 p.m.

Basically, what is dividing hon. members of this House is the question of power, and I think that we all have to understand that this country has changed within the last two years. What has caused it to change was something which divides us fundamentally. Before 1965 it was possible for two or three political Parties to exist in this Island and not to discover that there were deep and irreconcilable cleavages of principles between them. This is not so now. What has brought the political watershed is that hon. members on this side bravely and courageously took their political future into their hands and opted for independence for this country. Hon. members on the opposite side did not, and the side which opted for

independence has won. In the light of that victory, the other side does not trust the winning side because it feels, first of all, that the country should not be independent, and secondly, if it is to be independent, it should not be independent under us. We must face these facts because if we do not understand what it is we are quarrelling about, we would not be able to find what we are about to find. It cannot be a question of who eats with whom or who sits down in the dining room, because it is perfectly possible for a crowd to have to eat and drink with each other every day and still feel no fellowship with one another. That is perfectly possible. I am contending that what we think we are quarrelling about are only the things on the surface, and the things which we are not quarrelling about are the things which are really dividing us. I believe, because I am an incurable optimist, that, in time, we shall reach accommodation of outlook in this country between both sides, because you have to reach an accommodation outlook when the third, fourth or fifth force threatens to overturn the established and existing order, especially if that gives everybody wealth to demand the pumps, and the little, silly political games which we try not to play will be washed away in the limbo if we do not straighten up as we think we should. But there are deep and irreconcilable cleavages of principles which are still dividing us and these cleavages, are being reflected - if I may say it without offence because I mean no offence - these cleavages are reflected in the snarling and scuffling which go on not unnecessarily and not only in this House, but outside of it.

In the political arena generally and because we are so deeply divided on a matter of principle, and because the General Election has not healed the breach but has tended to widen it, we see as a sort of outpouring consequence of this division among us, all these little silly rows, if I may say so, that we indulge in from time to time. But there is an even more fundamental thing which is bothering us.

Mr. Speaker, the longer I stay in public life, or as long as I have been in public life, the more convinced I have been - and this conviction grows on me with every day that passes - that it takes a tremendous amount of courage for any twenty-four people of this Island to get themselves elected to this General Assembly. A lot of people when they read the misrepresentation in the House, when they refer to the bad behaviour among the smug, the satisfied little classes in this island, none of whom would venture to have the courage which the hon. junior member for St. Peter, despite his attitude, has had in offering himself - none of the people who criticize us as being bad-behaved and setting a bad example to others, has had the courage to go to the same people that we appealed to and asked them for their suffrage. It is their view that you have to be of a low calibre to get into the House of Assembly. They say that we are the worst form of animal life; perhaps we are. But if the twenty-four of us are the worst form of animal life, Mr. Speaker, where are the representatives of the better form of animal life? Where are they in this Island? Why are they not offering themselves since, on their own admission, if

on nobody else's, they have all the talent, the decency, the culture and everything else to get into the House of Assembly? This is the problem that they are up against. We are criticised, and in many instances rightly so, but in more instances wrongly so, by people who would never exchange places with us, because although they boast that they have superior qualities, superior manners, superior dignity and everything, they do not possess one-tenth of one per cent of the political courage which it has taken the most junior of us in this House to stand up on a public platform at Nomination Day and offer himself as a Candidate for the House of Assembly.

Having been elected, Mr. Speaker, look at the conditions under which the people's representatives allow themselves to work! Mr. Speaker, I say this; frankly, it is no surprise to me that human relationships are breaking down in this House, because we tolerated for ourselves levels of comfort, levels of commodiousness which we assume and would not countenance in the clubs or associations to which we belong. Who would have thought that in this year of grace, 1968, a House of Assembly, charged with the ultimate responsibility of the welfare of this country would allocate itself a dining room which, if the truth must be told, might well have been existing downstairs in the yard or at the Esplanade for all the privacy, decorum and dignity which it could afford to hon. members? Who would have thought that in a Parliament which is three hundred years old, and which is now Parliament of an independent country, it is impossible for the Prime Minister or the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - and for this as at all times, the incumbent Government must carry some part of the blame.

4.15 p.m.

But who would have thought that you could have a Parliament in which the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition could not have two properly furnished rooms for their comfort and convenience so that if in the case of the Prime Minister, he had to be in attendance in the House but not necessarily required in the Chamber he could still get on with his work without interruption in a properly fitted-out room of this House. Who would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition has to share the lobby with other members and a dining room with other members as in the present case? He has already been head of a Government, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he has been the head of the Government here and head of the former Federal Government. How can you expect responsible people in Parliament to tolerate with these standards? I say this because I believe in those standards of comfort and convenience and commodiousness and not having us quarrelling with one another. The question of eating or drinking would easily solve itself. That is no problem at all.

What you need for this Parliament is to have all of these buildings - this one, both top and bottom, as

well as the building on the other side - to be put entirely at the disposal of Parliament so that both Government and Opposition can have their own lobbies, their own dining rooms, their own reception rooms, and in addition to this, in case somebody thinks that I am using the best possible arguments for separation - in addition to the separate conveniences which I think we should have because after all we are political people doing political jobs, and political people doing political jobs ought to be able to consult with one another in the privacy of their own rooms or their own apartments. There is nothing wrong with this.

In addition to the separate lobbies and separate dining rooms, separate reception rooms and separate refreshment rooms, I would say that the entire Parliament - I mean not only this House but the Other Place - should have a properly equipped and most expensive and most tastily furnished common room or lounge usable by both members of Parliament - members of this House and members of the Senate - without distinction of location or even party allegiance so that hon. members not being pressed for private discussion among themselves and their respective political Parties but wishing to enjoy the social amenities which the whole Parliament offers, not only for all its members but for its members' guests, if it so wishes, would have this common meeting-room properly furnished with all the accoutrements and equipment which a dignified and decorous setting would provide for the use and enjoyment of all members of Parliament.

If this were so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they could be no objection to the Leader of the Opposition saying on some occasion, maybe during the Estimates or during a discussion on the Budget, "I would like members of my Party to meet with me in Lobby No. 1 over lunch or over dinner to discuss our strategy towards the Government's policy with respect to this, that or the other." It would be proper for me or the Prime Minister to say "I would like us to get together next Tuesday, or today or Friday in Lobby No. 2 to discuss our strategy and we would have our tea served there or our lunch", and on those days that we feel like not eating anywhere at all, we just do not eat, and on those days when we feel and sometimes in the case that Parliament as Parliament, or the House as a House, or the Senate as a Senate, wishes to use the common meeting room for the purpose of entertainment, then this can be done, and we all can meet on equal grounds without rancour or bitterness and without any necessity of having to inconvenience one another when we have reasons for eating or not eating.

This separation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this Parliament did not begin with the Prime Minister. I can remember when this horse shoe table was not divided in two as it is now, and as members are sitting now. I believe there may be one, possibly two or three members who can remember when instead of having two sections of the horse shoe table, you had one joint table. I can remember when this was so in this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation, I did not hear all that the Minister had to say. The change came as soon as Party politics came into being. At one time there were three groups which sat together in this House. I am not making a speech on that; I was just letting the hon. member know something about that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was never so grateful for an intervention as I am now. I am grateful to the Hon. Minister for the intervention.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is the motion before the House? What sort of Parliament building is it that you should have? What has that to do with the Resolution?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that I was never so grateful for an intervention as I am in respect of this one. There was a time when there was one table. The intervention of Party politics divided the table. The then Leader of the Government felt that it would be appropriate - no quarrel with you for it - to separate those who belonged to that side from those who belonged to this side. Naturally, as constitutional changes came, the Opposition went one side, Government going another. To me, that was a more significant departure from tradition than anything which we can complain of today because it means that for 200 or 320 years or whatever it was, the burgesses elected to the General Assembly of Barbados had sat in conclave with one another around a single table, and it rested with the now Leader of the Opposition, then the Leader of the Government, to desire a change in consonance with the constitutional development.

So too, in the dining room. You see, what I am establishing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this. Everybody is now saying that the country is going to the dogs because there is this division - a very, very good factor in politics. I think that is true, but I want to show that it did not start with us. There was a time when in the dining room, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was a large table which we now see there, and there was a much smaller table than the one which now exists upon which certain Officers of the House used to dine.

Now, in time it was inconvenient for the Officers of the House - or all of them - to use the little table because the Opposition wanted to move away from the Government.

(Mr. MOTTLEY made an aside.)

When the hon. member makes his contribution he can say his side of it. The larger small table which is now there was brought in to accommodate the minority Party or such members of the House as did not then belong to the majority Party.

4.25 p.m.

Now these are changes. First of all, the table separates. You go into the dining room - this is long before the Democratic Labour Party came into power, long before the Prime Minister was ever heard of -

and the change starts here to reflect the political realities of the time. You push the Officers out in order that the Opposition can be accommodated at the smaller table. Well, the changes come further. We are now saying that we wish to refurnish and expand the comforts and conveniences of the House so that both sides of the House - not the Government, not the Opposition as such - but both sides of the House should have commodious and comfortable apartments in these precincts for the better doing of their work. But it is a bit more than this.

You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I said earlier in my speech that the whole atmosphere in the dining room is such that it is bound to be not only worse, but worse in a peculiar kind of way from anything we enjoy in our own homes, and this should not be so. We should not have standards of comfort or convenience obtaining in this House of Assembly which are lower than those we would accept in our own homes or in the clubs to which we belong. It ought to be possible - and it is possible now, but under circumstances which are very questionable - that without any doubt hon. members ought to be able to entertain visitors, guests and friends to a meal somewhere in these buildings, because we are a Parliament of politicians who may have people coming to see us on public business or as a matter of courtesy either from within the Island or from outside. You would be surprised to know the trouble an hon. member has to go to and the precautions he may have to take before he can entertain a guest. It is not only that you must ask Mr. Speaker's permission, but he is well aware, for instance, that a certain number of meals are ordered, and he does not wish to presume upon the comfort of the House by introducing guests perhaps at inopportune times.

There has been worse than that, though. I can remember before I was a member of the House that I was asked in good faith to come into the dining room by a Mr. Alder who was then the member for St. John, because there was something which he wished to discuss with me, and he thought it would be more appropriate to discuss it over a meal. Now I do not know whether or not Mr. Alder sought the customary permission of the Speaker, but of course, it was not my concern because I was his guest and not a member of the House; but no sooner had I started to eat than Mr. Speaker came and embarrassed me and, presumably, must have embarrassed Mr. Alder who was my host by asking him how dare he to have somebody in the dining room without asking him, Mr. Speaker. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown did say that the Speaker was wrong at the time. This is the sort of thing that can happen even now, and everybody knows, of course, that the Speaker was the now hon. senior member for St. Peter. All of this I have lived through, and perhaps hon. members will forgive me if I speak this afternoon in this strain, because I think I am admirably placed in this House to do so. I have not been in it as long as the senior three or four hon. members, and I have been in it more than the junior ten or eleven. In this midway position I remember a little more than those who have just come and slightly less than those who have

been before, but what I remember provides the continuity between the old days and the new days which we are now seeing. That is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really cannot take a motion in these terms seriously. It arises, if at all, out of the very conditions under which we live and work in this building, and what I will campaign for and the reason why I accepted the idea mooted by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to go into this and other things, is that I really do believe that a Parliament in any country ought to be the best furnished, most commodious, the most decorous, and enjoy the most dignified surroundings of any public building or any public body in the whole island. Therefore my support will always go for a separate office and room for the Leader of the Opposition, a separate Lobby including facilities for dining or discussing for the other side, a separate Lobby including facilities for dining or discussing for this side, and a common room suitably furnished for everybody where everybody can eat together if they wish, can hold functions, can entertain, can sit and read, can drink, can do anything they wish which it would be proper to do in a common room. I bet you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, - well it is wrong to say I bet you - but I would lay a wager that if we had at the moment that sort of facility in these buildings, we should not now be wrangling over this unfortunate matter. This is the level of my thinking. It is worse than useless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to regret the divisions among the Parties. Divisions there are and divisions there must be. After all, we are in power now; and if the other side is honest to itself, it must wish to have the Government some time or other. We think from indications we have seen that although hon. members opposite may wish to have it sooner, they would have it later. Their hope on the other hand is that although we think they will have it later, they will have it sooner. In the last resort there is a Court of Appeal to which we all go, and that is the electorate when the time comes; but until the time comes to make that appeal, we have to do the people's business, and I am contending that the people's business cannot be done unless it is done in proper surroundings. If proper surroundings existed.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, I am drawing to Your Honour's attention the Standing Order against irrelevancies. I have been watching the clock since 14 minutes past four, and you see what the time is now. Not for one half second in that period has the hon. member dealt with the question of privilege. Surely you should stop him, Sir.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I need trouble Your Honour to reply. I am trying to assist the hon. member, gratuitously it would appear, but I am trying to show him the way out of his and our dilemma in this House, and I have tried to show him that what he imagines erroneously to have been a breach of privilege by the Prime Minister has been in fact a breach of commonsense by members of this House for not providing for themselves the facilities which would prevent the incident about which he complains.

One other point I should like to make, and it is a personal point which has relevance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my own position as Leader of the House.

I loathe and detest the duty which falls upon me of having to make a decision, when the House is meeting, as to whether or not a meal should be ordered. It renders me the most uncomfortable person in several respects. I do not think it should rest upon my judgment as to when other people should have meals or not. It is an intolerable affront to those people. Secondly, if when I think that a debate is going to end quickly and the House is going to disperse and I say "do not order dinner", and it turns out that the debate is prolonged and dinner has not been ordered, I get it in the neck, and I am placed in the most invidious position as being the person who, because he allegedly wanted to punish the Opposition, did not order a meal.

4.35 p.m.

On the other hand, if, using my own judgment, I ordered a meal and the proceedings of the House were shortened or concluded earlier than my judgment had anticipated, on my side of the House I run the risk of being told it has been a waste of time and public money, because hon. members have gone home and we still have to pay for the meal.

I think that the House of Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which is careful and solicitous of its dignity, should have some arrangement which absolves anyone of its members from having to make this decision which he cannot enjoy making and which, when he makes it, is bound to render him the most uncomfortable member of the House. I hope, when we reorganise our procedures, that I should be relieved of having to make that decision.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is open to opinion on either side of the question as to whether or not I have dealt with the motion. I will only say in anticipation of anything the Leader of the Opposition may say in winding up, if he says that I have not dealt with the motion, he could conceivably be right, because I can only deal with a motion before the House if the motion seems to me to attack some problem, or to refer to some basic problem which is upsetting the procedure of the House. The motion in the terms in which he has couched it does not seem to me to reach deep down into our problems and, therefore, I could not debate it on the surface. If, however, he wishes to hear a pronouncement on that, I am bound to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have heard no arguments on that side of the House to convince me that a breach of the privileges of this House has been committed by the Prime Minister.

I have heard arguments both from the Prime Minister and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph which have convinced me that an incident occurred in the Lobby or the dining room of this Chamber, which has been drawn to the House's attention and which has been blown up out of proportion to its significance. This is as much as I can say formally on the motion. I cannot agree that a breach of the privileges

of this House has been committed, because it should have been the duty of hon. members opposite to say what the privilege has been and how it was breached. It is my contention that they have not stated this, but I have spoken as I have because I want to arouse hon. members on both sides to some things which have been going through my mind which I think they had better attend to, because it is in the conditions of our work here and our surroundings that we get the spur or the inspiration, if you like to call it that, to quarrel with ourselves. If we had more commodious or a more convenient setting for the discharge of public business, we should have very little time to quarrel with each other, except on matters of principle which divide us when we discuss public policy. Yes, on those occasions; but they have nothing to do with our comforts outside of this Chamber.

We can make ourselves comfortable in a sensible way without extravagance, and be fortified in a proper and dignified way to do our business in this House. If we have to quarrel, we should quarrel about how the Government's business should be run, but we ought not to quarrel among ourselves about how we should react to certain conditions which, if the truth must be told, we ourselves have created, and which conditions will remain unless we grapple further with them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I speak on this matter and I think I can speak, unlike any other member, free from all encumbrances. (1) During my years in here, because of my health, I was not able to partake of anything in the Lunch room: (2) because I have had the experience here of only being in the Opposition and never being in the Government, therefore, I have had to defend members of the Government who are now in the Government, by attacking members who are now in the Opposition including the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and, when I speak on this matter, I want you to believe me, Sir, when I say that I regret that a matter of this sort had to be brought to the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to the Hon. Leader of the House. I do not agree with him on the whole, because I cannot agree with having these luxurious dining rooms and all of these luxuries for a little 2' x 4' country like Barbados, when we still have some people living in the same conditions under which they lived during the last century.

I came in here in the Gallery of this Chamber before I became a member of this House. I used to see one man of African descent sitting here. Then as Mr. T. W. B. O'neale has said at an Election; "the flood gates seem to have opened." I think that I was 29 years old when I saw quite a number of persons of African descent taking their seats in this Chamber. After that there were those of us who summoned courage and got elected here. I will speak from there on.

Mr. Speaker Pile, Mr. Speaker, Evelyn, Harold Austin and so on had different political philosophies to the new Leader of the Opposition who, in those

days, faced some very able, astute and, I may say, hon. men. As time went on, men like the Hon. Leader of the House and the now Prime Minister joined forces with him. I remember in the yard of the precincts of this Public Building the now Leader of the Opposition attempted to introduce me - he was then Prime Minister - as "Mottley the King-maker; Mottley the King-breaker." I remember well, Sir, immediately after that I had a discussion with the now Prime Minister. A week or two later I attended a political meeting in the Park. I heard the famous speech: "In God's good time all white men and white people should be banished and shipped out to sea."

I remember saying to the Prime Minister afterwards: "I know how you feel coming from a war, but I do not think this is the sort of thing that would suit Barbados". I was surprised myself, because my colleague, T. T. Lewis, was on the platform, and I think he was still regarded as a white man in Barbados. I have said that to show the position. I believe the Hon. Minister, the member for Christ Church, knows exactly what I am saying and he can vouch for it. All of these were members for whom the Leader of the Opposition made an opportunity for them to enter public life.

I remember well, Sir, when I was running....
(Interruption) I have never apologised for anything - and beat the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in St. John - I think it was Fred Bethel in those days. 4.45 p.m.

I remember that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on a public platform one night at a huge mass meeting said: "Would to God more people, more young men, more students, educated men like Cameron Tudor would come back to this country and serve the people of this country." He has given up all in all to come here to serve. I used to flatter myself - and the Prime Minister knew it too - I could speak well in those days; I had a little mass psychology and we won. I believe that you, in those days, know what I am speaking about. All this happened, and it also happened that, as the Hon. Leader of the House has said, there was the Congress Party, and the now Conservative Party a member of which I am never ashamed to be. You never saw me cross any bridge; I go down fighting. This is how I feel. When the Congress Party won eight members and we had eight and the Barbados Labour Party had eight, all that happened was that the suggestion was made that the eight members of each Party sit together in the House or in Committee. I want to make that point clear so that it will be clear in the minds of people, that there was a division, but that division was a division on political philosophy. Therefore, you had an extreme Left and an extreme Right, and as time went on, the now Leader of the Opposition gained power and got his majority in the House. For all of these years and up to now, I have been in the Opposition. No one gave the Hon. Leader of the Opposition more trouble on the floor of this House than I have given him in supporting members like the Hon. Leader of the House and members of his Party and Mr. Crawford who was the Leader of the Congress Party.

I would say this, that during all of this period, the only one man in the Government Party who ever attempted to think that he could draw lines outside the House, was the now ex-senior member for St. Michael, Mr. Cox. Outside of that, the Speaker presided in the dining room and members sat - not opposition at one table and Government at another, but all in between. The Speaker presided at the table. I will say this, that it was the custom that if any member - thank God I have never had to do it - wanted to offer a cup of tea, more especially to a visiting person to Barbados who came in to listen to the debates, he would always ask the Speaker. I have seen the now Leader of the Opposition and Dr. Cummins - I have seen every one of them go to the Speaker. I have seen the Speaker sit at the top of the table and preside. I have had in this House some turbulent rows with the now hon. senior member for St. Joseph when he was Chairman of Committees. We all would go out and we would laugh it off and we would say: "Boy, wait until we come back; I will show you what I will do with you." He would clap me on the shoulder and this would go on. That has happened throughout all the years; but what is strange to me in this matter - I was not there; I am going by evidence. If this were a Law Court, we would have to go by evidence. I believe that the disrespect for the Speaker in this matter is something which members of the Government will never get over. As regards the Hon. Leader of the House talking about these facilities which he would like to see and all of this thing for members of the House, I want to say that there are some people in this world who are so contentious, and although we know that education is the first step in making a humble person a gentleman, that they can never become gentlemen.

The Speaker of this House, as every one knows, is in charge of the House. I have been told that the Clerk of this House was given instructions by the Prime Minister to tell the caterer to fix food - I did not know that you were dealing with hogs - in the Senate Chamber's dining room for members of the Government Party. If any members of the Government, let us say, the Cabinet wanted to discuss something privately, that would be a different matter. If the Cabinet wanted to discuss something privately and they felt that if they went in there you could eavesdrop and so on, I would be the first to say that that is nonsense. You could very well say that if the Prime Minister wanted to discuss something privately in a room with his Cabinet members - but for months now I have been noticing that, with the exception of the hon. junior member for St. George, the Minister of Agriculture, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the Speaker, no members of the Government Party were coming into the dining room particularly. I threw a joke at them, but they never answered or gave any reply, but it is a bad day for anybody to be able to tell you because you are drawing a salary being elected in here and you are in a party, to whom you must speak and with whom you must be friendly.

4.55 p.m.

If I thought that the Prime Minister can make the hon. junior member for St. Michael who for forty

years had been my friend - friendship is like a plant of slow growth, it is true - well then, I would be very much surprised at him. For forty years the hon. junior member for St. Michael had been my friend. This is the sort of thing which I think elected members of the Democratic Labour Party need pulling themselves together, and the Prime Minister should not be able to tell people this.

Now, this is, I think, common knowledge. I understand that a member of the House has been told to pick his friends; he cannot be friendly with the Clerk of the House. (A VOICE: Who said that?) The Prime Minister. Do not look at me and ask me "Who told me so" because I know that is so.

Now, Sir, this is bad, very bad for Barbados. I am in business. Do you think if I had to do business with the Hon. Leader of the House that I was going to take into account that he was Leader of the House, or likewise with the Prime Minister, and because he belonged to a different political Party from mine, I must have some sort of venom, some sort of cancerous feeling towards him? No, that is not so. That is why I say that during the years when people of a different political philosophy, and a different complexion too, presided in this House, they never did that.

In the days when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was suspended from this House, that did not prevent Mr. Douglas Pile from taking his seat at the head of the table in the dining room. I can bring this to your knowledge chapter and verse. The Leader of the Opposition was suspended according to the rules of this House because he felt that he should not withdraw something; but it did not prevent Mr. Douglas Pile from sitting down in his place at the head of the table.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the House has had the advantage of some twelve years in England; he has had the advantage of an Oxford Education. Whatever might be his shortcomings, we do look at him as a gentleman, and I am surprised to hear him even defending this. Whatever might be his shortcomings, he is looked upon as a gentleman and there are certain things which you do not expect him to do. After spending twelve years in England and, maybe, five years at Oxford, whatever the case may be, you do not expect him to do certain things.

I have been in this House for quite some time. He is right when he said what happened between Mr. Alder and the then Speaker, and I criticised the then Speaker. I also criticised Mr. Alder because I said it was his duty first to enquire from the Speaker if it would have been all right to bring somebody in. But I do not like that sort of thing.

Now, as I have said, if this was in the Law Courts, you would have had to go by the evidence which you have. What is the evidence? The evidence is, as I understand it, that the Clerk told the caterer to fix up, not for the Government, not for the Cabinet members, but for the Government members - the

Speaker has said that he knew nothing about it, and it is about time that you put the Deputy Speaker in the Chair and the Speaker come out and say so. He said that he knew absolutely nothing about it.

Having said this, arrangements were made. The other members of the House - not all Opposition members - including His Honour the Speaker, sat in the dining room not eating, but waiting to be fed. Well, there are only two butlers. Seeing all the food, and so on, being passed outside, as I understand it, one thing, that is to say, one joint or whatever you might call it was to remain in the dining room and the others to go outside, how else could they act on seeing what was going on? This is not the eighteenth century where people, feeding servants, ate on the table and then raked up what is left and gave it unto their servants.

Those of us who have had the opportunity of travelling to America, and realising that you often had to work as a servant or maid or whatever it was in America, saw that it was a different way of life, and therefore, they felt that everything was being taken out of the dining room or that the Government must be fed first and they must be waited on afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, you are a member of the Government's Party; they are the Government in power. But you will remember this, as I have often said; all of us got elected here under the same Constitution. All of us came in here as elected members; none of us was brought in here in a wheelbarrow. There is no justifiable reason why food should be taken from inside of the dining room and carried somewhere else for members of the Democratic Labour Party. I can afford to speak as I do because I have never eaten in there for my twenty-odd years in this House. This is not the Democratic Labour Party Headquarters. This can be done at the Democratic Labour Party Headquarters.

Therefore, I am bound by what I heard as I was not there, and having heard the speeches of those who were there as to what happened - that while the food was taken out, hon. members who were in the dining room blocked the entrance and refused to allow any more food to be taken out, the caterer literally got on his knees and asked to be allowed - that is his business - to take out the food purely in the interest of his contract. I do not blame him. But the members of the Opposition refused, and rightly so. They were right. If I had been accustomed to eating in the dining room, I would have thrown all the food away and paid Mr. Jones for his dishes, because I would not be prepared to sit there and wait until you fed the Democratic Labour Party and then come to feed us.

Now, I want to show you what used to happen when the Prime Minister was a member of the Opposition like myself and would sit in there and eat. We remember well enough - the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and myself - when he summoned us to appear in Court to give evidence on his behalf as to what took place. We had the courage to go, one member from each Party - one member from the Labour

Party and one member from the Conservative Party. A member of the Labour Party had said something about him, and so on.

5.05 p.m.

One member from each Party was summoned. There was one member from the Barbados Labour Party, and one member from the Conservative Party to give evidence as to what took place when a member of the Barbados Labour Party had said something about him. We went and spoke the truth and said what happened. This just shows you that in those days the Speaker sat in the dining room and all members ate together. How is it now, simply because you have become Prime Minister and your guts and head have become swollen, that you cannot sit and eat with others like human beings? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope when I say this you do not get "fired"; but you are a member of the Party. I passed through Strathclyde and you saw my car and clapped your hands and called me. You know I do not drink, but you invited me in and all your boys were there; but you have been friendly with me for many, many years. Is this because people have political differences? Do you believe I share the same views as the Leader of the Opposition? I have not changed my views. I have never been afraid when people told me that when I was Leader of the Opposition I recommended Dick Leacock to be a member of the Other Place; and if you put me in that position again, I would do it again, because I feel that a man who is Chairman of the biggest investment in Barbados, the old iron that grinds canes, would have a right to be in that Chamber. I do not say that they should predominate the Chamber or predominate the life of politics in this country again, but because of that, must that make people bad friends? Do you know what I see about this? You will be bad friends with all these little fellows around here, and the Prime Minister would encourage you to be, but all the time he is abusing the white people, look in the papers and you will see the fraternizing. Of course, he is getting what I do not want now and that is the trouble.

On the evidence before us from members who were in there, it appears that the Speaker was not apprised of it, and secondly, the food was being carried out while they were sitting there, and they stopped the food. The Hon. Leader of the House says that the reason why he cannot vote for it is because it does not say what is the breach of privilege. The Resolution says "That this House views with the utmost gravity and consternation a breach of the privileges of members of the House committed by the Prime Minister"..... and then it goes on in simple English that any of us can understand "in invoking the aid of a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force to restrain the freedom of movement of hon. members." Either that is a fact or it is not a fact. If it is not a fact, this should be thrown out; but if it is a fact, it should be voted for. Is it a fact that Sergeant Laban Herbert was called by the Prime Minister and brought to the dining room door? Is it a fact also that the only person who can talk about ejecting a member of this House would be the Speaker by invoking the aid of the Marshal, and when that is

not sufficient, then with the aid of a policeman? I am sure the Hon. Leader of the House cannot deny this is the tradition. Therefore if you step beyond bounds to ask a policeman on your own, because you are a Prime Minister, or if you step beyond your bounds now as Deputy Speaker or as a member of the House, that is a breach of privilege. After all, this is Parliament. Is it that because you are Prime Minister you are in charge of the Senate or you are Speaker? This is terrible. Let the Leader of the House tell you that when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was Speaker, I adopted this same attitude with him; so I am free to speak on this matter. With the evidence before us, how can the Leader of the House say that no case has been made out when it says "in invoking the aid of a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force to restrain the freedom of movement of hon. members"?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to support this Resolution because I have sat and listened to the evidence, and the Hon. Leader of the House has not yet said that Laban Herbert was not brought by the Prime Minister. Of course he was not there. If he can prove here today that the policeman was not there, I would vote against it and I would have no qualms about so doing, because it does not matter to me. I have been in the Opposition all the time and I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if you as a lawyer sat as a judge and heard this case, you could only wait on the evidence. What is the evidence? The Clerk told Teddy Jones that he had been told by the Prime Minister, not even by the Leader of the House, where to put the plates for food for members of the Democratic Labour Party. Mind you, the table had already been laid for the members of the House. Everything was picked up and the members of the Opposition Party were sitting down, waiting, with hands folded, like boys outside waiting to ask for a plum, and they saw all this food being moved out. What else could they do? I think Teddy Jones is very lucky. There was curried mutton for one set of people, and pork chops for another set. I am not going to say what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, because no Prime Minister could stop me. The Leader of the Opposition could not stop me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want this to be made clear. I am not speaking for the same reason that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph spoke about being snubbed, because being snubbed is nonsense. Do you know why I say this? Let you and I look in a mirror, and let us look at the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. Do you think you look as if you can snub me? But let us refer it back. The Prime Minister's grandmother like everybody else's was the same masher of trash in the cane fields. She was the same thing as yours and mine; so how could he snub me? I would have more manners than to roll up my shirt sleeves and come in here to make a noise for food. You put a lot of little pigs together, and you will notice that if you have some little white ones, when the little black pigs are fighting, the white ones stand by and wait. I think it is bad manners and in bad taste. If you want to give people food, do as I do and invite them to your home.

When I was in the Opposition and the now Leader of the Opposition was Prime Minister, the hon. junior member for St. James can tell you there were occasions when I had a party. Who fought me more not to become Mayor of Bridgetown than the Leader of the Opposition! But I know what is right and what is wrong, and I would still invite all the members of his Party to functions. The only one member in my whole experience whom I have found to stand up and say: "You have no right going there: or "You have no right fraternizing with the member for the City" and so on, was the former member for St. Michael, Mr. Cox, and he is where he is now; so will the Prime Minister be some day. Whatever goes up comes down. It is no sense bullying and playing bull in a china shop and going all around doing this. I am supporting the motion because there is no evidence to the contrary. The suggestions made by the Leader of the House and these grandiose ideas about wanting the whole of this compound there for the House of Assembly, I do not agree with. What I do agree with is that a Committee should be appointed to go into the matter, just as you have the Printing Committee, of dealing with the question of accommodation for members and the like, but not that I will ever agree that you want all this.

5.15 p.m.

I have been into the House of Commons, and the Hon. Leader of the House has been there hundreds of times. Let him tell this House if he saw any cushioned chairs and fancy things in the House of Commons. That is in England. You will soon want some spring mattresses in here for members if we go on this way. It must be remembered that we still have people in Boscobelle cooking in a yard on a rock with a skillet. They now talk about members wanting this and that, and they did not want it in the days when Douglas Pile and Harold Austin were here! We have enough comforts here.

If hon. members were acting like normal, rational human beings and not being led away in this matter, they would realise that 'what difference does it make'. Going outside and talking to the Minister of Agriculture about a school, or about cricket, could not change his mind about being a member of his Party. If he spoke to the member for St. Michael on a matter, could that change his mind and make him come into this House and vote differently?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suppose this Resolution will not pass this House. With those few remarks I say that I am going to support it. This has been a bad thing for Barbados. No one regrets this more than I do. Wherever you turn in this country you hear people regretting this incident. We have to think of the young people and the youngsters in this country. I think myself that the Prime Minister must shudder to say: "I am Prime Minister; I have come up and up, but look what has happened?" *(Interruption)* (Mr. CORBIN: Do not waste time.) My friend, you are going up the wrong tree; you are talking to the wrong person. You have lots of work to do? Do not waste the paint, or do not rush the brush.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very, very bad state of affairs to see the headlines "ROW OVER FOOD". This is a very bad thing. We cannot expect the Speaker to descend in this arena in this matter. He will have to keep quiet, I suppose, but I think we all know that the Speaker was not even consulted in this matter. I admire the Hon. Leader of the House - you can always look in his face and see when he is defending a bad case; he turns pale; he knows he has a bad case. He regrets having to do this, but he has to say something. He can play with words, and he said something.

This is one of these things which I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will never happen in Barbados again. If, because members are working for a couple of hundred dollars when the month comes and they can be dictated to and told: "Do not speak to Sergeant; do not speak to Husbands; do not speak to this person and another person", that is certainly a bad state of affairs, Sir. I have been in politics for a long time, and I have never changed my colours. With the exception of Ronald Mapp and Cox, whenever members of this House got up - and I gave a lot of trouble in here. For instance, the Leader of the House called me out one morning very early and asked me to fire licks at the then Government. I came in here and fired licks at the Government. (Mr. ST. JOHN: They have dis-owned you now.)

When I was a little boy, my aunt used to tell me: "My dear boy, whatever happens happens for the best." I know that they cannot point their fingers at me about anything dishonest; they cannot do it; I challenge them to do it. You may say that I made money and made money fast, but that is my business. I went into the real estate business, but they have some people who grudge others right and left. As long as they did not go to a University and they made money, some people think that they should not.

However, Sir, today if I were a member of a jury and I saw this and I had heard the evidence, I could not go along with the Leader of the House that no case has been made out. He heard every bit of the evidence. This is a question of invoking the aid of a member of the Police Force. That is beyond the authority of the Prime Minister. Only the Speaker can call on the Marshal, and then the Marshal can invoke the aid of a Police Officer. This is the case that has been made out. I have listened to the evidence of those who were there. We have all heard the evidence, and the evidence is very clear - it is as clear as a pikestaff. If the evidence is there, much as we regret it, instead of doing this in here, just as the Speaker said "Errol what are you getting on with?" The Speaker admitted that, you know - be courageous enough to say to the Prime Minister: "Do not catch at something small."

For instance, I usually talk to the hon. member for St. Michael. If I wanted a favour done tomorrow in respect of an opinion about something which he was conversant with, I would go to Fontabelle to see him. I hope if the Prime Minister comes and sees me at your home, he will not..... (Mr. ST. JOHN: Throw

him out of the Party.) No, he will not do that to George. George is in a better position. He would do that to others. I said in here just now, and I am sorry certain members are not here, that it is a fact that he told the hon. member for St. John: "Look for your company; you should not be speaking with Horse Cumberbatch". He cannot tell you that, Sir. After all, you have your piece of parchment, your wig and gown, and your shingles. (Laughter) .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you saw the senior member for Christ Church coming through Strathclyde, and you saw me, and said: "Come in, man; the boys are here, let us have a drink - all D.L.P. members; let us fraternize", and you called the hon. member for Christ Church, you would not be the Deputy Speaker again. I am voting for this Resolution, Sir.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if any hon. member on the other side would like to speak, because I intend to reply. If any other hon. member on the opposite side wishes to speak, he should speak now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to speak on this motion before the hon. Leader of the Opposition winds up?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the course of my reply I may be tempted to make the sort of appeal that we on this side of the House made when this session began, and that we have made from time to time. I say "may be tempted", but quite recently I did feel - of course some of us can change our minds and some do not. I may be tempted to remind myself that a short time ago I felt that it would be war to the death as between these two sides of the House, because all of our appeals seem to have fallen on deaf ears.

5.25 p.m.

Even when an appeal is made to some hon. members who support the Government, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the hon. junior member for Christ Church are conspicuous examples of persons willing and offering to cease to have rows and let us get on with the business of the Government and of the country. As the hon. junior member for St. Thomas would put it, I am so old - which is an honour; it is nothing to be ashamed about - so old as to be very well experienced in a number of things, chiefly parliamentary, - I say "old" because I am a lawyer as well as a politician and I do think that some of us - and I am addressing my remarks more specifically now through you to the Hon. Leader of the House - some of us should remember that Barbados comes before anything else, even parliamentary victories or debating victories, and we should see that when you sometimes win a victory, you have lost the confidence and the respect of the people. Who, apart from wanting a dialectical victory, or who are invincibly ignorant, could possibly say that this is not a case of a breach of privilege? At one time the Hon. Leader of the House gave the impression, although he was drifting and drifting for a very long time, that

because things said over on this side were said by us, it did not necessarily mean that they should be turned down. That is what caused me to say, when I first got up a moment ago, that I have been almost tempted again to hold out the hand of peace to them, but I have reached the conclusion, I repeat, that there is no hope of having a peaceful settlement between these two sides of the House.

I am making an appeal now; I know it will fall on the majority of deaf ears. Hon. members may say that they have scored a point this evening if they turn this down, but to the outside world you are telling them this - the lowest of the low, if they had a family row, would not do a thing like this, bring in a policeman. The lowest person in this island, man and wife, sons and daughters quarrelling - does one go and fetch a policeman? I would not insult the lowest agricultural labourer or carpenter or the lowest of any type of labourer in this island, to suppose that that could happen. We know that that could not happen unless one of them, husband and wife, son or daughter has a low, low mentality. If you vote against this this evening, you will be scoring a House of Assembly victory, but you are telling the outside world that you condoned the Prime Minister of all people, the man who should be the symbol of what Barbados is or what Barbados should stand for, you are condoning that conduct for purely Party reasons. The Hon. Leader of the House asked in his usual undergraduate, dialectical conduct, in his saying-a-lot-and-meaning-nothing style, where is the evidence of a breach of privilege? I am not going to repeat it; I said it quite strongly enough a few minutes ago, that bringing a policeman in a purely House of Assembly difference of opinion - you cannot even elevate it to say that it was a row - is not a breach of privilege?

I was about to appeal to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to remember his history. Charles I threatened Parliament with soldiers, Charles I died on the scaffold. This bring me - I wish to deal specifically with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as I go along, and I paid him the compliment which I do not remember paying to many people in all of my parliamentary life, of writing down all the things he said with the object of replying to them. He said, for instance, that this is a part of the whole set-up which some hon. members - we should be insulting some members of the Government to think that they have such low gutter-like mentalities as to say this sort of thing. The instance which the hon. member who has just sat down referred to, we all know or have heard of. He would not be seen dead in Westbury Cemetery. *(Laughter)* He will be seen dead in Station Hill. *(Laughter)* If he goes on as he goes on, he is going to end up there. Could anybody on this side care whether he is seen dead with him or not? How could anyone of us on this side, by any stretch of the imagination care? Then he said something which, obviously, cannot be true. I saw very little of this, in fact, when I got there - I was in here talking with the hon. member for St. James to an old friend from the United States of America. When I got there, the Police sergeant was at the door and the Prime Minister was walking off in his shirt and pants - his shirt in-

side this time - and I asked the Police Sergeant what had happened. Up to then I did not know. I heard some voices inside and sonon. The Sergeant was embarrassed and so afraid that all he could say was "I do not know." I asked: "What are you here for?" And he said: "I do not know, Sir." Obviously, the Police Sergeant was afraid to say. I repeat, and I repeat for the last time. You have a family row and worse still, a row over food. Smooth it over as much as you like; it is a plain, plain food row, who to eat first, and who to get what, and then you bring along a policeman! Does the Hon. Leader of the House still ask where is the breach of privilege?

There has been very little reference to the fact that the Speaker was insulted or overlooked. If it were possible for anybody to be more embarrassed than how the policeman looked, it was the Speaker. When I stepped in, and I stepped in immediately behind the hon. junior member for St. Thomas - I saw him snatch up the two plates and it was a snatch. He pushed his way past, pushed his way between two people just in front of me, and went to one table, and up with the left hand, and then with the other also. I suppose that that was reminiscent of the old days when he used his left and right hands to make a living. 5.35 p.m.

But then, the hon. member does not realise that sometimes we say things only to goad him because he is so easy to be goaded; though really we are paying him a compliment when we take notice of him. But if he tells you that he would throw them away - it is not true, of course, because he snatched them up with the object of carrying them out to eat - well, it is just that some of us cannot live down our past.

Again, I repeat, I am too old just to be rhetorical. I have heard all sorts of speeches in this House. I have heard all sorts of abuse; but I have never heard so great an exhibition of real, low, common, bad manners as has taken place in this debate. The Speaker, as I have said, when I saw him, looked more than embarrassed; but it should be stressed that our sympathy, if you like to call it so, should go out to him in that episode. He has some faults with which we would deal later: but in this particular matter the Speaker looked like a little child being pushed away because the Prime Minister felt that he can dictate to everybody and bring a policeman. I have seen that sort of thing happen when I was a school boy and I have never forgotten it. It was the occasion of a match at Harrison College. I was about 16 years old, I suppose. It was a long time ago, and a man in the crowd kept shouting out. Pickwick was playing Harrison College, and this man kept shouting when Harrison College was getting the better of Pickwick. I have forgotten his name. There was a big blustering man who became a Magistrate and was a Magistrate at the time. He went and called a policeman to put that man off the field. I could not help feeling what an abuse of authority it was. The policeman dared not to tell the Magistrate that the man was not doing anything. The man was only shouting out. He was shouting "Harrison College, play on".

This is exactly what the Prime Minister was asking that policeman to do in this case. He took advantage of that Sergeant. The Sergeant could not say "No, Sir, I am nothing to do with it". The Sergeant could not tell him "I must ask the Speaker if I must go in". He is just a blustering bully; and if the members of the Government do not say that and do not assert themselves, then they will retain their seats for this Parliament alone and never get back in this House because their manhood would have disappeared. Who is a man if he cannot stand up to anybody?

This is what I mean when I said that this is the most disgraceful speech I have ever heard. The Prime Minister comes into here and instead of doing what the junior member for St. Andrew did - it is true he tried to pooh-pooh it and said it was trivial - but he said, "Let us get on with the work." Instead of doing that, he delivered himself of a speech which I am going to take around when the *Official Gazette* is published and sheet this Island with copies of that speech so that the people can see the type of man the Prime Minister is.

He told you that you must not mix with us. He told you in effect that you must eat alone. I wonder if hon. members on the other side know that at the following sitting of the House fourteen lots of lunch was placed on one side and ten on the other. I am referring to the following sitting after the debate in here on this motion. When it reaches that stage, I have to add a little to what the hon. senior member for the City said. Which of us sitting around here - even if we had the old stupidity of the white aristocrats of this Island of a century or so ago - can afford to look down for any reason whatsoever on another? I was almost about to say which is better and which is worse, but there are some worse ones.

I repeat, what members on the Government benches - if the Prime Minister, or if the Speaker had done it, it would be the same thing - would expect him to bring in a policeman if there was a difference of opinion between members of the House of Assembly?

(ASIDES)

I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. We can hear the scores afterwards.

As I said, I paid the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that compliment of taking notes. Now I am just using a Roman phrase "The invincible ignorance of the junior member for St. Thomas." Imagine in a debate of this sort, a debate when the dignity of the House and the respect due to Parliament is at stake that the hon. member does not take the trouble to ask somebody something. He would not know by himself, and if he read it he would not understand. But he can take the trouble to see what happened to a person complained of in cases of breach of privilege and what punishment is used.

I did not look up anything on this matter. This is the sort of thing that is in your brain anyhow. When

the word "punishment" is used, you punish people for a breach of privilege. You either commit them to prison - in the old days there was plenty of that - or you fine them, or as in this case, what I called on Mr. Speaker to do - you reprimand or admonish them.

Some things have happened, even as recently as this morning where the procedure has been completely forgotten. When these breaches of privilege take place and are complained of, the custom is that the person complained of has to withdraw, but you would certainly give him a chance to say something in his defence. None of that was done, but that is by the way.

This is what I am asking Mr. Speaker to do, and this is what I meant by the operation of the motion. I said a moment ago that I did not look up anything. Obviously, I did not because I made the motion standing on my hind legs soon after I had drawn the Speaker's attention to it. But it is the duty of Mr. Speaker to reprimand or admonish, or both, the offender and in the case of the Prime Minister nobody would want to ask more than that. I stress that the Prime Minister had it in his power to show himself a man instead of blustering it out.

How in the name of heavens could he go to the Senate? That is a breach of privilege. I suppose that some hon. member over there, especially the member for St. Thomas, would protest against saying that there was a breach of privilege as regards their going in the Senate. The Prime Minister had it in his power, possibly, to say the truth: that he did not think of it, he is sorry, he made a mistake and he apologises to the Senate and it would not happen again. Instead of that, he gloried himself in what he had done. That is one of the most appalling things that could have happened in this debate.

5.45 p.m.

Now the Leader of the House, like the Hon. Prime Minister, though to a less degree - he is not as bombastic; in fact I do not think you could use the word "bombastic" of the Leader of the House whether it is offensive or not offensive - but the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House make these extraordinarily stupid accusations that we on this side of the House are trying to pull down Barbados, and worse still, when these things happen, the people who say it do not realise that they are attacking themselves and making themselves out to be idiots, in accusing us of trying to keep back Government business. Who was keeping back Government Business when this House two weeks ago was adjourned for a fortnight, and a day or two after - and we all know why - the Speaker granted leave to have a special session? I am replying now to the world on this stupid accusation that the Opposition is only bent on pulling down Barbados and keeping back Government Business. The Leader of the House even used the word "device". Here we are ready to work. We thought we were coming back and that the House was going to be adjourned until Friday of last week. Instead of that, it was adjourned for a fortnight, and we are accused of keeping back Government Business!

It was the duty of the Government to see then that we came back on Friday and got through some more Government Business. Two weeks were wasted, according to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I apologise to the hon. member for referring to him so often. (Laughter) There you have it, the loud laugh that speaks the vacant mind! I am replying, I repeat, to the people of this Island, to the people in the West Indies, to the people of the world. I am speaking now as bluntly and plainly as possible to the British High Commissioner, to Mr. Mann, the United States Ambassador, to the other Ambassadors whom we have here. They use their security people and send some of their staff here to listen and to ask people's opinion of us, and the image that Barbados has today in the eyes of many people is that it is sinking, sinking, down, down, down. I invite them to report to their Governments who is keeping back Barbados.

We have been asked today by the Leader of the House in what other Parliaments would this, that and the other thing be said. In what other country where people try at least to be decent and respectable would you get a Prime Minister who hardly ever opens his mouth without cursing his opponent?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am as keen a cricketer as anybody else. I suppose without boasting that I played more cricket than anybody else sitting down around here. I said cricket, not bat and ball for Speightstown.

The hon. member, being dishonest, thinks that other people are dishonest. I repeat that the Prime Minister got in here and made an exhibition of himself with his style of vituperation, which is the lowest type of vituperation you can get from any type of politician. Down in the gutter he goes. He says some vile things in here, and I challenge him to repeat them outside, but he is a coward. If he were not a coward, he would repeat them outside and stand in a witness box and defend himself in an action for slander; but he is going to say things and hide under the cloak of diplomatic and parliamentary immunity. We ought to be ashamed of having a man like the present Prime Minister as our Prime Minister, and that has nothing to do with this Party or that Party. We have to see what image he gives to the outside world, and I do not care how much I am attacked for pulling down Barbados, I will make it my business whenever a foreigner asks me anything about Barbados to tell him the truth about this Government. Some hon. members facing me, apart from politics, are the best of friends you could want, but they are cowards. Stand up to him! Many a Prime Minister has to be "fired" by his own people, and only then does the Opposition get a chance of "firing" him to become the Government. He is a bully and a coward, and he has dragged Barbados down into the mud.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be surprised to find members of the Government voting for this motion, but they would be voting against the motion only for Party reasons. Let them ask their conscience if, when a Prime Minister calls in a policeman because there is a difference of opinion - and, above all, over food - that is not a breach of privilege, apart from

the question that he ignored the Speaker, and only the Speaker has control over this Place and the dining room. Could anything be worse? If it is a breach of privilege for him to do what he did in the Senate, is it not a breach of privilege for him to have done what he did in the House? Do not be like children in voting. Do not be cowards. This is a plain, straightforward motion to maintain the dignity and the respectability of Parliament. This, barring one other in the Caribbean area, is the oldest of Parliaments. Let us live up to the dignity of those Barbadians who went before us and built a great name for Barbados.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

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

AYES: Mr. LYNCH; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. SMITH; Mr. St. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 10.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is a motion relating to a breach of privilege standing in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MOTION RELATING TO BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in spite of the vote which was just taken, I am going to make this motion and press it. This is even more disgraceful than the last. My motion reads: - I hope hon. members have a copy before them:

This House having heard Mr. Speaker read a letter sent by the Leader of the House to Mr. Speaker for transmission to the Honourable President of the Senate respecting a breach of privilege committed by some members of this Honourable House against the President and members of the Senate strongly protests against this action on the part of the Leader of the House and the Speaker;

The House having learnt from the reading of the said letter that the Leader of the House purported to apologise on behalf of the Majority Party of this House without reference to others of its number considers this act to be a gross breach of its privileges and should not be condoned;

The House therefore places on record its gravest displeasure at the conduct of the Leader of the House and of the Speaker as being contemptuous of the House, as lowering the dignity of Parliamentary democracy and as conducive to complete disrespect for the holders of the high offices of Speaker and Leader of the House.

Now, as I did not speak earlier, I cannot be accused of repeating what.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to point out to the hon. member that the first three lines of the proposed motion are at variance with the facts. The first three lines of the motion do not correspond with the facts. The motion reads:

"This House having heard Mr. Speaker read a letter sent by the Leader of the House to Mr. Speaker for transmission to the Honourable President of the Senate....."

That is not true. I have written to the President of the Senate, and I have sent a copy of that letter to Mr. Speaker. Those are the facts. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Then that letter should not be before us.) *(Asides)*. You have to be concerned with the facts. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I am not entering the debate now. My letter to the Speaker says:

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to enclose a copy of a letter which I have sent to His Honour the President of the Senate....." *(Asides)*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to get this matter straight. The motion says:

"This House having heard Mr. Speaker read a letter sent by the Leader of the House to Mr. Speaker for transmission....."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He has said that, and I have accepted what he has said. I understood the Speaker to say this, but the hon. member says it is not so. He said that he wrote a letter to the President of the Senate and sent a copy to Mr. Speaker. I accept that. It will now be necessary to amend my motion accordingly. The necessary amendment can be made. Hon. members have the documents before them, and they can read the letter for themselves. I have not read my copy of the letter yet as I was on my feet. "This House having heard Mr. Speaker read a copy of a letter....." will be the slight amendment to be made. *(Asides)*

"The House having learnt from the reading of the said letter that the Leader of the House purported to apologise....." I am sorry to be repeating it, Sir, but I know that some hon. members will read it....

"on behalf of the Majority Party of this House without reference to others of its number considers this act to be a gross...." *(Interruption)* *(Noises from the Clerk's Office)*

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot hear because there is too much noise behind there.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether the Marshal forgets that he is the policeman of the House?

Mr. SMITH: Ask the Marshal to put them out, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a breach of privilege, but the hon. member for St. Thomas does not understand that. The noise is disturbing the House, and that is a breach of privilege. Apparently appeals to reason fall on deaf ears. Do hon. members for one half-second not see that it could hardly be a greater breach of privilege than this?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot hear him; the Reporter cannot hear him.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should hate to say anything that would give a reflection on yourself, but, if you do not keep order, I shall have to move that the House do now adjourn. (Mr. SMITH: This is grave disorder; adjourn the House and let us go home.)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I say that it is the Government and the leaders that bring discredit on Barbados some people get annoyed. For instance, Mr. Speaker, is in there and yet this is happening, and then they blame the Opposition for bad behaviour!

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As there is grave disorder within the precincts of the House, I suspend this sitting for 15 minutes.
6.06 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended some fifteen minutes ago, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was on his feet; but under Standing Order 16 (3), as it is now later than 6.15 p.m. of the clock, that matter stands over. The next matter on the Order Paper for today is the notice of a Resolution standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not often that a matter of this sort comes before the Assembly.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is on his feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no point of order at this moment. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just risen to speak and I have taken the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, the Deputy Speaker.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I started off by saying that a motion of this sort is a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Am I to understand.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not yet completed a sentence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you have ruled...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition proceed. *(Asides)* that is my Ruling.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take it that you.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not like that kind of bullying. I like to be calm. I want to know whether.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition may proceed. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not disposed to proceed.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: What have you ruled on, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY took his seat.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I take it that the hon. member thinks that this is not in order as a question.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is therefore ill-advised.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot tell me that I am ill-advised.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am entitled to say that. Sit down. I am entitled to tell any hon. member who remains standing after Mr. Speaker has risen, or who stands after Mr. Speaker has risen, to sit down, unless, of course, he does so gracefully to bow to the Chair and withdraw.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am speaking on a point of order backing the rights and privileges of hon. members of this place. Mr. Speaker is in a position of authority.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, are you going to hear him and not me?

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will sit. *(Asides)* Try to name me. I am just the person to play with. Do you think they sent me here.... *(Asides)*.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an indication of grave disorder. In view of that *(After a pause)* The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may proceed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I take grave exception.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you allowing him to speak and not me?

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. I suspend the sitting for fifteen minutes on account of what I consider to be grave disorder. 6.30 p.m.

On resumption, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recall that when this sitting was suspended the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the whole object of this Resolution is to tell the Government that we on this side of the House take most seriously the position that exists today in the sugar industry and the threat of the General Secretary of the Union. Those who have not studied or at any rate read the history and attempts at general strikes in Great Britain do not realise exactly what is happening in similar circumstances and have not realised that if the community is going to be held up to ransom.....

(Members of the Government walked out of the Chamber.)

We are told that we retard Government Business: but every single person over four years cannot fail to see that the present Opposition is of a very serious nature and the Government which is trying to stall the Opposition, which is accusing the Opposition with holding up Government Business is playing with fire. I think even the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union has realised that he was playing with fire and is saying now that he is soft-peddling.

In 1926, as hon. members know, there was a General Strike in Great Britain and some of the Labour leaders had been opposed to it, but finally the Trade Union Congress brought it about.

(The remainder of Government members walked out of the Chamber.)

(Hand Claps)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, can anybody who has any real regard for honesty

possibly say that this is a matter with which we are merely trying to make political capital? I do not want to say anything that sounds boastful. I worked with the General Secretary of the Union. I made him what he is today, unfortunately, and I would know him. He knows that his braggadocio comes from a real desire to hit people hard when he thinks he has a chance and a duty to hit them.

I take this very seriously. I take it that he thought this was a chance for calling out transport workers or dock workers. He forgot all about the tourist industry and the economy of Barbados. History repeats itself. Forty-two years ago we had a General Strike in England and it collapsed. That is one of the reasons why I used the words "questionable legality." It was because of the decision of the High Courts that in the circumstances of the case then before the Judge, the General Strike was illegal.

After all, the transport workers and the dock workers have no quarrel with their employers, but they are being asked to come out in sympathy with the sugar workers. That failed in England, and for these forty-two years no attempt has been made in England to have a General Strike. We have had a dock strike and a bus strike in 1958. We have had some big strikes from time to time; but I knowing the effects of a General Strike, take it seriously when I know that if he can get anybody to stop working so as to bring pressure to bear, he will do so notwithstanding the suffering on the poor, on the sugar workers and the management staff.

Now, I know that of these people who are talking, some of them are spies; some have set out deliberately to attack us. No hon. member on this side can possibly be honestly accused of being on the side of the Sugar Producers Association. If it is anything else, we are on nobody's side in this sense; the cost of living rise in this Island would make you say that 49 cents is too little. To accuse us - and I am speaking for myself; I hope that I do not sound as if I am criticising my colleagues - I am far more Left Wing than it appears on the surface. I think profits under a capitalist system are too high.

Let nobody be stupid enough to say that the Barbados Labour Party is on the side of the big people, on the side of the capitalist and on the side of the Sugar Producers' Association. But what we do say is that we do not have all the facts. We do not know if 49 cents, 5 per cent, 12 1/2 per cent, whatever it may be, should be the amount offered. But what we do say is this. Rather than have a general holdup of work, I would modify what I said here a few Fridays ago as regards the necessity to reap the crop.

All sort of stupid lies have been shed and Mr. Walcott is saying that at the time of the involvement we told the people not to work and now we are telling them to work. We are doing nothing of the sort. I will modify what I said. What I really do say is this. If the Island is going to suffer, the working-class man is going to suffer more than anybody else. Therefore,

I say that work should be continued; and, in addition, people should be assured of getting an increase.

I will go further. This is my modification of what might have been bland and emphatic - even dogmatic. We know very well that the people want money. If workers can get some increase now, in order that they undertake work, then the rest which may be due to them can be given them when a board of enquiry or an arbitration tribunal decides. Then they guarantee that by law.

I think that hon. members and quite a number of people generally know that you cannot have arbitration. In the old days when I was President of the Union I never favoured compulsory arbitration. Let the people get together and get together, and after a time with commonsense they would reach an agreement rather than that the country should suffer.

That is why I said *ad hoc* in particular cases if you see negotiations breaking down and breaking down. If both sides are adamant, then for that particular dispute have arbitration.

Therefore, I make it short because our time is limited on a debate of this sort and doubtless some other hon. members may wish to speak. Before I sit down I repeat; we are not telling anybody that we are going back on our Socialist principles; we are telling the employers that you can afford to pay more. We are not telling them that they cannot pay more. If anything, we say that as a Socialist organization we believe that profits in industry generally are higher than they should be if a lot of people still cannot get two square meals a day. We say that; but at the same time we say that we do not know all the facts. I know, and we all know, that 49 cents is too little, but we do not know the position to tell you what it should be and, therefore, you should have an impartial arbitration.

I cannot sit down without contradicting in the broadest strongest language consistent with parliamentary speech and giving the lie directly to Mr. Walcott's telling people that I, the then Leader of the Government, had appointed an arbitrator in 1958 and then went behind his back.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was said that as Leader of the Government I appointed an arbitrator in 1958 and then went behind the backs of the workers and told him to give them little or nothing. That is not only a damnable lie, but a stupid lie. In 1958 I was not the Premier of this country; Dr. Cummins was Premier. When Mr. Lewis, now Sir Arthur Lewis was appointed I never at that time saw the Report or read it because I was very busy in Trinidad. It was some time long after that I read the Report. When Mr. Walcott can get up in public and say that I appointed an arbitrator, it is just a damnable lie and you can see what we are up against. What is the point of telling a lie when there are hundreds of thousands of people who can contradict it?

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not intend to speak long in as much as according to the Standing Order we have to finish by 8.30 p.m. I think I have said enough and it is unnecessary to repeat what our position is. We want more information; we want an impartial arbitrator to say what exactly over 49 cents should be paid to the workers, and we do hope that in order to get the workers back, something can be done. After all, we go around and we have a new Union, and we know that the average worker will cut the canes, but he wants to see his money, and we know that the engineers are more emphatic about not working than the average cane cutter.

I would also just remind hon. members that the Resolution envisages now an *ad hoc* tribunal, but we are also in favour of something over and above that - a survey of the industry as a whole. I did not say this on the last occasion I was speaking about sugar, but I say it now. We do not know because we have had views on one side or the other side about Haggatts. For instance, the last expert who was out here says we have not got too many factories. On the other hand some say we have got too many factories, and our position is this: let an independent survey - not just a one-man but three first-class men who know about sugar outside of this Island - be made as to how many factories Barbados should have or should not have and as to where they should be cited. If they say one should be in the North, then scrap Haggatts for being old iron, or improve Haggatts and let that be one. On the other hand, they may say: "Do not have one down there at all". How could we possibly come down dogmatically and say you must do this until experts go into the position, give us all the facts and then let the matter be hammered out on the floor of the House?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have very much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a member of the Legislature of this Island and as a citizen of this Island, one must take note of the fact that reading all of the media of communication in existence in Barbados at the present moment, one can only come to the conclusion that we are heading for a grave industrial crisis. It is the duty of us as legislators, and, in particular, it is the duty of the Government to watch and view this situation carefully.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order No. 5 (3), this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung but no quorum was obtained.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being more than two minutes after the time to which this sitting was suspended, and there not being nine hon. members present, automatically this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, 20th February, 1968, at 12 noon. 7.50 p.m.