THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th January, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon o'clock 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. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries);* Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. 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. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, *(Deputy Speaker);* C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

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

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that the Minutes for Tuesday, 16th and Tuesday, 23rd January, 1968, have both been circulated.

If there is no objection, these Minutes will be confirmed.

First, as to the Minutes of the 16th, hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

As to the Minutes of 23rd January, hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly confirmed.

Mr. SMITH entered the Chamber and took his seat,

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, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended 30th November, 1967.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st December, 1967.

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several Districts of the Island for the quarter ended 31st December, 1967.

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

Tenth annual report of the Housing Authority for the period 1st April, 1965 - 31st March, 1966.

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 $6,290 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 44 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of $135,828 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part II Capital as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 45 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of this Resolution, I am giving notice now of my intention to deal with it in all its stages today for reasons which I believe the House will appreciate. First of all I would like to say that copies of the Resolution are being prepared and will be circulated to hon. members; and secondly, I believe that all hon. members may have been invited and may wish to attend the University ceremony next week, and it would only be for this and one other item that the House would be meeting in so far as Government Business is concerned. However, hon. members will judge for themselves when they see the Resolution.

I now give notice of my intention, other things being equal, to proceed with it in all its stages today.

As I said, copies of it will be circulated shortly so that hon. members can study and judge for themselves.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice also of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolution for $6,290 of which notice has just been given.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 96, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 97, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 111, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 120, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James, is ready.

Mr. CRAIG and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

"WHEREAS the Royal Barbados Police Force is requested to deploy some of its members in the performance of such duties as preserving law and order at Cricket Matches, Boxing Matches and other forms of sport held at entertainment centres in this Island;

AND WHEREAS such members as are detailed remain on duty - as in the case of Cricket Matches - for periods extending over eight hours, and in some other cases for long unbroken tours;

AND WHEREAS Writ Servers and other Units are amongst those so detailed, and yet have to perform their regular duties immediately following this extended tour of duty at Kensington Oval or elsewhere;

BE IT RESOLVED that whilst giving wholehearted support for the furtherance of sport and its being played and enjoyed according to the rules applicable thereto, this House feels deeply concerned and views with disgust the fact that as happened at Kensington Oval during the month of January this year such members of the Royal Barbados Police Force as were detailed for duty there received a mere meal of food for the extra services they rendered."

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Lions Club.

I must apologise to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House for this re-introduction, because on the first occasion when the Bill was introduced, all of the Regulations re advertisement had not been complied with. That has now been done.

12.25 p.m.

QUESTIONS

NON-BARBADIANS EMPLOYED IN BARBADOS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. How many non-Barbadians arrived in this Island by yacht in each year 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967?

2. How many such persons have remained and taken up residence in the Island after the departure of the yacht by which they came?

3. How many of those remaining have since been granted permanent residence?

4. How many have taken up employment in this Island?

5. What is the occupation of each such person who has taken up employment?

6. Are any of the jobs such persons engage in beyond the capacity or ability of Barbadians to perform?

7. Were work permits or any form of permission given by the Ministry of Home Affairs to those who took up employment here?

8. If the answer to No. 6 is in the negative, will the Minister state the circumstances which did influence the issuing of a work permit in each case?

9. How many, among those allowed to work here, are employed by Government?

DIGGING UP OF THE HIGHWAY

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. What policy, if any, has the Government or his Ministry in respect of the digging up of sections of the highway to enable Public Utility Companies and the Waterworks Department to lay pipes, cables and the like?

2. Will the Minister recommend to the Government the establishment of a policy, to be adhered to in all cases, of all works of this nature being conducted at the same time?

3. As a means of securing this end will the Government obtain from its own Public Works Department and from Public Utility Companies an estimate of foreseeable and projected repair and extension works for a five year period, before allowing any further promiscuous digging up of the highway?

4. Does the Minister agree that this policy will save much inconvenience and passed-on expense to the taxpayer?

EMPLOYMENT OF STAFF AT SCHOOL MEALS CENTRE

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

1. What is the system of selecting staff for employment at the School Meals Centre under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education?

2. Is it a fact that the Minister of Education enjoys a "prerogative" of making recommendations of persons for consideration for such employment?

3. Has the Minister of Education or his immediate predecessor ever made specific recommendations for the employment of persons in the School Meals Service?

4. Will the Government take steps in future to stop or prevent such Ministerial recommendations as referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above so as to avoid the accusation of political favour in the dispensation of the taxpayers' money?

IMPORTATION OF GOODS FROM COUNTRIES FORBIDDEN

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member has a question which refers to the importation of goods from countries forbidden.

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

Now that Barbados is Independent, does the Minister consider that there is any justification in continuing to forbid the importation of any goods from the list of countries set out in the first Schedule to the Exports and Imports (Open Import License Order) 1962?

2. If the Minister considers such a restriction still to be necessary, will he state what is the justification for including Japan in a list of Communist countries and excluding Cuba, Yugoslavia and North Vietnam?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Lions Club be read the first time.

Mr. HOPPIN: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee and that there should be an instruction to the House, while in Committee of Supply, to deal only with the Resolution for $22,659.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear him.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry, Sir, and also the Resolution for $135,828 of which notice was given earlier. Perhaps it would be appropriate for me to amend my motion to read as follows:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that there be an instruction to the House, while in Committee, to deal with the Resolution for $135,828 of which notice was given earlier. With respect to the other Resolution, when we are in Committee, I might be in a position to say something on that.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the first amendment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the Resolution for $22,659, which is already on the Order Paper.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am hearing all the time about $135,000 of which notice has just been given. Has this Resolution been circularised?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. member took his seat, I explained about that one and said that copies would be available to hon. members as shortly as possible. After we have finished the first one and the copies for the second one are not then available, we would have to report progress.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand it; we are going into Committee, we are going to deal with a Resolution for a $135,000, but while we are in Committee it may be circularised.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the purpose is to go into Committee to deal with a Resolution, and, if the time is ripe while in Committee, we may be able to deal with this Resolution; otherwise progress will be reported and it will remain until later.

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

12.35 p.m.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.40

A Resolution for the sum of $12,600 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to proceed with this Resolution today.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No.43

CUSTOMS

A Resolution for the sum of $22,659 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution asks for a Supplementary provision under Head 13 of the Estimates - Customs - Item 15 - Overtime and 17 - Incidentals. Hon. members will see from the explanatory notes that provision of $42,000 has already been made in respect of overtime, and that has proved to be inadequate. This provision of $11,000 is required for the financial year because of increased flights, an increase in the number of airlines operating in Barbados, an increase in the number of passengers arriving by bigger jets and an increase in the number of Customs Officers and Guards. That is as far as overtime is concerned. A smaller amount of $500 covers such items as incidentals, and, as is explained, that is required to supplement the original vote in respect of certain renovations and other expenditure at Seawell. I beg to move that Head 13 stand part of the Schedule. If hon. members wish additional information, I will try my best to supply it.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, while I do not oppose this Resolution, when it comes to the information which is supplied in the notes, I consider that it is very inadequate. We are happy to know that Seawell Airport is expanding, that there is an increase in the number of airlines operating in Barbados, that there is an increase in the number of passengers arriving by bigger jets, that there are increased flights and there must be an increase in the number of Officers and Guards. But what is the extent of this increase? Whereas so many planes arrive at Seawell Airport in the course of a year or half year or quarter year, now there is an increase. Coming here with these notes and informing the Committee that there is an increase in the number of planes arriving and therefore we must vote this $11,000, is treating this House with contempt. How can the Government expect to have an easy passage of Resolutions even when they are of merit, when the Minister quotes verbatim from these notes and then says: "I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass," that is seconded by another Minister, and that is all?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the hon. member will give way, it is not quite like that. I said that if hon. members wish additional information, I welcome the request and I will do my best to provide it. If the hon. member asks for further information and it is here, certainly I will give it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister ought to know, unless he thinks he is dealing with little children, that this information could not be enough and we will ask for more. If the Minister knows that he will be asked for more information, why does he not give it instead of being pressed for it? You know that we will ask for information and you withhold it. I appreciate the manner and mood of the Minister of Communications and Works this day week. He made a long explanatory dissertation. (Asides) But today the Hon. Minister is just telling us that there is an increase in the number of passengers which is consequent on the increase in the number of flights, and an increase in the number of Officers and Guards is consequent on the foregoing. The Hon. Minister has the information there in the file and still he wants me to waste time. Do you want to provoke somebody? I will wait because I think we deserve the information. The Hon. Minister anticipates that we will seek more information on this vote of $11,000. I am glad to see that this Airport is expanding. I see that there is a further amount of $500 to supplement the existing provision of $4,800, due to expenditure in respect of the main office and the cost of removing old ceilings and fans. This is, of course, departmental and routine, and we will not cavil over that. Note 2 (c) is consequent on Note 2 (a) and (b). Mr. Chairman, again I would not like on another occasion to have to press members of the Government for information which they anticipate is going to be sought. On more than one occasion in the past - I am not blaming the Ministers; I am blaming those whose job it is to assist the Ministers - Resolutions have been brought down here with Addenda which mean little or nothing to us. I do not blame any Minister for that, but for the Minister just to read from these notes is regarding us like little children. Just reading from these sparse notes is merely treating us like little children. I would not like to see any repetition of this sort of thing. It must be regarded that we are grownup men who are hard politicians and not babes and sucklings who do not know what the job is all about. This is not the sort of thing that we expect in the future.

12.45 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the entire question of the Airport and monies that will have to be spent on every aspect of this development is of course in a state of flux at the moment. Only last week we moved a supplementary Resolution to cover the increased cost of building and rebuilding, and it is on the cards that at some stage in the not distant future the Government may have to come to this House for a very large sum of money, indeed, for further rebuilding at Seawell because of the expectation that aircraft that can carry 400 passengers will be arriving there within three, four or five years. When that day comes, the question of $42,000 originally

provided for overtime at the Airport will become a joke, Mr. Chairman, because the entire passenger transit situation through Seawell will have been transformed.

But on this stark question, Mr. Chairman, before the Government lays out a great deal of money in providing the physical structure within which the Customs can work, I hope the Government is going to have a serious look at what is in fact required as the Customs and Excise service at an institution such as the Airport. Now, I am one of those, Mr. Chairman, who feel that too much time is spent at Customs at Seawell and that too much trouble is at the moment being experienced by passengers who pass through the Airport in their passage through the Customs. It is doubtful whether in Barbados, a tourist country seeking to attract a large number of tourists, that extensive Customs examination of tourists' baggage is necessary in any case.

Mr. Chairman, while I do not believe I can claim to be the most travelled man in this House, I have travelled to a lot of countries and I have travelled in the travel business. I have been a courier and I have carried 20 or 30 people through Customs, complete strangers to the countries where we were visiting. I have carried them through Customs with less trouble than it takes me to carry myself through the Customs at Seawell Airport. I have been to Russia and I have never had a Russian Customs Officer even look at my bags. In fact, it is the policy, for example, of a country which we talk of as being behind the Iron Curtain not to inspect the baggage, for Customs purposes, of people with a tourist visa. I think they very rightly assume that if you want to smuggle something in, you are not going to be so foolish as to smuggle it in a place where Customs Officers can readily find it, and this is true. Hon. members would find that in all countries in Europe which seek seriously to attract tourist business. If you travel by train you will see that the Customs Officer comes down the train, he looks up and he looks down, and that is the end of the matter - and these are also countries that have import duties.

In my days of travelling, Mr. Chairman, the only passenger who has ever been lost, so to speak, was taken off a ship at Brindisi. I remember the Italian Customs police and other policemen came up the gang plank and took him off. I think they called him an international smuggler or, may be, an international spy. All that had happened to the poor man in fact was that his passport was out of date and he happened to run across a rather keen member of the Italian Customs police. In other words, Mr. Chairman, tourist traffic is carried on in countries that have a lot of tourists without this over-insisting on the petty formalities of Customs that seem to be the practice at the Seawell Airport.

What I would like to see, Mr. Chairman, what I have been just doing, although I have just got the Auditor General's report this morning, is to have a cost analysis made of the return of revenue to the Customs at Seawell as against the wages paid out and compare that with the return of revenue with the Customs in Bridgetown as against the wages and salaries paid out. The amount of air freight for passengers passing through Seawell is slight compared with the volume that comes into the Bridgetown Harbour, and I think you will find that the Government is losing money on salaries and wages on Customs at Seawell Airport. Compare it to the real needs and real revenue that accrue therefrom.

How often, Mr. Chairman, is somebody's baggage inspected at Seawell and Customs Duty exacted! Compare it with the wages and salaries of Customs Officers and when you compare it with the convenience of passengers - because remember, Mr. Chairman, Seawell Airport is not at the moment geared for the size of aircraft that comes there - and if 150 or 200 passengers are passing through and each individual piece of baggage has to be declared, as it is at the moment, by a Customs officer who offers a personal interview to the incoming passenger - if it has to be done, with the best will in the world, these passengers are going to take a very long time to pass through the Customs. I observe that the Minister of Trade is shaking his head. The Minister, perhaps, forgets that he passes through the V.I.P. room and therefore he cannot be so familiar, and the last six years that his days of air travelling began, he could not have the opportunity to become familiar with what happens with ordinary passengers who pass through Seawell Airport. This applies to Hon. Ministers who believe that they are not unnecessarily hold-ups in the Customs at Seawell.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will mention another hold-up that you get. This is the physical job of locating your baggage through the Customs at Seawell. The bags come off the airplanes. They go in and there is no A.B.C.D. arrangement around the Customs examination area to indicate which passenger names begin with A so that an "A" passenger is sent up there. The baggage is jumbled together and you have to search for it. All this is what increases the work of Customs Officers and makes an increase in the number of Officers and Guards and an increase in the overtime pay. Mr. Chairman, of course we are making some effort to correct all that, and we hope that we will not have to complain too much about that in the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are also a number of small matters which I might suggest to the Government that might reduce the demands on the Customs at the Seawell Airport apart from giving tourists a little easier time because after all, Mr. Chairman, it is within our experience that even firearms can get through the Customs at Seawell Airport, no matter what number of Customs officers are there on duty. But apart from that, Sir, I would suggest that the Government look at the new feature at Seawell - the V.I.P. lounge.

12.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is within the knowledge of members on this side of the House that the V.I.P. room is much too extensively used, and each time you open the V.I.P. room, a Customs Officer has to be called

or should be called to inspect the baggage of whoever is passing through the V.I.P. room. Now, Mr. Chairman, what can we say about the time Customs Officers have to spend when we hear that the Project Manager of HARP demands the keys of the V.I.P. room from the caretaker, opens it and brings in his friends? That is the kind of thing that must of necessity increase the time of the Customs. A Customs Officer has to be called away to go and attend to Mr. Brathwaite's friends in the V.I.P. room, and then and only then can he go back to his ordinary duties. That is a case which we might perhaps think is very near to an unauthorised use of the V.I.P. room at Seawell, but there are other cases as well. Every day we see that persons pass through the V.I.P. room. Why? It seems as a rule that any titled person who arrives from England must be a V.I.P.

Mr. Chairman, M.Ps in Britain, if they pass through London Airport, used to complain because they were not sent through the V.I.P. room. These are members of the House of Commons in Britain. I remember Mr. Maurice Edelman making a complaint about it, and then on his next visit to London Airport going through the V.I.P. room, and then subsequent to that complaints being made about the fact that he had used it, because it was felt that a V.I.P. room is for the use of visiting foreign dignataries to be entertained and not to be disturbed and troubled by Customs and so on, and of course Her Majesty's Ministers and Her Majesty herself and other persons on official business for the British Government. But the V.I.P. room at Seawell is over-used, and it contributes to this problem which we are discussing here under Head 13 of this Resolution.

All these are little petty things perhaps, Mr. Chairman, but they add up. I see, Mr. Chairman, that there has been an increase in the number of Officers and Guards. Obviously there has to be an increase in the number of Customs Officers if there is an increase in the number of passengers, assuming that they had the necessary number in the first place; but we would like some evidence, if it has not been done, that it will be done in the future, that a real analysis will be made of the value to be gained by intense examination of passengers' baggage before any new and larger sums are voted for this particular Head. I know that the Leader of the House has some information which he is going to give to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that this information will give us some idea from which we can deduce the relationship between Customs costs at Seawell and Customs revenue, and I join with the hon. senior member for St. Peter in wondering why this information could not have been given to us at greater length at the start. At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I will give the Hon. Leader of the House the opportunity, which I believe he was in a position to have taken before I spoke, to give the information required.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come when the Leader of this House should desist from misleading.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a Standing Order which says that in a debate hon. members may not impute improper motives to other hon. members. The hon. member has said something about hoping the time will come when the Leader of this House should desist from misleading the House. This is contrary to the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Standing Order No. 26 (5) reads as follows:-

"

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

I will therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark immediately.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if I have been called upon to withdraw any remark I have used, I will withdraw it; but I never had the opportunity to tell the House what the Leader of the House was misleading it on. Nowhere on record can it be found that I said he was misleading the House. The moment I got to "misleading", he jumped to his feet, and you have called on me to withdraw. I withdraw. You, Sir, do not know what I have been asked to withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member is imputing improper motives to the Chair, I will have no other member proceed.

Mr. HINDS: I think that the Leader of the House needs one of those parliamentary courses that you had.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. member to proceed with the Resolution which is before him. I need no advice from any hon. member. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Resolution, if all hon. members who attempt to speak on it were to raise their voices equally as loud as yours, what do you think would be thought about this Hon. House in the end? Now, Mr. Chairman, it is time that whenever the Leader of this House introduces any Resolution or any measure that all that cannot be rebutted by this side should be told the House.

Now, Sir, under Head 13 - Customs - Item 15 - Overtime, we see that there is an amount of $11,000 being asked for. The note, if I read correctly, tells us that this amount is required (a) because of increased flights, (b) increase in the number of airlines operating in Barbados, (c) increase in the number of passengers arriving by bigger jets, and (d) increase in the number of Officers and Guards.
1.05 p.m.

Now these notes do not go on to tell us that the sum asked for to pay overtime is in truth and in fact not being used for paying overtime. Why do I say so? Customs Officers are requested to travel from Bridgetown to Seawell. They use their own motorcars, but, when they travel from Bridgetown to Seawell and back, they are not paid a dime for travelling. Some of this money is to pay for that.

These Officers are not paid travelling allowance at all; but whenever they travel, their overtime is so computed that two additional hours are added to their overtime to make up for the travelling they have done from Bridgetown to Seawell and back to Bridgetown. This is rank dishonesty on the part of somebody. I want to say that the Customs Officers who are called upon to do this travelling and then given two hours overtime are not at all satisfied with it. How can they be satisfied? If these Officers were paid regular travelling allowance rates, they would not have to pay income tax on the amount they get for travelling; but, when it is added to their overtime, they get it in one hand and the Income Tax Officer takes it out of the other hand. These Officers are definitely not satisfied about this state of affairs. These notes tell us absolutely nothing about that.

We now find that travelling allowance is called "alias overtime". That is not fair. It is not fair. either to this Hon. House or to the Officers concerned. These Officers are dissatisfied with several more things which you will hear of later. You will see that there is a definite need for Customs requirements and personnel both at Seawell and in Bridgetown to be gone into. This matter calls for a thorough examination.

We have absolutely nothing against the employment of additional Porters, Officers, or Guards, but, as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has already pointed out, we find that there is too much overlapping. One week you are coming here to ask for money to spend at Seawell Airport, and the following week for more money to spend there, and that is just not good enough. We should have this matter thoroughly investigated. This side of the House should be approached with a view to examining the requirements of the Customs Department both at Seawell and in Bridgetown, and we would then be in a better position to arrive at a decision.

Let us look at things. These Customs Officers have further grievances. At Seawell and at the Bridgetown Port it so happens that as late as last November a French boat came to bunker at the Bridgetown Port. That boat anchored outside about four o'clock in the evening, and it never got alongside of the wharf until 6.20 next morning. The Captain was so disgusted that he said it would be the last time he would call at this Port for bunkering. This occasion was the second on which his ship had been held up for long and undue hours.

We have had worse than that. The Customs at Seawell and at Bridgetown need looking into. A Banana boat was anchored outside the same day at one o'clock and it was unable to get alongside the wharf until 4.30 that day. On that occasion they said the gangs were off. Can you imagine the Customs being subjected to such treatment by labour gangs? Some of the Trade Union Secretaries would make excellent workers in these gangs. They would do better work. The Customs are being subjected to this. This work involves Customs Officers.

A ship comes here at one o'clock in the day, and it cannot get alongside the wharf until 4.30 p.m. The moment the ship comes alongside the wharf at four o'clock, overtime begins for these Customs Officers. We had a worst case. After this ship came alongside the wharf at 4.30 p.m., and started taking water, at eight o'clock the Harbour Master came and stopped the gangs from working. He said that there would be no more overtime. The ship was taking water; the ship was alongside the wharf at 4.30 p.m., and at eight o'clock all work was stopped.
1.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, we mean to see to it that this House is given information that is the truth. We mean to see to it that these Customs Officers are not called upon to travel in their own motor vehicles and then not be compensated for it as all other Officers who receive their travelling allowance. They ought to be given a travelling allowance and not be given an overtime allowance of two hours in lieu of travelling allowance, because as I have said, they receive it in one hand and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue takes it out with the other. I am sure that it is the duty of the Minister concerned to weigh all of these matters and examine them as closely and as carefully as is reasonably possible because, make no mistake about it, if the Customs Officers are dissatisfied, the Government can lose revenue. Anything can happen when you have dissatisfied staff. I am not suggesting that the Custom Officers would, in any way, be found to be slack; I know that they will perform their duties to the best of their abilities to the end, but the end must come some day. It is now that it has been drawn to the Government's attention - we know on this side very well, that there are many Officers in the Customs and other Departments of Government who have grievances; they are working under conditions that do not become their offices; they would be glad to draw it to the attention of their Ministers or their Permanent Secretaries, but some of these gentlemen are so haughty that they cannot be approached. That is the trouble. Since the Government is now well aware - for instance, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas drew attention to a case where a Project Manager from HARP demanded the keys of the V.I.P. lounge at Seawell and carried his friends in there, taking up the time of Customs Officers; in other words, he was employing a Custom's Officer for himself and his friends. You must imagine that these are people like the Prime Minister who leave Barbados and go to Canada to Bull. They go to Dr. Jerry Bull in Canada and come back here with their friends. How are we to know when the keys are demanded and these people go into the V.I.P. lounge? this is not good. The Government has been told enough and it is for them to act at this stage.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter asked some questions or rather, if I understand him, complained that not enough information was given in my original statement to the Committee on this Resolution. I do not think I need to defend my position in this respect. Very often a Resolution comes before the House and both sides of the House, including the Ministers themselves, feel that the explanatory notes accompanying it may not always be as good as we desire.

and it is only fair to a Minister in these circumstances to say that these are the facts accompanying the matter, and if hon. members wish additional information it is here awaiting them. That is quite in order, but it does not mean that a Minister refuses to give the House information or has to be pressed or pushed into so doing. The additional information is not at variance with the original, and it is this; first, with respect to the increased flights by merely all airlines at the Airport. I think that hon. members should know that all flights from the United States and the United Kingdom are scheduled to arrive at Seawell mostly out of official hours, that is to say, after 4 o'clock p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and after noon on Saturdays. Immigrant flights also arrive occasionally very late at night and the examination of baggage runs into the very early hours of the morning. Apart from that, there is also the Bridgetown Port. Every year there is a corresponding increase of tourist ships calling at the Port, and some of them leave after 11 o'clock at night and this necessitates the services of an Officer, or, in the case of more ships, officers to deal with these tourist ships. It is not true to contend, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter contends, that this is just payment of a travelling allowance under another guise. That is just not true. There is a regular Customs Staff, as hon. members will know, attached to the Airport and the Bridgetown Port, and this Customs Staff is on duty and on call, not only at normal hours but during other times as well. The overtime vote for the current financial year was $42,000 and in the week ending on the 13th December, 1967, there was a balance of nearly $6,000.

1.25 p.m.

At the week ending the 13th December, 1967, there was a balance of nearly $6,000, but between December and March there are three months or approximately 14 weeks to the end of the financial year, and at an average weekly pay sheet of $1,100 for overtime, the amount of $16,500 would be needed. When the balance is deducted, an amount of $10,700, or approximately $11,000, is required.

With respect to Incidentals, hon. members will recall that there has been a removal of the main office of the Customs at Careenage House. Extra labour had to be engaged to clean up and pack away rubbage for disposal. Then there is an increase in the wages of Cleaning Women to the office because there are now two offices to be cleaned, and these offices are bigger.

These are urgent supplementary requirements. Naturally, if you wish to take on Government on every simple Resolution, you can do it; but there is nothing on the face of this Resolution out of which the Government can be accused of hiding information or covering up expended votes for specific purposes under another vote. It is simply not so. This is not for other than what is required, and that is a supplementary vote for overtime.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I would like to ask the Minister if, when he referred to tourist ships, he meant airplanes or sea-going vessels because in his reply to the query which I asked regarding the inefficiency - I made my complaint regarding (A) the increase in the number of increased flights, (B) the increase in the number of airlines appearing in Barbados; the Minister replying had not even the courtesy to mention whether these were additional airlines appearing since any date, and subsequently or whether there is an increase in the number as implied here appearing in Barbados.

I have heard the Minister mention tourist ships. Was he referring to sea-going vessels or tourist air-going ships because I see nothing in this Resolution which comes under Customs and Excise. When I look at the notes, I see the word "flights" and the word "airlines". The Minister has not told this Committee how many increasd flights there have been since any date, or how many international airlines have been appearing in Barbados since any date. Mr. Chairman, if you have heard him, I have not - I am sure you have not. Then he gets up here and for the sake of contending, alleges that we are just waiting for a complaint. That is not fair to us.

If you read the short notes, you will see that they are sparse notes and that you simply, in a general way, say that you want an additional sum of money and that you want that money guaranteed by this Committee because there has been an increase to the number of airlines operating in Barbados. You have not even mentioned one. Then you mentioned tourist ships. Do you mean sea-going ships that bring tourists or do you mean airplanes that bring tourists?

I think there is a muddle somewhere in this because may be some other hon. member said that things have been going amiss at the Harbour. I think the Minister has muddled this because at one time I was tempted to ask him to which member was he referring, but I did not interrupt him.

It is not good enough - it is not even fair - to say that we are making complaints for the sake of making complaints. Anyone who reads these notes would quite reasonably say that they are unduly sparse, and the Minister has just repeated that there is an increase in the number of airplanes. That is all he said. He has not given the name of one additional airline appearing in Barbados since the given date, and does he mean to tell me that I must be satisfied and say that he is really courteous and has amply replied as far as what was raised by me? It is void of reason.

He must not be thinking that we get up here and just say things just for the sake of making an argument or for the fun of it. I have no time to waste personally. The Minister is provoking me to ask questions and provoking me again to reply to him because he has not yet mentioned whether the particular additional airlines have been increased by so many since a given date. He has not done so. He may have said tourist ships. I do not think that he has come down here to tell us of tourist ships. Some hon. member mentioned something of delay in a ship finding its berth and that sort of thing, but I did not have any-

thing to say about that. I do not get into matters which I know nothing about. I must know something of something to get into it, and when I am seeking information, I am seeking information, and there is so much information that has not yet been given, because when you say there is an increase in the number of flights, when you cannot say there has been an increase in the number of airplanes appearing in Barbados and you make no mention whether the increase is an increase of one, you have not given the information which I have been seeking. If you think so, you are fooling yourself.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of amusement to the hon. member who has just sat down. I did not know that any Minister was under any obligations when he came into this House to say "Ladies and Gentlemen, hon. members, Flight 200 arrived from New York, Kennedy International Airport, at 9.25 last night; that was one increase over the week before; and Flight 420 arrived from Miami, Kingston, San Juan, Coolige; Antigua at 10.25 this morning." If the hon. senior member for St. Peter had looked at the Barbados Estimates, the dim light of revelation should flash upon his concience because he would see that the revenue from Seawell International Airport is derived chiefly from landing fees, telephones charges, supply of electric current to consumers, concessions, and rentals.

In the current Estimates for this year alone, the total revenue from Seawell International Airport was $1,089,462 or $1,090,000 as you care to describe it. Now, out of that $1,000,000 were landing fees. By a process of simple arithmetic, if he goes over to the 1964-65 esimates, he will see that only $420,000 is derived from landing fees and now in the short space of three years, we have more than doubled the landing fees which we are receiving at Seawell Airport.

That can only mean one of two things. It can mean that we have doubled the landing fees which is nonsensical because hon. members who have been in here, at least from 1961 when this Government took office, would know that there has been one increase in landing fees of an infinitesimal amount - it has not even gone up by 25 percent; so it means that more aircraft are landing. Just by a process of simple deduction he can see that in the Estimates.

But what I want to tell the hon. member is this. Taking his rate alone, I budget for an increase in the annual growth rate at the airport of 25 per cent both in frequency of flights and so on. I am going to give him a lesson in aeronautics and Civil Aviation. 1.35 p.m.

I estimated a 23% increase. The increase this year which the hon. member could not possibly know, and therefore I forgive him for his innocence of these statistics, is 50%. Now do I have to give him the flight numbers of the aircraft if I can produce evidence to show him that instead of getting $1 million, we are going to get well over $1,300,000 in revenue from landing fees at Seawell Airport? And then he says we have not named one flight that arrived! Last year Caribair did not fly into Barbados; LAV did not fly into Barbados. Quite apart from that, Pan American Airways during the winter season have stepped up their frequencies - that is the number of weekly flights coming into Barbados - from somewhere just over ten or eleven to 23. These figures are comparative because I have not checked the actual number of flights that arrived last week, because I did not think it would be necessary in the face of the Estimates which show our growth rate.

Let us go back pre - 1961 and find out what the revenue was. It was appalling because we were getting less than $300,000 before 1961 from Seawell, and it is now $1 million more in revenue. It is all right to say that Government expenditure has increased, but this is one of the Departments from which we derive considerable revenue, and the hon. member is getting up asking what time did such-and-such a flight arrive, and that we did not produce any evidence that an additional aircraft had come in. All the hon. member has to do is to go up there on a Saturday afternoon between 4 o'clock and 10 o'clock, and try to get a coke from somewhere other than a coke machine on a Sunday morning between 8 a.m. and 1.30 p.m., and he would find out if the traffic has increased. I did not say "gin", I said "coke".

The position in Barbados is that right now we cannot develop the Airport at Seawell fast enough to accommodate the traffic which is coming in as a result of the efforts of the Government and the Barbados Tourist Board. Why should a Government which has increased the revenue of this Island from $26 million in 1961 to over $53 million in 1967-68 be apologetic about what it has done for the economy of this Island, and put up with this carping nonsense we have to put up with? It is difficult to walk down Bridgetown today, and except from some of the more benighted parts of this country which are not represented by members on this side, expect to find a single person in Bridgetown barefooted; and any time you see any barefooted and with big saddle patches and square holes in their pants, you can be sure that they are supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. I am going to give you chapter and verse. We come in here with a Resolution which concerns the Customs. This is not a Civil Aviation Head. The Minister has explained to me and, as I understood it from the member who is asking the question, that this is a Customs factor which we are discussing. We are not discussing the Airport at Seawell. In other words, we do not have a Department of Customs at the Airport, a Department of Customs at the Bridgetown Port and another Department of Customs at the Careenage. All of the Customs Officers and the Customs Guards are under the jurisdiction of the Comptroller of Customs. They are subject to his discipline and the discipline of the Public Service Commission, and not under the direct or indirect supervision of the Director of Civil Aviation. If the Minister gets up then and says that it is due to the increase in the number of tourist ships, this is also so.

In 1961 less than sixty cruise ships called at Barbados; that is the highest number. In 1967 there

were 150, a 300 per cent increase. Why should we be ashamed of that? (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Who built the Harbour?) The hon. member has no right interfering. We on this side of the House, members who were here from 1951 onwards - and you can go and read my speech on the Budget in 1953 - tried to impress upon the Government that it was essential to build a harbour. They waited until the cost had risen four times, started it in 1958, and I had to find the money to pay for it. So you built it and I paid for it. It is just as if you go and buy a motor car and I pay for it. What is there to be proud of in paying four times the price you should have paid? Absolutely nothing. You ought to be ashamed! They think that the only thing in politics is to abuse people and abuse people's family and slander and malign; but I am giving chapter and verse of what has been happening to the economy of this Island. They have elevated the unrighteous. They have set new standards with the things and the rogues and the villains, in the people our school children have to look up to and say "These are our representatives"; and they come in here when we have brought in $1,300,000 in revenue at the Airport and ask what plane landed day before yesterday. If the hon. senior member for St. Peter cannot be convinced of those figures, there is nothing in God's creation other than the just executioner's axe which will execute him for all the crimes that have been committed in this country.

Now the hon. member talks about ships. Of course it is for ships as well, Mr. Chairman, because the Customs are under the administration of the Comptroller, and he can say to this Customs Officer "Go to Seawell" and he goeth, and he can say to the other "Go to Bridgetown Port" and he will have to go. It is as simple as that; and the overtime rates for ships other than cruise ships, ships which are unloading after normal working hours, are fixed after consultation with the Chamber of Commerce, and are directly recoverable from the people who wish to offload their ships after normal working hours. As far as Seawell International Airport is concerned and you are engaged on scheduled flights, we charge you so much per thousand pounds depending upon the weight of the aircraft. We charge no landing fee for aircraft under 6,000 pounds; it is not really worthwhile collecting; but when you get something weighing 100,000 or 200,000 pounds - I cannot do a quick calculation because there is more than one equation involved - there is more than one rate depending on the overall gross weight of the aircraft which would apply to the same aircraft landing; so I am not trying to be a computer, but a single landing for an aircraft can cost $350. So how else could you get - since the age of the jumbo jets is not yet upon us, and we are using the same type of equipment by all the airlines coming into Seawell Airport and there has been no radical metamorphosis in the configuration - an increase in revenue unless you get an increase in the number of aircraft landing or the number of times that the same aircraft lands?

1.45 p.m.

Therefore this imposes a greater work-load, and this work-load is going to increase. We want it to increase, because as it increases the people will work for more money, more revenue comes into the Island, and we will get more money to spend upon all the social services and all the other things that the Government is called upon to provide from time to time.

If hon. members, despite the historical shortcomings, would only regard the people's business as if they were running a business in which they were directors and came around to be constructive, to ask questions to satisfy themselves that everything is all right; if they approached the people's business from that angle, then democracy in Barbados could never be threatened. But we are very, very concerned about the level to which the political life of this country has sunk. We are very, very much concerned about it, and it is regrettable that people, who now should be tendering advice and trying to uplift some of their more unfortunate colleagues, are only concerned in manipulating those colleagues so that the country could be brought down to destruction.

I want to say this: we have a country; I do not have any other country; I am not really particularly concerned about public offices or anything like that, but I do not want to see the younger generation of Barbados brought up in the kind of atmosphere that they want to engender in this country of ours, because I do not have any other country. A lot of them have other countries and other affiliations, but I have one.

This is how we feel on this side of the Table: we have a country and, as citizens, we pay taxes. This is very important, you know. We make a contribution to the life of this country. We make it with all sincerity and to the utmost of our ability. It is unfortunate that, when Barbados should be setting an example to the rest of the world, we have the kind of thuggery going on that is going on in this country today. I say that with all due seriousness. Past Grand Masters at defamation and trying to tear down their own country and their fellow citizens in the eyes of the outside world! That is all that is happening. They cannot regard a parliamentary institution as a place where - as a citizen in the old days of Greece and Rome and even in some countries today - Scandinivian countries and maybe in some other parts of the Commonwealth - people come in to make a genuine contribution to try and see how they can push forward their more unfortunate fellowmen to greater and greater heights of inspiration. We are not having that in Barbados today, but I warn them. I am warning them.

If I can leave this country and go outside to defend this country, I can stay right here and defend this country, too. If I can defend somebody else's country for them and for the ones who stayed behind, then I can stay right here and defend the people of goodwill in this country against all attacks, whether those attacks came from within or without. They are not going to destroy this country as easily as they would like to feel they could do it. That is the warning which I want to give.

We do not believe in the politics of conflagration.. For some of their past members, "No more the blazing cane shall burn," speaking specifically of a former member for St. George. For him, "No more the blazing cane shall burn". For the others I want to tell them, "No more the blazing cane shall burn." We are not going to allow that kind of thing to destroy the country and the future of the young people that we have to protect.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Prime Minister has got up to lecture to us, to chastise us, and to warn us, and in doing so he incidentally made some reference to my complaint that the Minister who took charge of the Resolution did not give the Committee sufficient information. The Prime Minister forgets that this is a Supplementary Resolution, and he refers to the Estimates of 1967-68. This Resolution is supplementary to that; therefore I am in my right senses when I requested to be told the additional number of airlines operating in Barbados since we passed the 1967-68 Estimates.

I do not get up and talk nonsense like whom we have to call the Hon. Prime Minister. He cannot get through anything I can say in here. I understand we are approaching the New Moon. I pause. Now, I will proceed. The Hon. Prime Minister told me - I rather wondered - if I wanted to know how many flights and their flight numbers - how many flights concern me, yes; but not the numbers. Now, the Prime Minister would do well to be a schoolmaster in a school of mentally retarded children, and he would have a good audience, but not in the House of Assembly when in Committee of Supply we are dealing with a Resolution to supplement the 1967-68 Estimates. Listen to this economist; he goes back to 1961. He comes in here on January, 30, 1968, with something to supplement the 1967-68 Estimates, and he goes back to 1961 to tell me where he brought this country from! What sort of argument is that? Where does he think he is? We are not at Culloden Farm now, or at Black Rock - question mark.

I understand that the New Moon is somewhere around. All this stock in trade about those who supported us and, Mr. Chairman, you allowed him to say who supported us on this side are the unfortunate men in Barbados who wear patched trousers and things of that sort. Maybe they support people like me, people like us on this side, but, maybe, those gentlemen who are well dressed maybe at this hour parading Broad Street with detectives looking for them, who rob and steal at night - maybe, they support the Hon. Prime Minister. He said absolutely nothing worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, you have a copy of this Resolution in your hands; you see the notes. The sum of $42,000 provided under this item has proved inadequate, and an additional amount of $11,000 is required in this financial year owing to the following factors -

(a) Increased flights.....

Since 1961? Since 1964, or since we passed the Estimates for 1967-68? In your considered judgment, Mr. Chairman, what do you think he meant? Certainly what did the hon. member think he could expatiate on ? He thought he was entertaining us, but he made himself look absolutely ridiculous, and when it is read it will appear more so.

Again, Mr. Chairman, what he had to say about if I want to see how busy the airport is, I should come to Seawell on a Sunday morning and get a Coke. That is the kind of thing that I have to expect from the Hon. Prime Minister. I have lived with him in this House of Assembly long enough to know exactly what to expect from him and nothing higher. He just cannot help it; he will never ever be able to help it; he is built of that stuff, and he is regarded as one who is absolutely incurable from what he mentally suffers.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation. I have not said that the hon. member got drunk at the Airport on Sunday mornings. I said that if the hon. member wants to see how easy it is, he can get up there and even try to get a coke on Sunday mornings at certain times. Why should he take exception to that, unless he thought I was saying that he was getting drunk? I did not know that he could get drunk on coke. *(Asides)* I said "not gin" - and you know that too, Sir.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, can't you stop this low, low type of speech? (Mr. HUSBANDS: He cannot help it, he was born so.) You have just ruled about imputing improper motives, and all that. What could be lower than that remark by the Hon. Prime Minister? What could be lower than that? You do not have to wait until somebody objects to something; it is the duty of the Chair to stop offensive remarks.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, were you addressing the Committee, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I appreciate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I thank him for his intervention. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is an old member who has some respect for law, order and dignity and he would try to intervene. Honestly, I did not even hear what he said, if he made any reference to drunkenness or gin. His character is so well delineated in and it cannot be anything complimentary or decent or respectable.

At this stage, it now being after 2 p.m. of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, automatically this sitting is suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is resumed, I should like to draw to your attention a gross breach of privilege. I did not witness it and therefore I am asking permis-

sion to defer any comments I may have to make until other hon. members have spoken. I thought it was elementary that members of the House claim at the beginning of every session, in this case from the Governor-General, the four privileges which the House of Commons and we ourselves have had for centuries. I understand that the Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs brought a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force - a Police Sergeant - only to commit a breach of the peace by assaulting, as apparently he was expected to do, or restraining an hon. member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seeking to give notice of a motion under Standing Order 68?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: No, Sir. I am bringing to Your Honour's attention an exceptional happening having arisen. It is not necessary to give notice. I am asking Your Honour to say that this is a matter of the utmost urgent public importance and to permit hon. members to fill out what I am going to say because, I repeat, I did not see it all. I only saw the presence of the Police Sargeant and where my colleague on my left was sitting, but I am asking Your Honour to say, from what I have said, that this is a matter not only of public urgent importance, but it is a great breach of privilege. The policeman would have had no defence in an action of false imprisonment if he had even stood in front of my colleague, apart from touching him. I think that every law student - I almost said every school boy - knows that. I ask Your Honour to say that this is a matter of urgent public importance because it is a breach of privilege of members of the House who cannot be restrained even in coming to this House and going from this House, let alone a show of force in the person of the Police Sergeant.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, in support of the contention raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, we will have to say that this matter arose immediately, although the House was not in session. I do not know if the sitting of the House was suspended or adjourned. (A MEMBER: The sitting was suspended.) Therefore, Mr. Speaker was in complete charge of the affairs at that time. I am one who witnessed a part of the incident and your attention was drawn to this incident.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. Your Honour has drawn my attention to Standing Order 68. Probably Your Honour will rule that I should have made a motion to the effect that a breach of privilege has taken place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may mention to the hon. member that in connection with a matter of an alleged breach of privilege, Standing Order 68 reads as follows:-

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

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

It is my ruling that to raise a question of privilege under Standing Order 68, there must be a motion. In respect of Standing Order 16 - Adjournment - a definite matter of public importance:

(1) Any member other than a Minister may at the time appointed under Standing Order No. 8, - Order of Business". That time appointed has long since passed and in any event (2) of 16 lays it down that before the commencement of the sitting, the matter for discussion shall be reduced to writing and handed to the Speaker. So 16 is with respect to Urgent Public Business.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: By 68 (1) it is clear that it is humanly impossible to do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making a motion concerning the privileges of the House? And will he hand in a copy to the Clerk of the House?

Mr. HUSBANDS: No, Sir. It happened during this sitting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: My motion is.....

"That this House takes notice of a breach of privilege committed in these precincts and calls on His Honour the Speaker to take appropriate action to preserve the privileges and the dignity of the House."

As Your Honour is aware, May's states the procedure. You can bring the Sergeant of Police to the Bar of the House if he has admitted a breach of privilege. I do not want to make my motion too long.....

(A VOICE: Why?)

"And that the Prime Minister is causing....."

I do not know if the Clerk is taking it down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member at dictation speed state the terms of the motion?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: 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 Honourable 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.

As I have said, I merely moved the motion and ask Your Honour - if I should use the word - "permission" to note that I am just not making a speech on the motion because I know very little about it and I reserve the right to speak after other hon. members have spoken.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am seconding the motion, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister has risen and stated "on a point of order."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member who just sat down said that he is making a motion and he also said "he knows very little about it." Hence, the inflammatory language that he used as his boast that he reserves the right to speak on the motion, Sir, at a later stage after he has heard the evidence. In other words, he delivers a verdict, hears the evidence after and sums up after he has had the evidence and heard the verdict.

(VOICES: Order; order.)

Now, Sir, the point which I am making on a point of order is that he has just made a motion and he spoke on that motion. He can only speak again in reply. The hon. member said that he wanted to speak on the motion. He cannot now speak on the motion. That is the point I am making.

(A VOICE: Order.)

That is the point I am making. That is strictly on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister has made the point of order, but really I was not concerned about what was said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in the sense that I thought he was proposing to make three speeches. He has made his motion and he is entitled on making a motion to speak on it and of course, he has the right of final reply - not three speeches, not a speech stating the motion, another speech amplifying it and a third speech outlining it. I think it is perfectly clear.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion and to say thereon that I witnessed part of the gross misbehaviour, gross misconduct, flagrant disregard for parliamentary institutions and for the rights of Parliament disapproved openly within the precincts of the House this afternoon by the Hon. Prime Minister, the hon. senior member for St. John.

2.45 p.m.

Within my almost twenty years of being a member of Parliament, I have never seen any member demean himself in such a manner as would call forth the greatest and harshest judgment in a most unfavourable sense. This afternoon, Sir, there occurred within the prcints of this House at lunch time an incident unheard of, I believe, in the history of parliamentary institutions, in that we of the Opposition on approaching the lunchroom were told - and observed what turned out to be true - that the Government members intended to dine not in their usual place as has been the custom of this Place for long over 100 years; they intended to dine and had made arrangements for so doing in the Senate Chamber. (A VOICE: Who?) Government members. I do not know if His Honour the President was privy to that or if they, led by the Prime Minister, have trespassed within the precincts of the Hon. Senate Chamber. That is not a concern of mine immediately; but the caterer was extremely busy taking off items of lunch to them of the Government membership in the precincts of the Senate. It was really a disgusting affair, ungentlemanly, something so brash, something so contemptible, that you, Mr. Speaker, took your accustomed place in the dining room of the House of Assembly. Members of the Opposition took their seats for lunch in their accustomed place in the dining room of the House of Assembly. The caterer got very busy taking off items. One member of the House saw to it that we too of the Opposition should get some lunch. Information, I believe - so it appeared - reached the Prime Minister. He came at once to the entrance door to the lunch room, called on the services of a Police Sergeant - and of course you, Your Honour - and he said that a member of the House had debarred the caterer's passage and was restricting him of his liberty against his will, and asked the Police Sergeant to enter the lunch room.

Mr. Speaker, you were within easy call and easy reach because the Hon. Prime Minister was addressing his remarks to you. I interposed and I told the Police Sergeant not to enter this Chamber unless he had a warrant of arrest. I turned then to the Prime Minister and told him that he had better get away from there: otherwise he would find himself in trouble, because he would be usurping the powers of Mr. Speaker who was present and in his place in the Lunch Room. If that is not a breach of privilege, for a member of Parliament other than Mr. Speaker to call on a Policeman to enter the precincts of the Barbados House of Assembly and use even a threatening word to a member of this Parliament, I do not know what is one. I would like to turn the shoe on the other foot and see how the Prime Minister would react. Among other things I told him was "Beware of the moon". That bothered him a great deal. There is no pale moon today or tonight.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather serious occasion. I have never been witness to one like it within my years in this Place, and I do not think the oldest member present who is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition can remember an incident similar to this one. Your Honour is called upon to be the final judge on this occasion. This incident was witnessed by many members of the House. Your Honour would have laughed to see how urgently and how business-like

an Hon. Minister despatched certain dishes of lunch viands to the Senate. Anyway, that is the lighter side of the affair; but in more serious vein, if hon. members are going to be subjected to this sort of behaviour when an Hon. Prime Minister can call on a Sergeant of Police and invite him to enter into a room within the precincts of this House to use even a threatening word, parliamentary democracy is at stake. Mr. Speaker, many other members present in this Chamber witnessed what I have just related. Your Honour witnessed it.
2.55 p.m.

Your Honour was called upon, but that is not inviting you to give a biased judgment. You saw what took place, but we intend to mark this occasion, and we intend to let this occasion pass with a very, very serious note of action, because if this can be repeated, trouble is in the offing. Hon. members must learn to maintain their balance, no matter in what position they find themselves. If the Opposition feel inclined that they should not eat or drink in the same room - if the Government feel they should not eat or drink in the same room as the Opposition, with that we have absolutely no quarrel. We would regard it as being undignified and ungentlemanly, of course, but that is a personal opinion only. But when it comes to invoking the assistance of a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force and bringing him within the precincts of this Honourable and ancient Chamber - no; take him to Culloden Farm or down Black Rock. Question mark against "Black Rock". Who knows understands, and who knows dare not look me in the face now. He dares not look me in the face now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this ancient and honourable Assembly, one of the oldest within the British Commonwealth of Nations, must be reminded that it must uphold its ancient prestige. We are the inheritors of many and valuable privileges and institutions, and what we have come by without bloodshed we will maintain without bloodshed, trusting that those whom we have invested with honour will uphold justice and right; trusting to the impartiality of judges, trusting to the impartiality of all mediators, and all who find themselves honourably placed in a position to dispense justice and, of course, in this Place, too.

Mr. Speaker, when the privilege of this House is invoked, we do not apologise for having it fully hammered out at length, and we take our time in emphasizing the gravity of the situation. We have to follow very minutely and very assiduously, very correctly, the correct procedures involved in dealing with a matter of this sort. We put our case dispassionately and unmoved - no bias, the bare, bald facts. This day the Hon. Prime Minister, the senior member for St. John, did - during the lunch interval when the House was in session, the Mace being in its present place and the Speaker in charge of proceedings - call on the services of a sergeant of the Royal Barbados Police Force, drawing to Your Honour's attention and drawing to the policeman's attention, allegedly - that means as he stated, not necessarily rightly, not necessarily correctly - that a member of this House was restraining the liberty of the caterer. When the Hon. Prime Minister can do that, we say no; not in here.

He can withdraw, at any time, the members of his Party and have them take lunch wherever he likes. Again, I say it is unparliamentary, ungentlemanly, discourteous and, of course, an unprecedented manner which he can understand what it is worth. He can understand its worthiness. He, the Hon. Prime Minister, can and does. We on this side cannot and do not, but we make no protestation there. We come straight to what is our political and parliamentary significance; a breach of the privileges of this ancient and honourable Chamber which arose suddenly and was forthwith brought to the attention of Your Honour presiding in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the incident, but I do hope that there will never be ever again in the history of this or any other Parliament such a despicable act even to be reflected upon by any hon. member - disgusted, unwarranted, uncalled for, unmanerly, outrageous, unparliamentary, detestable and, of course, mad.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just say this: I have been giving the matter my consideration in respect of whether the motion, of which I am yet awaiting a copy, directly concerns the privileges of the House, because thereby it is entitled to and shall take precedence of all other public business. I have now been handed a copy. I would point out that the 17th Edition of May apropos of the raising of matters of privileges in the Commons, Page 377, states as follows:

"Speaker's discretion in permitting matter to be raised, - As a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the prearranged programme of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that there is a *prima facie* case that a breach of privilege has been committed: and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity."
3.05 p.m.

"If he is not so satisfied when the circumstances are first brought to his attention privately" - I want to draw to the attention of hon. members that such a matter should be brought to the attention privately of the Speaker - "he may inform the Member that he is not entitled to raise the matter as a question of privilege, or he may allow him to make a statement with a view to ascertaining whether or not a *prima facie* case can be made out. This latter course is also taken when for some reason a preliminary explanation has not been given to the Speaker. The right of making complaint of a breach of privilege is open to any member of the House, and even if an individual Member alone is affected, is not confined to that Member. The Speaker himself has informed the House of a breach of privilege committed against an Officer of the House."

In view of what has been said - the hon. mover of the motion merely moved the motion. It was se-

-cond. by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who drew the matter to the attention of the Chamber. It is my ruling that a prima facie case has been made out, and accordingly that the motion may be made.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. I think it is only fair to say that I was quite aware of the fact that I should speak to Your Honour in Private first, but before I got to Your Honour, I understood that Your Honour was in the Chair even although the Clerk of the House did not get in here yet. But I was quite well aware of the necessity of approaching Your Honour privately and I did tell you that, sitting at the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in duty bound, unless Mr. Deputy Speaker has undertaken to deputise for me, to be back here, according to the Standing Orders, at 2.30 p.m. of the clock, with or without the Clerk.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and ashamed at the behaviour of the Hon. Prime Minister this afternoon. Sir, what I am going to say here and now - I am speaking for Lloyd Smith as a member of this Hon. Chamber and nobody else. All the others have their mouths. I am speaking for myself. I have been elected here in the same manner as the Prime Minister has been elected. I have the same authority and power and privilege in this Hon. House as the Prime Minister. I want him to know that he does not have any more privilege or honour in here than I have. I want him to get that straight. I do not care how he may look at me, I do not care how he may want to treat me, I demand my respect from him as a representative of the people. I am going to give him my respect. I have no axe to grind with him, for him or anybody. I have received invitations to attend functions at Culloden Farm. I attended them. I have received invitations from the Prime Minister's Deputy to attend functions and I have done so; therefore I have nothing against him. I have nothing against him whatsoever. They do not look to me as if they have leprosy because if they had leprosy I would not have gone. If I have leprosy, they have a perfect right to take their exit out to the Senate Chamber to take their lunch.

Now, Sir, it is one of the worst things which has ever happened to this Hon. House. From the inception of this Barbados House of Assembly, nothing has ever happened so nasty as what has happened today. It could not be worse. The nastiest person could not have thought so low as to do such a thing this afternoon. I am ashamed of it; it is an insult to you, Sir, where the Leader is one that we have to look up to, one whom we expect to lead, and how is he leading? He wants to lead with a thousand-yard length rope, so that you cannot even see him if he has to turn a corner. 3.15 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I went out there, I saw the caterer busily taking the lunch outside the dining room. I asked him what is the meaning of it and yet there were members of this Hon. Chamber sitting there awaiting. I was informed that the Clerk of the House informed the caterer through the Prime Minister to take the lunch for his members elsewhere.

Now, Sir, before I go any further, I feel that that is an insult to you, trying to abuse your privilege because I cannot see for the life of me why the Clerk should be taking orders from the Prime Minister behind Your back, unknown to you, Sir, and telling the caterer what to do. I am saying that the Clerk is wrong. He also should be punished. He has sense; he went to school; he is a learned man. He knows when he is doing right or wrong and he should not allow any Prime Minister, any kind of Minister, to mislead him. He is paid by the taxpayers. No Prime Minister's money pays him because if one cent of the Prime Minister's money was to pay him, he would starve. I know that. He would not employ him, I am sure, even if it were in his place to employ him.

As regards your privilege, Sir, it is not fair to you. The Prime Minister should have taken up the matter with you; in fact, I do not know if he did. That is how I feel about the matter. I am being insulted; I, Lloyd Smith, am being insulted. I want the Prime Minister to know that he insulted me and the people in St. Joseph and the people in Barbados as a whole. I am being insulted.

The Rules are here to govern such behaviour. If the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees rules wrongly, we have to bow, and if he rules rightly, we have to bow. We have to respect the Chair, and the Prime Minister should be made to respect hon. members. I want hon. members of his Party to know that too.

The Prime Minister referred today to something about torn-up trousers, saddle patch and bare-foot. I know that he meant me too, and most of them over on the other side too. I want him to understand that. He may try to make them feel that they are ones of big, high top-notchers. He wants your support, he wants you to keep there so that the poorer classes would look up to him as the Almighty. That is all he wants you all for.

I tell you this. I am insulted this afternoon. I am hurt. It is I. I am nothing to do with one of those learned men. I would not get up here to defend the Leader of the Opposition nor the senior member for St. Thomas. They are the same lawyers as he, the Prime Minister. They went to the same Temple or, may be, to some Temple or the other. I went nowhere; I am speaking for myself. I am hurt, and if he came a little nearer where I was sitting outside there this afternoon behind the door, I would have tumbled him out; I would have.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to restrain himself.

Mr. SMITH: I cannot restrain myself; I am trying to represent my people; advantage is being taken of me this afternoon. I am hurt, Sir. By whom? If it were one of the other hon. members, I would not say

one word. (A VOICE: Why?) That is how I feel. I am here to represent the people of Barbados, and here it is how I am being treated over a little bit of food. A big Prime Minister playing the fool with food. Oh Lord have mercy! A little food! The Prime Minister is trying to deprive me of my rights. Here it is this afternoon and none of his members has told him anything; they should tell him not to do it. His members should have appealed to him if they had any sense of decency.

The Prime Minister has insulted them too. But no! You have one big crapeau who came out; a crapeau jumped out of a hole and asked what happened and wanted the door opened. But, Sir, he did not touch me. He did not touch me and he was very obedient; otherwise, somebody would have gone over. Instead of his sitting in this dining room and letting the Prime Minister know that he is making a mess of himself, he walked out, snatching up two plates like prisoners rowing and fighting for food. A big Minister of the Crown, an Hon. Minister, running in a room and snatching up two plates! He is ready now to fight for food. If I had told him to come back, a row would have come down. For what? For food.

Sir, I am ashamed and shocked. The Prime Minister has said that we over on this side, want to tear down Barbados. Oh gracious! What would the outside world when they read this in the newspapers think of him? I wonder if he knows that; I wonder if he knows that he has done as much that the people of this country should call upon him to resign. We can have no more confidence in you as a Leader. He has done as much for the people of this country to do that. A Leader should stand up and serve.

The very first time that this sort of thing happened, I understand he took them up at Culloden Farm and fed them. They do not want to go back inside there at all. I do not know if his vote has run out or what has happened with the money that has caused him to come back down here now and want to do his little own thing out in the Senate Chamber. But it did not start in the Senate Chamber; it started when he took them out and they were going out. The money must have run out. The Resolution here today must be to fix-it-right. That may be it.

This is a disgrace. I am hurt. I have not taken it so seriously before. Whenever I meet him, I would speak to him. I call him "Boy child" and he calls me "boy child". I did not think he would have done anything of that sort. He promised to kick me through the window; I did not take that seriously. He promised to cuff me in my mouth; I did not take that seriously. He promised to shut down my business from the point of view of the law; I did not take that seriously.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I was the person who closed the door, and I believe I was the person whom he called the policeman for, because I prevented the caterer. The poor caterer was so afraid that I believe up to now he is still crying. He was hurt and he came down there calling a policeman. But to do what? We are not vagabonds. What have we done for the police to lock us up? He tried to embarrass the policeman. He tries to embarrass every human being under the sun, and he embarrasses himself in all. What could the policeman do, poor fellow? He followed the Prime Minister but he could not do anything, because I would tumble him upside down also, because when I am mad, I am mad. I am a madman too, but I do not take injections. It is a disgrace in this Honourable Chamber this afternoon for a Prime Minister on whom the people of this country have conferred such an honour. I have told the Prime Minister already that after Almighty God, it is he; but he does not care anything about that. It is just like when you put silk on a hog.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister could have gone to the Hilton and taken his lunch leaving the rest here to battle for themselves, but instead he flew out of the room with his jacket off. Did he come to fight? He did not come to the right person. He called on you and told you about somebody trying to restrain the caterer. I would throw out the caterer also. This is not fair to us. We are hon. members. We cannot accost any member as a member; we have to say "the hon. member", and you, Sir, add a bit more in addressing the Hon. Prime Minister by saying "the learned". I do not know what kind of "learned" this is. If I had behaved like that this afternoon, nobody would have been surprised; if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas had behaved like that, nobody would have been surprised, because we did not go to Jesus College. I want to know how the Hon. Prime Minister feels now to see that we have not even managed to obtain the letter "L" to learned". We have not got either a big "L" or a small "L" in "learned", and we would not have behaved so; therefore when you say "learned", it is forging, and you should from today stop saying it.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I interpose to say that that is applicable in Parliaments in the Commonwealth to all gentlemen or ladies of the Long Robe. Every Barrister is referred to in Parliament as "the Learned Member".

Mr. SMITH: Sir, whatever you call it, - the Long Robe thing - that needs amending because there are several that call themselves lawyers who are not learned. When you say "learned" to a member who is not "learned", it is hypocrisy. There are a lot who, although you call them lawyers or barristers, are not learned, and I can do better than them sometimes if I have the chance. Let me wait until you drop to sleep and I take up your robe and go in the Court. I would throw away a good set of them. Well, it speaks for itself this afternoon. I will never forget that behaviour. I am hurt, I am ashamed: and any hon. member on the other side who has the slightest bit of dignity about him is ashamed too, but he cannot say it. Do you mean to say that there are 250,000 people in this country and only one can do as he likes? If the Prime Minister had it within the Constitution, all of us who were out there and deprived him of getting his food first would be locked up, and I do not doubt that he may bring it down. He may try to amend it so that rather than going for a policeman and appealing to

— you, we would go through the eddoes. Where are we heading? How can we represent and lead people so?

Mr. Speaker, we want unity. Unity is badly-lacking. We should unite one with the other. All the time I am appealing to members of this House and to the Prime Minister to let us unite. When an election is on and every man is catching his own corner, let us pull the sword; but after we are elected and come in here, let us unite. How can the Hon. Prime Minister expect the Opposition to have any kind of respect for him when he has done such a thing? He is trying to divide the whole Island; he is trying to divide this House and rule. It hurt me today when he referred to people walking down Broad Street with saddle patches in their pants and barefooted, and I wondered if any family of his ever wore such clothes. I would not expect him to have done, but I know that the majority of the people voted for him in St. John wore such clothes, and it is an insult to them. Lord have mercy! These are the people who are responsible for the wealth of this country, not the collar-and-tie men or those who wore shoes and socks. If you have a record of the Court cases, you will see that most of them are from these people, because the other people have more sense. In order to make a speech and to make the people feel that the Barbados Labour Party is the worst thing in the world, he has referred to these people.

Mr. Speaker, I heard it come over the radio yesterday that there was a man who used to "go off" and he went to the Court and told the Sergeant that he had just shot his wife. The Sergeant asked him why, and he said that he shot his wife's lover, and when the Sergeant went with him to his home, the man's wife was at home and nothing was wrong. There was no gun or anything. It is only that the idea crossed the fellow's brain and he was so sure that he was going to shoot his wife that he went along before he shot her and gave up himself.
3.35 p.m.

Sir, I wonder whether that was happening today with my Prime Minister when he referred to barefoot people and people with saddle patches.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. senior member for St. Joseph of Standing Order 26 (11), that no member is to allude to any debate of the same session. I rather got the impression that the hon. member is referring or alluding to a debate of this session. I ask him not to do that.

Mr. SMITH: I said that I heard it over the radio yesterday afternoon; it was a story; I heard it, and it had nothing to do with the debate. The man was so hurt that he said he shot his wife's lover. You would know the meaning to that, because your wife should love you. He said, "Sergeant, lock me up; I have shot my wife." He took the Sergeant to his house and found his wife there. She brought out a book and showed an Inspector where the story was written in the book. The man may have read it at some time, and went off. He thought he had shot his wife. This is what you call "went off".

I do not want to say I am hurt all the time. I will say that I am disappointed - disappointed from the point of view that the Hon. Prime Minister knows right from wrong; he is a big man; I believe he has sense, and what he has done today he has done it deliberately. I saw two of his generals come out there. The two of them did nothing, and then he turned up. Do you know why I say that he has sense, Sir? He did not come in the corner by me. I was the person who barred the door, and I would not let anything pass. I was putting up an embargo. After the members who were in the room were well served, I opened the door.

I believe they paid us an honour when they refused to dine with us. I feel so, but if you want it like that you must pass an order to serve the Opposition first and then the other side. I do not feel that it is fair, and it will go down in history. How can the Prime Minister ever get out of this I do not know. He has given me some first-class ammunition to fight him with at the next election. I refer to the patches in trousers, the saddle patches and barefoot people. He has to talk to those people. He has to go and beg those same people to vote for him. He has to do that, and how is he going to face them now? I have to do it. If a man's trousers had a patch, I would tell him that it is a nice patch, and that the tailor did a good job. I was not going to criticize the patch. Something is wrong with my Prime Minister today!

Sir, last Tuesday he was very jovial. When I was looking for himself and my colleagues on this side of the House to clash, he was making sport. He was nice last Tuesday, but I do not know what has happened to him today. Something has gone wrong. Do you mean to say that he cannot be a gentleman for two days? He cannot really behave in this House as a Prime Minister for two consecutive days?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is making an unparliamentary remark. One cannot do it like that. For instance, one cannot avoid a libel by putting it by way of a question. I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, tell me what to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The last remark which the hon. member made.

Mr. SMITH: Tell me what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remark to which I take exception, on the ground that in my view it is offensive and insulting, is the remark: "Do you mean to say that he cannot be a gentleman for two days? He cannot behave like a gentleman for two consecutive days?" I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not having any noise with you. I withdraw those remarks, but can't he appear in this House to behave himself like an Hon. Prime Minister for two days - two consecutive days? Sir, I want him to be always as he was last Tuesday. Do you mean to say that every time he comes in here, something must go wrong? I do not

nor would never believe in obeah, but it is something to make me get suspicious. Do you mean to say that every time he comes here something must go wrong? Sir, something is wrong. This is Parliament; this is the place where the people of this country have met and elected people to serve them. He cannot look at me to be anything less than any of the members he has on the other side of the House.
3.45 p.m.

He cannot look at any of us over here as anything less. If he is going to do that, he can say it and let me define it for him here and now. If he says so, he would be a hypocrite. I say so; therefore look at us like men. We all do not have the same education, but, Sir, too much education corrupts. Too much power corrupts, so that it is not a question of education to measure us by. It is a question of decency, dignity, commonsense and such like. There are some people who come down here with ever so much behind their names, and I could take them for a ride. Therefore do not look at us as if we are lepers. The Prime Minister makes me feel that we are lepers and he is afraid to come amongst us.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member not to make such a remark.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have told you already that I am hurt.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member to say that.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, what is the reason when a lunch room is put there for all hon. members - for you, for me, for the Prime Minister for everybody - and the Prime Minister says: "No, you boys come with me and let them stay there"? Something is causing it. Sir, it is an insult to you because you had to stay out there, and must I not say how I feel? Does he feel that something is going to fly from us to him and contaminate him, or injure him or something like that? There does seem to be some reason for doing it. That is what is hurting me, and it is only because you can get things done. He can tell the Clerk, the Clerk tells the caterer and the caterer tries his best to please both sides. We have had some heated debates in here. I could remember that the same Prime Minister - he was not anything then - was a member just like me and we had things hot in here. He went so far as to bring a Resolution in here for a vote of "no confidence" in me. You must know how hot the thing was, but he never took away himself. Nothing has happened during this session in comparison with other sessions, and he has taken away himself only this year and he never did it last time. But too much power does corrupt. Lord, have mercy! Deal with those people, deal with those powerful people, deal with them quickly! Take it out of their hands; otherwise we will suffer. We must suffer when one can say that as long as he is in this Government, you will never get so-and-so.

Sir, I am not going back on what has happened. That is power. It puts me in mind that even from the lower class - I can remember as a little boy that the manager at Mellowes sent away a Superintendent and took one from among the gang who was using the fork, and gave him the job. And as soon as I tell you so, he was no more a man like the others. Every other week the manager gave people notices on whatever that fellow said. It is not one and not the other. In other words, it looks to me that all these Prime Ministers and Premiers are power-mad. All over the world it seems to me to be like that. You want to do things in your way and not in the people's way. You must listen to people and you must remember that you are from among the people. I do not blame the Prime Minister; I blame the others with him, and they are worse than he. Do you know why they are worse than he, Sir? They know in some cases that the actions are wrong and they have to make them appear as if they are right. I blame them now, and if I could lash them, I would. Look how they ran over behind him! Up to last Tuesday some of them that ran over with him today were down there with us. They have one who is the biggest in the bunch and he was the smallest of them today. Gracious me! That is what happened only from the word of command. I wonder why he does not let them down in some well; he should get on top and let every one of them go down. I sincerely hope that he would lead them somewhere and just take away himself and let every one of them drown just as you drown puppies. They want drowning, they are a menace to the people of this country. Do you mean to say that one cannot even turn back? The old people say that 'one cannot tell the other to come back.' I know he has as much brain that he would take away himself if and when the time comes, because I know the time will come when he will say that this is the time for everyone to break for himself. He has said it already and he will say it again. I cannot remember much of the Bible, but I think it was the prophet Eli who would not chastise his children. Everything they did was right; and what happened? When he heard what happened with one of them, he broke his neck. If he had chastised his children, he would have been alive, and they too. Do you mean to say that everything a man like myself tells you, he is right? Some day you will have to be wrong. You canot always be right. You should be able to stand up like men and speak your mind.

Sir, I remember that when I was in the Chair as Chairman of Committees, the present Leader of the Opposition was my Premier and he did not want to obey the Chair and I had to order him to take his seat; otherwise I would have 'fixed-him-right'. You do not get that happening now with the Prime Minister at all. I stood up to the Premier and I will stand up to anybody like a man either in here or out of here. On the platform I pierce you and I do not care. When I mean to talk I will talk. Who can stop me? The hon. junior member for St. Andrew asked who can stop the tide? You cannot stop the current; when the current is against you, you go with it and it will bring you back: but do not fight it. Up to last Tuesday night the same hon. member for St. Andrew and I were in the dining room; and where was he today? It is only because the Leader said: "Follow me" and he followed him.
3.55 p.m.

It is disgraceful. Believe you me, Sir, the actions today of the Prime Minister could not be nastier.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to....

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I would withdraw it. I withdraw it except to say that it is down inside me like that. I would not have done it. It is an insult to me and to the people of this country because I am not representing St. Joseph alone. It is an insult to St. Joseph and all over the Island. Do you know why it is an insult? It is an insult because there are some like me that make this Government, that look like the Hon. Prime Minister. That is true.

If ever the bare-footed men and patchy-trousers men were to withdraw their votes next elections, not one of them would be in here. I can swear to that. Using the other Kiaiki King's words, they would come inside here to bring a message. He thought he was so high and mighty that he would never have lost his seat. I think that should be an example for most of us in here when you consider what happened to the former member for St. Peter, the one that they threw outside of this Chamber. I can remember that he told me inside here that I could not get back. Here I am, Sir, and he is outside.

He is hurt and he is going to embarrass this same Government. In three weeks from now he is going to put this Government in a stranner. He was the love bird. I can remember the Prime Minister telling me one day "I leave you to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. He can handle you." Well I leave him to the outside man, Frank Walcott, to handle him. He told me so and I tell him so now. Three weeks from now, you will be in trouble; you will be getting all the hot water in the world by that same man because you let him get away with too much foolishness. You thought that he was a first-class friend. Everybody is not born to be an Ambassador, Sir, and lots of people do not know that. I know the Hon. Prime Minister knows that this time; but I hope he does not have to pay for it because by his trying to make him pay for it, my poor people may suffer. But open your eyes wide and look for it! Three weeks from now, this Government is going to be in hot water through one man. He started to eat up one of the Ministers already. He is not having a thing to do with that Minister. Why? Because he spoke the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that there is a motion for privilege.

Mr. SMITH: Did you say that there is a motion of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion which we are discussing now before the Chamber is a motion of privilege by virtue of Standing Order 68.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am using my privilege now. This is my privilege now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Speak on the motion before the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Well anyhow, privilege is only spelt one way. I do not know of two privileges.

Mr. SPEAKER: By those who do not know how to spell it.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. Well, I am still hurt, but I am going to take my seat now and let the Prime Minister know that he has insulted me. He could not have insulted me more deeply today. I take it very seriously. I do not know how to forgive him for it.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, Sir. Speaking on the motion that is before the House, from the time I have been in the House of Assembly I never was so shocked in my life so much as when I entered the dining hall this afternoon. Personally, I am not one who is crazy over food or anything like that. I remember as a boy at school that I was trained, and in such a way that one midday in Queen's Park when Bishop Swaby's daughter and Miss Norah Burton were serving cake, when they got to me there were some crumbs left and I would not put my hand in it and Miss Norah Burton said to me, "Oh come on, Holder, take it out. When I come back I will begin with you."

Never ever was I so shocked as today when I saw the attitude of some - must I use the word "honourable" - members of the House. We of the Opposition were never notified that there was to be a change as to where you should eat. Had I known that, I would never have crossed the door of that dining Hall. When it was changed some years ago by this same Government and they said that there would not be a caterer and they would have somebody out there where you could go and buy your food, Mr. Speaker, I have never crossed that step even to take a glass of water. Therefore, Sir, today I was a hurt man, and it was a time before I could start to eat anything. I did not intend to do so either. I am saying it here and now, Sir, if it were left to me, after I got in there and found out what was happening, I would have sat quietly and pushed every dish over on the other side.

Why such discrimination? I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that it happened in this hon. and ancient Chamber. Why? Somebody may have asked me tomorrow about it and I would have to say what it is; but if it had happened elsewhere, in the future we would be blamed as strangers to the truth. But it happened today, and spectators and everybody saw it.

I have noticed lately, Sir, that you do not head the table at all. From the time I came to this House, every Speaker headed the dining table; therefore, you look so forlorn at the head of that table alone that you come down and sit with us. I must say, Sir, that it is nice of you to come down and sit with us, but what is the reason? I would be very glad to know the reason for this discrimination.

I have noticed, Sir, that lately they do not eat in here. Where they go to eat does not concern me. If they go to the Hilton Hotel and they feel like paying those prices, let them go; but I personally would like to know why is this discrimination.

Right here on my agenda, I have written down some words which I heard was used - "bare-foot people and saddle patches." I am doubtful whether you will find a bare-footed person or a saddle patch person to exhibit such behaviour over food as we saw today. What is food? Food is not anything. Everybody eats a little food and this hon. and ancient Chamber - the dining hall - was in a thorough disgrace when I was going to the door. As usual, I am always late. That is a known fact.

I heard someone saying, "Holder is coming, do not shut the door." I pushed it and the whole of the dining room was in confusion. For what? Food. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is oppressed; he is hurt. I was hurt also. When the Speaker got up from the table and left what was served him, I had not even touched mine yet. We can express ourselves in various ways; but culture is such that you cannot express culture if it is not in you.
4.05 p.m.

When the Hon. Prime Minister talked about bare-foot people and saddle patches, I was sad to think that he would look upon the electorate of this Island, and in less than twenty minutes display an attitude in this Chamber's dining hall far below the level, in my candid opinion, of those whom he is titling as carrying saddle patches or being barefoot. It is a pleasure to walk about barefooted some days. Those who wear shoes all day long should take off their shoes and look back. Today members of the Government have had to follow the Leader to eat a meal, and he is the same one getting up and saying that we over here are trying to lower the culture and standard of Barbados in the eyes of foreigners. I can see this incident appearing in glaring headlines. And what is it all about? Food! It is not catch to me.

Mr. Speaker, culture is one of those things that has to be instilled in you; you cannot get it out of a book. When you are brought up in a house with your father and mother representing and steering you, no matter what glory or honour or how many million letters you get behind your name, you cannot go from that training. You hear many people talking about power, but when it gets to your head, it turns you into a fool. When the owners of Gibbons were leaving, after giving their driver his present, they gave him a spot of land on the plantation which had two sides and a public road, and instead of accepting that, what did he ask for? He asked to be given a little more authority over the negroes. What took place today in the dining hall was a disgrace. I was very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the one who came in or tried to open the door did not touch the member who was standing there, because although it would look bad, only God knows what might have happened in that room today. There are many people who believe that because you do not get up and shout at everything that you do not carry a serious thought, a reserved thought or a candid thought.

Coming back to the point, Mr. Speaker, no one could ever believe that the Leader of this Island would run in the dining hall with jacket off, and I was standing quietly hoping he would not lose his head as he did some years ago in that same dining hall. Things are different today. There is too much power. I will close my remarks, although short, with these few words. There is nothing better for me today than that it happened here. None of them can go out and say that it is not true. They can twist it, because some people are direct strangers to the truth. A policeman was called in, and therefore they cannot go out and turn the tables on us saying that we caused a racket in the House for food. I must say that I think you were the first served, Mr. Speaker, but you did not have the chance to use your knife and fork. When I left the dining hall they were there closed. Fancy the Speaker, because of the conduct of the Prime Minister of the Island, was deprived of this meal today!

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this motion of a breach of privilege which is before us, I remember somewhere seeing that a small spark sets the whole world aflame. I do not see the necessity for all this debate today, because I deem that we are all men. I understood today, Mr. Speaker, that we had something to discuss, and when I was in a part of the Legislature, Mr. Jones who caters for the members of the House, came to us and said that he had been prevented from bringing lunch into that Chamber. I can assure you that I have often seen lunch being taken to the various parts of this House, not for the members, but for the servants of the House. When I heard that report, I said nothing, but Mr. Jones came back a second time and said that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph had prevented him from bringing out any lunch for us. I saw the Hon. Prime Minister leave the room and I followed him to see what was taking place, and when I got there I saw that the door was barred. The Prime Minister knocked on the door, it was open and he asked what was wrong. He then asked the Police Sergeant not to allow any incident to take place. Now I am pretty fair. If the Sergeant had entered the dining room to make an arrest or say anything against any member, it would have been shocking to me, but he did not go even on the step. He stood up as he is accustomed and listened quietly and patiently, but did not respond either in words or action. Following this I addressed you and said that if there is to be any change in the lunch room, you should know about it. If the Clerk receives a message from the Prime Minister or anyone else to transfer lunch to any other part of the Assembly, he should acquaint you before any alteration takes place which would cause a disturbance.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to think that such a small incident could cause such a great disturbance in this House today, and I do not see the necessity for it. As I said before, we are men, and though our passions may be strained, we cannot allow that to break the bonds of our affection. We are men, and I do not see why such a thing should spread so far and create such a flame to burn up the whole Island.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I trust, in future, that if there should be any change in the House, or any change in the lunch room, the matter will be brought to your

notice and that you will be able to direct and give your Ruling in every capacity. I also trust that there will be no more incidents like this occurring in this House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, from the moment when the Prime Minister entered the House today, I think that all hon. members: the Leader of the House, the Minister of Community Development, the Minister for Trade, the Minister for Agriculture - all hon. members could see that today was going to be one of 'those days', for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, has 'those days' just as much as members of the opposite sex have 'those days'. There are certain times - a week, a month, a year - when the Prime Minister comes in here and every hon. member knows that a disgraceful episode of some sort is going to take place.

We have seen the Prime Minister transform a debate in which all hon. members.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I think that we have sat down here a very long time and, except for the intervention of the hon. member for St. Andrew, we have allowed the hon. members, no matter how distorted their remarks have been and how far from the truth.....

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now I want to say this, Sir. It cannot be on a point of order on a point of order. What I am saying is this: the hon. member cannot say that they can tell when a disgraceful episode is going to take place unless they are creating the disgraceful episode themselves. He could not tell when I walk into the House that a disgraceful episode is going to take place, unless he is going to be the perpetrator of that episode.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it really is time that you discipline these experienced members who rise on points of order that are not points of order at all. I know that before the hon. member speaks Your Honour cannot know - nor can he, in fact, - know exactly what he is going to say; but, nevertheless, there is such a thing as that the Chair can interrupt. If the Prime Minister wants to comment on who is going to cause a disgraceful episode, he is welcome to do so in his speech.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that, whether the Prime Minister knows it or not, 23 other members of this House know it. Your Honour back down to myself, the most junior member, know that there are occasions when the business of this House is going to be disrupted, not by the Opposition, not even by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but it is going to be disrupted as a result of the Prime Minister's mood and temper. I do not believe that there is a single hon. member in this House who has not commented on this matter within the precincts of this House at some time or another.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who could transform a debate in which both sides of the House were seeking honestly, decently and sincerely to analyse the Customs arrangements at Seawell Airport into an assault upon the integrity of the parliamentary system, in effect, by attacking the Opposition in the terms in which the Prime Minister did by describing the 33,483 persons who voted for the Barbados Labour Party at the last Elections as barefoot and saddle-patched.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for St. Thomas alluding to any debate of this Session?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask your guidance on that. My impression is that a debate on privilege is an interruption of the other Public Business; therefore there is no past debate on the Seawell Resolution. It is still in effect the instant Public Business which is being interrupted by this debate. The Prime Minister interrupts me on a point of order from time to time.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as I am concerned, the Rules of debate, Standing Order 26, is as relevant in discussing a motion of privilege as it is relevant otherwise. *(ASIDES)*

Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I make my point of order now, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Prime Minister has intimated that he has risen on a point of order, but I have heard a very loud sotto voce which I think it will be better for me, as I am big enough, to ignore completely.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, like other speakers before him, - I regard some of what he has said as straw, but he made a statement to the effect that I said that the 33,000 people who voted for the Barbados Labour Party are barefoot and wear saddle-patches. Mr. Speaker, I think that you were present, and if you were not present I would like to correct the hon. member. We were in Committee, and I said that it was extremely difficult in Barbados today, since the Democratic Labour Party came into power, to find anybody in the City of Bridgetown who was not decently clad with a pair of shoes on. I said also that, if by any remote possibility you found one decrepit-looking character barefooted and with square ventilations and saddle-patches, you could swear it was some adherent or supporter of the Barbados Labour Party. They have translated that from an expression of protest in this country as an indictment against 33,000 people who voted for them. As a matter of fact, all the planters and merchants voted for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a point which I deem not to be a point of order, but which I do deem to be a point of explanation in conformity with Standing Order 26 (16). Inasmuch as the

hon. senior member for St. Thomas referred to something which I regarded as an allusion to a debate of the same session, I allowed the point of order in respect of the same allusion to a debate of this same session. But let hon. members clearly understand now that we are not now debating anything other than the motion of privilege standing in the name of the hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition. We are not now rehearsing something which took place during this same session, whether today or any other day.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As I take it then, Mr. Speaker, I was out of order in referring to the Prime Minister's speech. He immediately got up and made a speech about it, but you are telling me, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot explain further upon his explanation and correct his explanation. Nevertheless, unlike the Prime Minister, evidently the Rules of debate apply to me, and certainly, unlike the Prime Minister, I obey Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules of debate apply to everyone equally. Some members, I admit, are less concise than others.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Rules apply to me as far as I am concerned, and I bow to Your Honour's ruling. This is the background that we have had. Today was clearly going to be one of 'those days'. I do not know what physiological upset or imbalance causes 'those days'. All of us are sick in one way or another; some of us are sick in the hand or the foot; some of us are sick in the head; some of us are sick in the head one day a year, or one day in the month. There are various degrees of mental disturbances which can explain some of what, in the absence of a rational explanation, we are forced to turn to in the behaviour of the person who, in shirt sleeves, I saw out there in the lunch room come in and say: "False imprisonment is false imprisonment wherever it happens. Sergeant, come here and stand up." You, Sir, will know to whom I am referring, because unless I am mistaken you were speaking to me at the time. Immediately afterwards you got up and said: "Wait, what is happening, Errol? What is all this?" You will remember, Sir, your own reaction on that occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House was suspended at two o'clock. Prior to that I had observed some activities happening in a Chamber associated with the Other Place, and I indeed asked whether there was a meeting of the Other Place planned for this afternoon. Noncommittal answers were given to me, and I fancy that I saw in those answers the usual fear of honest public servants when faced with dealings with the more aggressive aspects of the Prime Minister. 4.25 p.m.

Answers to questions, as Your Honour might not know, are very hard to come by where people feel that something wrong is being done, but they are afraid to say so because they think that the Prime Minister would not be in favour of that. Knowing that half an hour is all too brief a period sometimes for the adequate service of luncheon, it was impossible for us to get it. Bear in mind, the question was about who was waiting on their food. Now, Sir, there are twenty-four hon. members in here. I was the first looking for food today and I was the first to be kept waiting. Let us bear that fairly in mind. There was no discrimination against any Government members. I was alone in the lunch room when I discovered that the Senate's precincts were to be opened because the Prime Minister did not think it desirable that members of the Democratic Labour Party, except for yourself, should eat with the members of the Barbados Labour Party.

I do not believe that it is we who are seeking to divide the country; I do not believe that it is we who are tearing down Barbados; I do not believe that it is we who are bringing the fair name of Barbados into disrepute. History has a way of analysing and estimating who are the real disturbers of the public peace, and the real causers of breaches of public goodwill. When you really get down to it, what kind of man would decide that in this island of Barbados politics must prevent two people from sitting down at the same dining-room table? What kind of man is that? There are fables of persons, of barriers existing, but what kind of fables are they where the spirit of the House of Assembly in all of its years when there were deep, powerful, strong-flowing divisions between members of different points of view - even at that time when they were white planters in this House who would not let a black man come into their dining rooms, yet they came into this Hon. House and they could sit down and eat with the people who sought to destroy them and all that they stood for; but we have a Prime Minister here today who says that the Democratic Labour Party sits so close at God's right hand that the barefooted and saddle patched people's representatives cannot sit too close to the members of the Democratic Labour Party. Probably, the Prime Minister has so much doubt of his own Party that he is afraid that the niceties of conversation, that the social courtesies which have extended between members on separate sides of the House - that they will lead to some erosion of his own personal position.

Again, Sir, what kind of man is that, what kind of people does he think his own Party members are? I have seen the hon. junior member for St. George, the hon. senior member for St. Philip the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the hon. senior member for St. George, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the Chairman of Committees eating in the Members' dining room. Does the Prime Minister think that the Chairman of Committees will be seduced by all the sweet words and false friendships of the Opposition? Has he got doubts of the reality of the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. junior member for St. George that they should be excluded from the company of the Opposition? Does the Prime Minister so much distrust his own Cabinet Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, that he takes it upon himself to say whom he should eat with and where he should eat? I have had dinner with the Minister of Agriculture.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. As I understand it, Sir, this is not a debate on who is eating or who is not eating; it arises as a motion of privilege with respect to an alleged complaint against the action of the Prime Minister. If the hon. member is debating a motion which arises from that, then obviously, he is debating the proper motion. But if he goes outside of that, then he is not debating the motion the terms of which are before us, and the business of the House cannot be interrupted on that score.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Has he changed the Rules for Your Honour to decide whether a member is going away from the subject? The hon. member gets up as if he is speaking on a point of order and, in fact, attacks you for not stopping the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the Clerk to read the motion now in order to ensure that it remains fresh in all our minds. (MEMBERS: It is in the minds of hon. members).

The Clerk read the motion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know if the hon. member is afraid that I am going to say that he eats with us and that he meets some of us and has a drink or something like that. If that is what he fears, I will refrain from that argument. I do not know if he is afraid of the speeches or the contents of the speeches of hon. members. It is the Addendum of this particular Resolution that we are dealing with now.

The background of this motion is the fact that there is contradiction of the ancient customs of this House, contradiction of the spirit of fellowship which, I am sure, my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, by constituency if not by Party, will see and join with me in seeing, should exist between all Barbadians. We are all Barbadians together; but, apparently, some of us are one sort of Barbadians and others are another sort of Barbadians. In contradiction of this spirit today, it was decreed that the Government members are no longer to be subjected to the contamination of eating in the same room as Your Honour and the members of the Opposition, that the Government members should be segregated and secluded in the Senate Chamber and kept away from the dining room of this House.
4.35 p.m.

Let us be in no doubt about that at all, Mr. Speaker, that dining room is ours. That is the Members' dining room. That is where members of this House have gone, presumably, since the House was dining. That is where members of this House are expected to eat whether or not the Prime Minister has been carrying members of his Cabinet up at Culloden Farm during luncheon. That is where, Mr. Speaker, you preside in that atmosphere of good fellowship because I had never heard an angry word spoken in there until today. I had never seen disputes arise in there until today. I have never seen playing at politics being deplored in what used to be the second phrase of our former National Anthem broadcast in there. It is a place where we go to remember that we are members of the House of Assembly sent here by the electorate to do the best we can for them. It is there where we go to remember that although there are a Government and Opposition as was said in the 1860's: "there is Government and Opposition; but we are Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, nevertheless."

The dining room is one of the places where we go to know that. We exchange verbal blows across the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but in the dining room we remember the things that bind us together. We remember the electoral campaign, and campaigns for those hon. members who fought a lot of times. It is the place where we seriously remember the things that face Barbados and the solutions which can be offered.

Now there is one discordant note to all that, Mr. Speaker. There is one man who cannot accept the fellowship of hon. members of this House cheerfully, and unfortunately today, Sir, the incident arose which, I hope, never to see again under any circumstance.

Now, Sir, I was inside there. I was sitting down facing the door. I was trying to get my lunch which I was trying to get from before the suspension of the House. Some hon. members had been served already. Your Honour's lunch in ample proportions had been placed in Your Honour's place at the head of the great table in the members' dining room. Your Honour and I if Your Honour would readily recall, were discussing the "Times" newspaper, and the senior Clerk-at-the Table had just gone to confirm certain aspects of the order which had been placed for an airmail edition.

Mr. Speaker, if I make a mistake, I trust Your Honour would correct me. At this stage, a person in shirt sleeves came in and I heard: "They are detaining Mr. Jones against his will. This is false imprisonment wherever it happens. Sergeant! Sergeant!' I then saw that this was the hon. senior member for St. John. As I looked again, I observed that he was surrounded by unfriendly faces and I hoped that he came to no harm, because I could see that his manner, his demeanour, his words, his attitude and everything was beginning to affect certain hon. members and offend certain hon. members who were then present in the dining room. You, Sir, then got up and said, "What is this, Errol? What is happening?" and you, Sir, and the hon. senior member for St. John, still in shirt sleeves, disappeared in the direction of the door, and I busied myself with trying to get my lunch.

Subsequent to that, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas came in. I observed the hon. junior member for St. Thomas walk up to the door. He raised his arms towards the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I said to the person next to me that he had better not touch "Smithy". This proved to be unnecessary because I think that he realised that discretion is the better part of valour where the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is concerned. He then retreated and with a practice known to be born of many years of operation, picked up a tray, snapped it into position

and went back outside sucking his teeth. While marching outside he was making sure that whatever was detained and whatever was not there, he and his two plates and his salad were going to settle down and find a home somewhere in another place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the account given by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. If he said that he was there, I did not see him. If he said that he heard the Prime Minister calling the policeman to make peace, I cannot agree with him there. I cannot agree that peace was in the Prime Minister's heart. I only thank goodness that Sergeant Herbert then had more sense than to do what he was called to do because, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that nobody can give the Police orders about what to do in this Chamber but yourself.

There was then an outcry immediately and it was said to the Sergeant that he must take orders from you. It was detailed to the Clerks that they must take orders from you. Mr. Speaker, in the heat of the commotion, I did not take down what the Prime Minister said, but I can assure you, when the policeman was first called, that it was the Prime Minister who was calling the policeman's name to prevent hon. members from leaving the dining room. That was my impression, so aggressive was the attitude of the Prime Minister, so determined, so raged was the look on the Prime Minister's face and so incensed was he when he said "Sergeant! Sergeant!"

From what I could remember, Sir, you were so very upset that you could not enjoy your lunch. This is the first time I saw that you were unable to eat your lunch. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was also interrupted in his consumption of his lunch. The incident left a bad impression on those who saw what had happened. When you consider the implications of the Prime Minister taking it upon himself to order about a policeman.....

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I understand it, the more frivolous aspects of what the Prime Minister said was that he considered that Government members should have priority of being served their lunch and that they should not eat in the Members' dining room.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, on a point of explanation. I have never at any time made any such statements that members should have priority in being served their lunch first. The hon. member is a master of inventions. It is a great pity that he cannot invent something constructive.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the Prime Minister wishes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at some stage I will turn my hand to inventing an argument machine or a method of treatment or something which will make him rational for just once in a while; I will do that.

There are statements being made about what Mr. Jones said and what Mr. Jones did not say. I cannot go into all this because unfortunately like you, Sir, I pay some attention to the rules of hearsay and disbelief. My account of what Mr. Jones in fact said up at the Senate Chamber - and perhaps you can correct me - was that the door was shut and he could not get the lunch out through it. I fail to see how the Prime Minister could walk into a room where I was sitting and say to the room at large full of hon. members that we were detaining Mr. Jones, and that that was false imprisonment, and he was calling a policeman to put an end to it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I am prepared to let hon. members fulminate, but I will have my say. Fortunately for me, the Speaker was present, and I never made any statement to the effect that I was calling a policeman to put an end to something. This is the first time I am hearing that in the course of this debate. I have heard very garbled versions of what took place, but what the hon. member is saying is that if they were committing murder in there, the officer who is sent here by the Commissioner of Police to maintain peace in these precincts could not go inside there or stand up on the steps and see that murder is not committed. In the days of the planters, we did not have thugs and rogues.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Hon. Prime Minister listens to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, surely he will get a garbled version of how exactly the policeman was called for, what was said when you got there and what the Prime Minister said in calling him, because the Prime Minister said he never called a policeman to put an end to anything.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said that I never made any statement to the effect that I was calling a policeman to put an end to anything. I never made any such statement.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it the Hon. Prime Minister is saying he never made the statement that he was calling a policeman to put an end to anything, but that when I say that he was calling a policeman to put an end to anything, that is wrong. So what I take the Prime Minister to be saying is that he was calling a policeman to put an end to something, but he did not say so. I can take it to be nothing else. You cannot contradict those of my statements which he has contradicted without meaning that, because he is not only contradicting me; he is contradicting his camp follower the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. He is making sure that the "Old City" has no sway in the Members' dining room.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House are, unfortunately for the Prime Minister, in a position to judge and to say exactly what did take place. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will be joined and in fact to some degree has been joined by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, although the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is too careful to make any statement as to what took place, both because he was not there, and I suspect, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, because he has little faith in the accounts that he is hearing even on his own right hand; but we were all there, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When we sit down to be counted and the votes are taken, votes are going to be cast "Aye" or "No", as the case may be, by persons who were not there, but who have only the Prime Minister's word to rely on. I will tell them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I heard an hon. member state once in a debate "I am voting for the Party". That may be a consideration that will make hon. members vote if and when a vote comes to be taken on this, but let hon. members bear in mind that they are putting their trust in a broken reed when they put their trust in the Hon. Prime Minister's version of affairs, when they put their trust in the Prime Minister's version of any affair.

The Hon. Prime Minister spoke at some stage about how the Opposition comes in here and does this, does that, and slander people's families. Every member in this House can judge who is the slanderer of families. Every member knows who the chief slanderer of families is. You would think these words would turn to coals in his mouth when he utters them, because in this House he has slandered families in the vilest, filthiest way on previous occasions; so we know, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas Standing Order No. 26 (7).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not mean to impute any improper motives to the Hon. Prime Minister or to any other hon. member, but I will bear Standing Order No. 26 (7) in mind when I speak. I was not aware I had transgressed it, nor on reflection do I imagine that you are saying so. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all we can say is: What is this Hon. House coming to? What is the Barbados House of Assembly being led to? I do not refer to the Leader of the House, because in the last analysis courtesy has been known to break through Party considerations, and good manners have been allowed to show their faces when Government Business is being conducted by the Leader of the House. It is only when the Prime Minister comes in to the House that these incidents break through like festering sores. There is not another person who has ever sat in this Hon. House who would walk about in his shirt sleeves accusing members of falsely imprisoning the caterer, and calling on a policeman not to put an end to it - I do not know what the policeman was called for if he was not called to put an end to something. I can only take it that he was called precisely to restrain the liberty of members if he was not called on, putting the best construction on it, to release the caterer from an imprisonment which the Prime Minister took to be false.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if this has been made clear. When the Prime Minister came into the dining room the caterer was not present; he was nowhere to be seen; I understood he was up by the Senate Chamber while he was supposed to be falsely imprisoned. He was not there. These were threats bouncing from wall to wall of a Jonesless room. I did not see anybody in there who answered to the description of Mr. Jones, or the caterer, at the time when the policeman was being invited to stand up in the doorway. He was not even invited at that stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to stand in the door which was, allegedly, blocked. It may be that Sgt. Herbert had enough good sense not to involve himself in a room of very angry persons who resented that members of the House should have their privileges so put upon as they have been between the hours of 2.00 and 2.30 o'clock this afternoon, January 30, 1968.

Let us hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the time, the date, and the place will go down in all our memories as a day not only renowned for its disgraceful conduct, but as a day when members of the House showed that the privileges of the House are not merely empty phrases but they represent something that we can fight for, and we can air in this House. Let it go down as a day when people would remember that the Opposition do not come in here as spineless robots jumping at the crack of a Party's whip, stifling their consciences if not their tonges, and casting their votes against conscience, against common sense and sometimes against decency. Let us all remember that there must be a turning point, there must be some stage at which the excesses of the barbaric side of the innermost recesses of a worn-out mind are restrained.

The Prime Minister has been in office for more than six years now. He likes to talk about the Party of youths, about representing youths and vigour as though no one ever gets old. Let the Prime Minister look at himself in the looking-glass; let the Prime Minister ask his doctor; let the Prime Minister ask his friends if he does not need a rest. It has been six long years of believing that he alone in the Cabinet is capable of carrying out all the important decisions, of believing, as he has said in here, that he alone is capable of controlling the Opposition in this House. This is what is besetting Barbados today. This is the problem that 23 of us in here have to face. This is the really serious problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to be glad that democratic restraints still exist in Barbados; we have to be glad that some of the shocking happenings the last year in the House have awakened many persons, hon. members included, and at least two or three occupants of the Chairs upon that dais to the need of pulling things out of the rut in which they have got.

As far as we are concerned, no one is immune from giving a wrong Ruling when in the Chair. Here on my right, although I never heard him preside as Speaker - I beg the hon. senior member for St. Peter pardon. I have heard him preside as Speaker, and I think I saw him elected Speaker on one occasion, perhaps, at a time when I was unable to give mature consideration to his Rulings. I have no doubt that he used to give wrong Rulings, too. But at least, Mr.

Deputy Speaker, when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy launched himself into space with the Mace, he was not suspended from one, two, or any meetings of the House. That is a measure of the difference between 10 years ago and today. Ten years ago it was inconceivable that an outcry could appear in the Minutes of this House that due to the unruly behaviour of the Opposition the hon. senior member for St. James was named. That appeared in the minutes. Unruly behaviour by the Opposition and an hon. member was named! That is the true measure of the degeneration of public life under the regime of the hon. senior member for St. John: the absence of tolerance, the abandonment at times of fairness; if, indeed, the concept of fairness is understood by the two Hon. Members for St. John - if, indeed, it is understood at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have an opportunity here and now to call a halt and to say this cannot go on. All of us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, want it to stop. When you really get down to it, I do not think the Prime Minister himself wants it to go on, because he cannot like to come in here Tuesday after Tuesday to hear the home-truths about himself, which he provokes. He cannot like to come in here Tuesday after Tuesday and see the business of the House unable to proceed because of gross provocation of hon. members because of the introduction into the conduct of affairs of behaviour such as today's.

If he honestly believes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in parliamentary government, he must want to see things debated on a certain plane. I really cannot believe that the Prime Minister can sit at home on a morning and consciously, rationally and deliberately choose, if he understands what his conduct is choosing, to make a speech - I am not going to refer to its terms; I am just going to refer to its existence - such as the speech he made in answer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter this morning, and to follow that up by issuing an edit in the manner of the Czars, the Roman Emperors and the Kaisers as to where you, Sir, and other members of this Hon. House must eat their lunch.

5.05 p.m.

Who does he think he is? Ordering around the Deputy Speaker, Ministers and hon. members returned by the votes of the electorate who must be told where to eat and where not to eat! I am sure that today is the first day that Your Honour has been told for twenty-five years where you must sit down to eat. I cannot believe the Prime Minister that he could sit down at home and choose a course of conduct which commonsense would tell anybody, except the Prime Minister, would lead to a state of affairs such as what we are now debating today. The Prime Minister need not think that it is faction or breaking down for breaking down's sake or for faction's sake, and there are many hon. members on this side who can speak for themselves. I can speak for myself and certainly we are not hungry for power. Let hon. members who do not understand and who can never achieve power, who are only to be lackeys and jackals - Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw the word "jackals". Let hon. members who are in their positions laugh and snare. They cannot understand what it means to want to serve people. I have not come here hungry for power or to grab at any seats of power. I made a life for myself in another country and I wish to be enjoying that life today. *(Asides)* Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas evidently wants me to do certain services for him. If the hon. member thinks that I am a procurer or have ever been a procurer, let me assure him that I have never known anybody who could be a procurer for him, not at any price. *(Laughter)* So he need not mention it to me anymore. If he wants a procurer, he will have to look elsewhere. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have.) *(Laughter)*. Poor fellow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he says: "I have". Poor little fellow, I cannot use that expression. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that I will be able to assist this Hon. House; after 1971 we will be free of the amusements of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. Nevertheless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Prime Minister can understand when we emphasize that there are hon. members on this side who would not be aiming at the seats of power. We are not in it for money or for lust of power. I believe that the Prime Minister can understand when that argument is put to him. Let him think that it is just barely possible, and if he finds the idea hard to grasp in its entirety, let him grasp a little piece of it; let him hold it by the tail and see if he cannot just get it into his head that the Opposition has come in here not to make any assault on his personality. His personality is not important enough for that. We have not come in here for that; we have come in here just as much to do the duty of the Opposition to the people of Barbados as he and his Government have come in here to do their duty to the people as a Government.

The Prime Minister does not want any Opposition at all at the moment. He might find that he is a better Prime Minister by reason of having a better Opposition. I have no advice to give him. I do not want him to be a better Prime Minister because, at the present rate of progress, he will not be any Prime Minister at all within quite a short time; but in the short time remaining to us, let us call on him to behave himself and to be responsive to the wishes of this Hon. House and to the honest wishes of members of his own side who may be afraid of expressing them to him. Let us call upon him to be responsive to ideas of straightforward human decency in behaving. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you get down to it, it can be summed up shortly in one sentence, and that is how I am going to sum it up. The Prime Minister took upon himself to call a policeman for other members of the House of Assembly. That is what it is. If that is not a breach of privilege, nothing ever will be.

(Cheers from the Opposition.)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I remember, not less than four hon. members of the Opposition, excluding the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who moved this motion, have spoken and gave during the course of their remarks, various versions of what they consider to be a breach of privilege Since I am the main target of their attack because the hon. member who has just sat down seems to be expressing the fear that I am the only person on this

side who, he claims that I have said, can deal with them, I intend to deal with them; but I do not think that I am the only person on this side who is capable of doing it; and I am not going to make any apologies for what I say. What is significant about this debate, like so many other debates since November 1966, is that having met here at 12 o'clock (noon) today specifically at the request of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, although the Order Paper was a very short one - we had moved the motion for the adjournment at 2.30 o'clock p.m. and then the Hon. Leader of the House, after listening to the hon. member who beseeched, praised and did everything possible to persuade the Hon. Leader of the House to meet at an earlier time, we met at 12 o'clock (noon) today. Now this is a test of the sincerity of what is going on in this House. There were two short money Resolutions on the Order Paper.
5.15 p.m.

As far as I can remember, Order No. 2 was a Bill and there were altogether about four items of Government Business.

There was no encroachment envisaged, therefore, on the time of Private Members' Business because the House met at the statutory hour at the request of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. The Standing Orders had not been suspended. They are people who claim that they have a long number of items under Private Members' Business and begged us therefore to come here at twelve o'clock, and not one single item of Government Business has been completed indeed from between twelve o'clock and the time when the suspension was taken at two o'clock. There were varying delaying tactics on a simple Resolution to pay overtime to members of the Customs Department.

This so-called Breach of Privilege is therefore a consistent pattern. It has absolutely nothing to do with privilege to begin with; it is purely a dilatory motion so that no Government Business will be concluded today. As a matter of fact, in preventing us, they have even prevented themselves from doing a long, exacting list of Private Members' Business with which they claim they are so anxious to get through.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister is saying that this is not a point of privilege and it has nothing to do with it when the Speaker has ruled that and read the rules thereon. If it is not, then the Speaker is an idiot; the Speaker is a fool. The Speaker quoted the Rule and said that the Opposition may debate it, and now the Prime Minister is saying that. What caused it? We did not do it purposely. It has some cause and we gave the cause. He knows the cause; so what is he trying to get around it and putting it his way? Who else? Who else? We want the work done; but I cannot sit here, and I am not going to sit here, and let the Prime Minister take us above here for a ride. He is wrong; too wrong to be right.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when His Honour the Speaker was in the Chair, His Honour, with his usual tolerance, ruled that the motion can be debated; but neither His Honour the Speaker nor you tabled this motion. It was tabled, as all the nuisance motions were tabled and which we have here, by the Leader of the Opposition. I know he is going to get up and I shall allow him to get up and abuse me as usual. "Get up! Get up! Rise to the occasion."

The longest list of nuisance motions ever known in the history of Parliament has been tabled by the Leader of the Opposition. They are purely dilatory motions to interrupt the lawful management of the business of the people of this Island and I am going to deal with the motion which he introduced now. It is purely an undiluted nuisance motion. They could afford in the Federal House in Trinidad to have spent three years doing nothing. We have a big programme to get through with in this Island; we cannot waste time on this kind of thing; but I am going to deal with it.

Now, Sir, I have read books from time to time on how the facts of history become distorted. Those who have read George Orwell will remember that he even envisaged a state in which right was wrong and wrong was right. What really should be happening here today if we were not anxious to get along with the business of the people was that the Government should have been bringing in a motion objecting to the self-confessed wrongful actions of people like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the senior member for St. James and others.

What did the senior member for St. Joseph say? He said that he locked the door to prevent the caterer of this House - a simple matter like this - from taking lunch to members of the Government.

Now, Sir, I know that the gravamen of the address of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was one of hurt to his pride. What was the hurt? The hurt was not what has been alleged in this Resolution which I hold in my hands. The hurt was that he was looking for company, and the Government would not eat with him. He has never at any stage of his speech discussed anything about the policeman or anything like that in the Resolution. Not one single word on the Resolution is contained in any part of his speech. Go and check the record, Sir, and you will see that his hurt was the whole gravamen of his address. It was: "Look what I have brought the country to because I have the Government members eating apart from him." He goes to Culloden Farm; so he is not scornful. He goes to Lemon Grove; so he is not scornful; therefore, he is willing to accept invitations. Here it is that in the very House of Assembly we would not eat with him!

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is that that the Prime Minister is saying that I am going down to Lemon Grove? I did not mention Lemon Grove.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I agree with him. He has made his point.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am on a point of order. Rule him out of order. He says that I am looking for com-

pany. Not with him, because he knows where I can go for him now and meet his company. I am going to do it and everybody would know it too; or is it that he is not going back at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is made.

(ASIDES)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is quite right. He did not mention the words "Lemon Grove", but he referred to his receiving an invitation to the home of the Deputy Prime Minister who lives at Lemon Grove. Therefore, I was not trying to quote the hon. member when I said "Lemon Grove". That was a paraphrase of what he said that he would accept an invitation to the home of the Leader of the House.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew referred to him in his address. The point is this. I was pointing out that the hurt of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was not a question of breach of privilege. The breach of privilege was that we all should be eating together. I am not going to dwell on that because in this Chamber the Speaker most of the time graces the main table in the dining room.
5.25 p.m.

The Librarian, the Clerk of the House and the Reporters eat in one place, but the Police Officers who attend here for the purpose of maintaining law and order and making sure that a breach of the peace does not take place are provided with meals, and you will find in a Resolution before the House that we provide meals for four Police Officers who are invited here to the House specifically for the purpose of maintaining peace and making sure that a breach thereof does not take place.

Now just let us get our perspective straight. We have a Marshal of the House. On such occasion as the Marshal has to exercise his authority, he does not go and lay his hands physically upon any member of the public or any other person. The Marshal here is vested with authority on Mr. Speaker's direction to eject even a member of the House from the precincts thereof or to take into custody a member of the public or a member of this House. This is the Speaker's prerogative. Today the sitting was suspended at 2. p.m. for the purpose of taking lunch. It had been decided as long ago as yesterday evening that the Government would use the short time of the suspension to have a discussion together. At no time did we have lunch in the Senate Chamber. For this purpose we used the facilities of the small dining room attached to the Other Place. We were waiting in there for some considerable time when the gentleman who is in charge of the catering came in and reported simply what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has already admitted and confessed here in front of all of us - that the door had been locked by that member, and that the hon. member for St. James had also barred his way and prevented him from passing.....

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two...

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I do wish the Hon. Prime Minister to get his facts clear and not get himself muddled up further. He has the whole House in a muddle.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not the hon. member for St. James; it is the hon. junior member for St. Peter. You will appreciate that at the time when the report was made, we were not inside the House and the member was referred to by name, but the Rules of the House preclude me from calling the gentleman by name, although the Rules have been broken by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas in here today under the guise of reporting what the Speaker said. I am not going to fall into that error, but I apologise to both hon. members for St. James for suggesting that they were the people who barred the way. It was reported to us by the caterer that the door had been locked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and his way had been barred. He was in an extreme state of agitation, and he said that he got down on his knees literally and asked them to allow him to pass, and they refused to do so. I am not going to embellish it in any way. We had exactly half an hour to come back and we had matters to be discussed. I then left the Chamber...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will draw to the attention of hon. members Standing Order No. 29 (6).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sat here and listened to hon. members on the other side, four of them and the Introducer, fulminating in the grandest rhetorical terms, and at some times in abusive terms making all kinds of irrelevant and slanderous remarks, and I only interrupted on a point of personal explanation on two occasions, which points were well taken. Therefore since I am supposed to be the miscreant, I should be allowed to be heard in silence as well.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, did I hear the Prime Minister say that hon. members who had spoken used slanderous and abusive terms? As a member who has spoken in this debate, I object to those words about me. If there were slanderous and abusive, he should have objected.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was explaining that although they were slanderous and abusive, I still sat down and listened to them. I did not choose to object because this is a pattern.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe my point of order is being considered by you. I think the Prime Minister should know that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Speaker called on the same hon. member to withdraw without any intervention by any hon. member.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have heard your point.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, I am asking for the Hon. Prime Minister to withdraw his statement that earlier speakers have used slanderous and abusive remarks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Both the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. member who has just sat down were called upon to withdraw insulting remarks used by them. May I now continue? I do not know what the objection is now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the Clerk at the Table to give me the words complained of.

The Clerk supplied the words complained of.

The relevant words as handed to me by the Clerk at the Table are as follows:-

"I sat here and listened to the hon. members on the other side, four of them and the Introducer, fulminating in the grandest rhetorical terms, and at some times in abusive terms making all kinds of irrelevant and slanderous remarks."

The Chair rules that the expression "in abusive terms making all kinds of irrelevant and slanderous remarks" is very general and not particularly directed to any individual. (VOICES: Oh, no!)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no Ruling that is given here that the Leader of the Opposition, who is a constitutional lawyer, does not object to; and he says he is upholding the Constitution! If he were in Kanhai's position the other day and Cowdrey had nodded his head, he would want to knock his head off with the cricket bat for saying that he caught the ball. Anyhow, I will continue.

At that juncture, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was merely pointing out that I am entitled to be heard in silence. I had got to the stage where I said that the members, having waited for a considerable time, were approached by the caterer in a great state of trepidation, almost; he was agitated and he reported the matters to which I have referred. Now this we know out of the mouth of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph himself who said that he locked the door. (Mr. MOTTLEY: He said "blocked") The words which we have written down are that he said that he locked the door. If he said "blocked", I was under the impression that the hon. member said that he locked the door. This is what we have put down, but I may have misheard him. I understand from the members on the other side that he said "blocked". 5.35 p.m.

Now, this is tantamount, with all due respect, to saying it was not murder; it was manslaughter. The position is that he informed the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, on this side of the House, that he had locked the door, but it is irrelevant. The point is that when I got there the door was shut and also barred. It was also reported to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. junior member for St. Peter had barred - now whether by barring meant that a wooden bar was put through, I would not know; I was not there. I know that one door was shut, and one door which leads on to the passageway which, normally, would be used by the caterer as the shortest method of egress to the passageway was shut. Then there is only one other door to the dining room. I am merely saying what has been reported to me; I have not made any indictment against the member.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of explanation, Sir. On a point of order. I do not mind whether the Prime Minister is saying what has been reported to him or else. If he has a lick at the junior member for St. Peter, let him come straight to the point. I closed a door only after the Prime Minister had brought the policeman. I closed the door in the policeman's face to prevent him from coming inside to bring himself in trouble.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am glad the hon. member mentioned that, because I will disclose how untrue that is. When I approached the dining room, the door was shut. I knocked on the door; I do not know if it was one of the employees who opened the door, but shortly afterwards the half-door was opened and I was allowed to enter. The Officer who was in charge of the detail, as far as I know, was standing not more than four or five feet from the door. As the hon. junior member for St. Andrew reported, knowing what situation I may possibly be confronted with, I asked the Officer not to move from where he was. As a matter of fact, I invited him to stand closer to the step and he never entered the dining room. At no time did he enter the dining room. I said I did not know what is going to happen, "so do you mind staying here to see that no incident takes place."

I entered the dining room; I spoke to none of the other members; I went straight to His Honour the Speaker, and I told him that it had been reported to me as I have already related to hon. members of this House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was speaking to the Speaker when the Prime Minister entered, and he did not go straight to the Speaker. He made a remark, and he spoke to the policeman before he spoke to the Speaker. It is simply not true that the Prime Minister went straight to the Speaker.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is saying what he thinks took place, and I am saying what I know took place on that occasion. I am saying what took place in my presence, because I was a party to the

whole matter. I am a member of this House, and I went to His Honour and I reported to him. His Honour half-rose from his Chair, but never stood up at that stage. I reported to him. I said first: "Mr. Speaker, I am asking your permission to allow the Sergeant to remain at the door until this matter is cleared up " - or words to that effect. *(Interruption)*

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not have that sort of conduct in here.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was I who prevented the policeman from entering the room. I also chased the Hon. Prime Minister from the door.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. At no time did Sgt. Herbert attempt to enter that dining room. If he had, it would have been quite in keeping with his duty, because at a certain stage there certainly was something closely approaching a breach of the peace. Nobody can tell me that this House is so invested with sanctity that if members are committing murder inside of that dining room, having brought Sgt. Herbert and three other policemen here to maintain law and order and make sure that people's lives and integrity are sacrosanct, that he could not enter the dining room to prevent a breach of the peace, or murder, from taking place.

It is all very well and good to talk about the days of the planters, but the planters were brought up in a different tradition. We do not see eye to eye; but when it comes to the standards of values in dealing with other people they will call you all sorts of names, but you will never get the same kind of criminal behaviour to which this Island has been exposed.

I refuse to accept that a member of this House cannot invite the Speaker to allow a Police Sergeant to stand at the door, so that a person who is carrying out a contract for and on behalf of the House can have a free entry and exit in the place where he is supposed to be working. That is exactly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I invited His Honour the Speaker to do, and I said these words: "False imprisonment is false imprisonment whether it takes place in the precincts of the House, or whether it takes place somewhere outside." I said: "I want you to allow Sgt. Herbert to remain here at this door to make sure that no further breach takes place." I did not say "of the peace" at that stage; I said "no further breach."

Mr. Speaker, they themselves, particularly the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, spoke. Four of them spoke, but not one of us here said a word. The Speaker was present, thank God. *(Interruption)* Small things amuse small minds, and we have always heard that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot accept a proposition that it is a breach of privilege. None of them has said that Sgt. Herbert did anything, or put his hand on any member. None of them has suggested that I invited, or the Speaker invited Sgt. Herbert to arrest any member, because members are certainly immune from arrest. But if they want to get in there, whether with opened or behind closed doors, and poison somebody or commit murder, then Sgt. Herbert's duty actually would be to break down that door and go in there and apprehend them, if necessary, if some such action was taking place.

They have admitted that they falsely detained Mr. E. C. Jones, the caterer, by locking him inside the dining room to prevent the members of the Government - The first time for fifteen months since they came in here that I have ever eaten in here was today, because we had something to discuss. I do not go near that dining room.

Mr. HUSBANDS rose..... (Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. deputy Speaker, at no time were the two doors - the door that adjoins the passage leading from the House, and the door described by the Hon. Prime Minister as admitting egress into the passage way along the corridor on the Senate - at no time were both doors locked, latched, or barred.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. It may be a point of elucidation, but certainly not a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I never said order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I said " a point of explanation."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A point of explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can only be explaining something that I said about him, or about remarks that he had made. How could it be a different version according to the Gospel of "Saint Kenmore Rhystone"?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Who is that?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said "according to the Gospel of "Saint Kenmore Rhystone".

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if he is in a happy mood, I will let him off.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I must be serious about this. Here are self-avowed breakers of the peace: people who tell you, "We locked the door because we were hurt."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. You gave an earlier Ruling that certain remarks were general. The Prime Minister is categorising four members of the Opposition who have spoken as saying that they locked the door, that they are self-confessed breakers of the peace, and that they admitted they falsely detained Mr. E. C. Jones. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my speech I said I was never in the same room as Mr. Jones. I made no reference to a locked

door, and I am sure I confessed to breaking no peace. Those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been directed at me by saying that four members of the Opposition spoke.
5.45 p.m.

The Prime Minister must withdraw that statement. I never detained Mr. Jones, I never saw him, I never locked the door and I never broke any peace. As it happened, I was also present when the fancy story, which the Hon. Prime Minister is now telling the House, did not take place about what he said of the Speaker; but that is by the way. *(Asides)*

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the position. Right is wrong and wrong is right; day is night and black is white. It is now degrading.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is anybody in order to speak when a point of order is rightly made and not yet decided on?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What point of order is he talking about? He got up and made a statement; he did not make any point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am just objecting to the Prime Minister categorising me as a self-confessed breaker of the peace or a false imprisoner. I never said I imprisoned anybody or broke any peace.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked me to rule.
5.55 p.m.

The words handed me by the Deputy Clerk of the Table is:-

"Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am bound to be serious about this. They are self-avowed breakers of the peace - people who tell you they locked the door because we were hurt."

I do not consider those words unparliamentary; I do not consider those words offensive.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may continue without interruption by the hon. senior member for the City, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition framed - and I said "framed" - this Resolution while he was actually on his feet; and in introducing the Resolution, he said that he was not aware of the facts because he was not present. His precise words were that he knew very little about it.

Now, I think it is highly susceptible for a member who knows very little about the facts to move that motion with the kind of emotional language which he used.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. The member must know that it is for the Leader of the Opposition to make a motion of this sort.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is a new constitutional principle; whether it is true or not, whether it is based on fact or fiction, the Leader of the Opposition has interposed his discretion and his long years of parliamentary experience and his personal knowledge of the inaccuracies of his supporters and their predelictions for malice on the House that he must, on each and every occasion that somebody comes and tells him something, maliciously get up and make a motion either against the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, or the Leader of the Government or Leader of the House. This is a new principle that has been enunciated here today.

I cannot accept these new improvised rules that are invented here from time to time just because somebody is older than somebody else, and a lot of ignorant ones who pose with Combermere blazers believe that they are the fountain of all wisdom. I cannot have this improvisation in the serious business of the people.

What did the Leader of the Opposition get up and say? Listen to this:-

"That this House views with the utmost gravity and consternation a breach of the privileges of members of the House of Assembly committed by the Prime Minister - this is me - in invoking the aid of a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force to restrain the freedom of movement of hon. members."

The remarkable thing is that he had the sense to keep quiet - as I know he used to in the Other Place - listen to the arguments, then get up and sum up and be very effective with it. You have to give the devil his due. But I would say this, Sir. Not a single man has so perjured himself here today as to say that Sergeant Herbert has restrained any member of this House or that I, the Prime Minister of Barbados, invited Sergeant Herbert to restrain any member of this House. On the contrary, I invited the Speaker to allow Sergeant Herbert to prevent Mr. Jones from being restrained. So I am pilloried and castigated, and this is a breach of privilege of the House to ensure that a member of the public may not suffer false imprisonment, murder, manslaughter, or that something like that does not take place.

If the facts of history are being distorted now, then I am guilty; I am guilty like Thomas Moore in this respect. I would have to be guilty because there are a new set of standards which we are now witnessing. Wrong is right, day is night, black is white; so everything now is turned upside down. Therefore, when you ask the Officer of the Peace or the Speaker to use his influence to see that people can come in and out, that is restraining members by the mere fact that you invite the Speaker to see that somebody does not get murdered or that violence does not take place.

I have said "murder" deliberately because I have heard on more than one occasion that the Leader of the Opposition himself said that he would commit murder to stay in power. I heard him say that he

would join forces with the devil - meaning the member for the City - to get the Democratic Labour Party out.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order.

(ASIDES)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He said so; he referred to you as the devil.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is on his feet making a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is perfectly fresh in hon. members' memories; you do not have to ask the Reporter this time. The Prime Minister said that I would commit murder in order to stay in power. I object to it. It is most offensive.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister said that he heard the Leader of the Opposition to say those words.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: And I object to that too. I object to his saying so. I have not said so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I heard you say so at the Workers' Union.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have never said so in my life. That is saying that I am threatening to commit a criminal offence.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is not the first time. I have reminded the hon. member about it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would go further and say that this is what he said.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am merely reporting what took place in the presence of other people.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have risen on a point of order to say that that is an offensive remark and the hon. member should withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not regard it as offensive in that he did not say that you did it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not believe it. He does not have the courage to do it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have ruled. Will both hon. members please sit?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Can I continue the debate now?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If you did not waste the time of the House with this foolishness, I would not have exposed it. I said that you really could not be serious. I said, sitting at the Barbados Workers' Union, that you could not be serious talking about doing murder. He said, "I would murder my own mother." I said: "I know she is dead; and if I had any proof that you had done it, I would have been the first person to prosecute you, but I do not believe it." So I would tell the hon. member that I do not believe that he would do it. He has not got the courage even to murder himself.

(ASIDES)

That is all right. We all must die some time. I may die before you. The only thing is that you are afraid to die and I am not. I have faced death many times before; so I can die right now. If one of you had guns.... I hear them say that they are bringing guns here..... You can shoot me. That is alright with me.

(ASIDES)

Now, Sir, the Resolution states:-

"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."

6.05 p.m.

What I am merely illustrating is that this is the direct opposite, because it was they who were restraining the freedom of Mr. Jones. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has admitted that he locked or blocked the door. We have evidence that other people had restrained his freedom, and I invited His Honour the Speaker who, I hope, will be in the Chair to see that a breach of the peace did not take place by keeping the Sergeant stationed outside the door, and that is exactly what he is sent to this House to do, to prevent breaches of the peace. If that is a breach of the privileges of this House, I do not want to have anything to do with this kind of privileges where people can lock a room and maybe murder a man inside, and then say it is a breach of privilege if you try to restrain them. So I want to get this straight. There is no difference between locking up Mr. Jones in the room there and preventing him from taking food to members of the Government.

They say we are talking about food. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas talked about fellowship.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister continues saying that I locked the door. I admitted that I locked the door, and I told the caterer Mr. Jones to serve those there first and then the others; so it is no sense the Hon. Prime Minister saying something about murder being committed. I told the caterer to serve those in the lunch room first and then the others, because he had men like children sitting down there and sending out to Our Lord and Saviour, and that is what caused me to close that door.

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

Mr. SMITH: He had men sitting down there looking at him, and he was sending out to the ones who can save his life.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am deeply grateful to the hon. member for his intervention, because his solicitor, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, was swearing in here that he never said he locked the door.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are a liar; you cannot help lying. What was I swearing to? You really cannot help lying. I am sitting here very quietly, but the hon. member has an obsession for murder and shooting.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not going to ask him to withdraw because he is calling you a liar.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, I mean you. I mean the Prime Minister.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, I will ask you to withdraw that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown please withdraw?

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you want me to withdraw, I will withdraw; but as a classic of mendacity, he is the boss.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not really take the hon. member seriously. I understand his agitation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have no agitation, but you have an obsession for murder and poisoning. I am sitting down here listening and having my fun, while you have been talking about murder and poisoning all evening. Is somebody going to poison you? Is it a man or a woman?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If you are surrounded by murders and poisoners.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not worried about what is going on.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Don't go and eat a lot of stinking food from other men's wives! Why are you worried about poisoning?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know why the hon. member is so agitated now that we are analysing the alleged motion for breach of privilege. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I can now be heard in silence, you will see therefore that out of the admissions made, reiterated and emphasised particularly by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, there was any restraining, it was restraining by at least the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, because he said "I locked the door". I am not going to go into the refinements about the question of somebody being served first or served second. False imprisonment is false imprisonment, no matter what justification you may think you have for it, and I merely told the Speaker in these terms: "False imprisonment is false imprisonment no matter where it takes place, and I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that you allow the Sergeant to remain here to make sure that a breach does not take place." For these words there is a debate lasting from 2.30 p.m. until after 6 o'clock; and not one single item of Government Business has been done. Why? Because it is their intention that the session should expire without the people's work being done; but I want to warn them that as long as I am around, it will be done. I know you do not like me to be here to answer, but I want to tell the hon. senior member for St. Thomas something. I have heard a lot of mealy-mouthed hypocrisy in my life, but I want to tell the hon. member, when he talks about fellowship, that they have declared war. They have created a state tantamount to civil war in Barbados. When they talk about fellowship, we want no fellowship with them; we want fellowship with members of our Party and with people who support us. We do not want fellowship with our enemies. He said something about fellowship, and all this mealy-mouthed nonsense about fellowship is like talking.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I object to the use of the expression "mealy-mouthed nonsense" about my speech or any part of it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you see how intent they are in causing disruption. If the hon. member thinks that it imputes improper motives, I withdraw it. But I want to say this: the kind of fellowship.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please take his seat?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the confusion, perhaps Your Honour did not notice that the Prime Minister had withdrawn the remarks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is fellowship and fellowship. There is fellowship of people who have like ideas and want to do certain things for the benefit of humanity, whether they are Christians, Socialist politicians or otherwise. There is also the kind of fellowship that you get with the lamb and the lion, where one is in fellowship with the other inside of the other one's guts. There is the kind of fellowship that you would get with a slimy, slithery rattle-snake or boa constrictor which you take and put on your pillow; therefore there is fellowship and fellowship. There are some fellowships which are not conducive to harmonious relationships, and therefore it is better to be intolerant.

I want to tell them this: do not talk anything about fellowship, because for all the time I have been in this Island, 90 percent of them over there did not find it necessary to invite me or any of the members on this side to sit and dine with them. They sat and dined with their friends. Why because you come into the House of Assembly are they so agitated and call themselves lepers? You may consider yourself political lepers. They do not want to hear these things, but we have to be harsh and face up to realities in this country. They are creating a state of disruption and

civil war in this country and getting all kinds of elements in order to create disharmony in this Island. 6.15 p.m.

Whatever they say about the planters, I would rather be in fellowship with Dr. Verwoerd of South Africa than with some of the people on the other side. I would be much sooner in fellowship with some of the plantocracy of this Island, because they have certain standards of conduct inside of this Chamber, whatever their standards of conduct are outside. I do not see why they are agitated. The real thing that is irritating them is that we have withdrawn our fellowship from them. So be it. We have withdrawn it because we do not think that it is in the best interest that we should be consorting too closely with people who only mean us harm. I do not see that we are under any social or political obligation in this country to congregate with people who would push a knife down our backs if they had the slightest opportunity. It is as simple as that, but that has nothing to do with the debate; I am just straightening the record for them.

I want to say that if I have to invite His Honour to get the whole Police Force inside here to prevent them from detaining Mr. Jones or any law-abiding member of the general public of Barbados, either inside or outside the precincts of this House, then I intend to commit that kind of privilege again.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this meeting today is the 41st meeting between the 30th January, 1966, and the 30th January, 1968. I am going to simply say that we have had approximately 12 outbursts of tempers in here. Of the 12, Sir, except for the one unfortunate incident, which included the Deputy Prime Minister, the Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition, he was responsible. For the other 11 the Prime Minister's presence is responsible for the problems, the arguments and the delay of work in this Hon. Chamber. Whenever the hon. senior member for St. John comes into this Hon. Chamber, there is an argument, there are problems, and every possible thing goes wrong.

(Interruption)

At this stage the Hon. Prime Minister left the Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CRAIG: I have one or two things to tell him this evening. I am confident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that tomorrow morning when the world reads the newspaper headlines they will be sensationalised. They can safely say: "FOOD ROW IN PARLIAMENT STARTED BY BARROW." Sir, I know you will call upon me to say 'the hon. senior member for St. John.' At that time he was inside the dining room and not in the House. I can -(Mr. MOTTLEY: "You cannot do that - call him 'Mr. Barrow'.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please let me draw to the attention of the hon. member Order 26, Rule 6, which states: "No member shall refer to any other member by name."

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was only quoting headlines.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry; you were only quoting headlines.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, tomorrow morning when he sees the news, the *Barbados Advocate*, the *Truth*, the *Beacon* and the *Observer*, he will see what I have spoken about. In the interest of the people of Barbados, I hope that they will never see this: "FOOD ROW IN PARLIAMENT CAUSED BY BIG FLUFFLY BARROW". That is what I say you should read in the newspapers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to control himself.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am in complete control. Thank you for your observations, but I am in complete control. When history is recorded from the speeches made in this ancient Chamber today, what does it all amount to? Twenty-four hon. members - look at our complexion; one destiny for the people of this country. Look around you. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure, along with the Speaker of this House, along with the Minister of Community Development, along with the Minister of Agriculture, along with the Chairman of Committees, along with the hon. junior member for St. George, have all sat in the dining room and dined with us. Who is complaining about joining in fellowship? We sat in the dining room and we have had our lunch together. We have exchanged views together. How can the Hon. Prime Minister come here and say that there is no fellowship? He is fooling himself. He is the person who is going to murder himself. He is going to murder himself when he sees the power, the lust and the things he has been fighting for day after day to remain under his control slipping away slowly from his hands. That is his problem. Whenever he is in this House there is trouble.

I must confess that I would rather see - and this is a compliment and a very sincere one - the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister be the Prime Minister of this country before I see then hon. senior members for St. John. At least, for conduct, he handles his business with common decency and, as Your Honour and as the Speaker of this House today said, when hon. members go to a University, when hon. members are lawyers, they are addressed as hon. gentlemen. It is unfortunate that the Inn he attended, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could not be proud of him - not even Lord Douglas.

What happened in the dining room today, Sir? I saw with my own eyes not only the caterer and his staff taking lunch out, but also a different type of lunch. They were served with chicken. I have no interest where food is concerned. The others in the

dining hall were served with something else. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph asked one simple question. Why were we not served first? We were elected in here together; we came in here together under the same democratic right. The Prime Minister did not come here in any golden chariot. It is the same people with their trousers patched and with no shoes on their feet who gave him the power to rule and to sleep in comfort in Culloden Farm. Those are the same people. It is the humble, simple folk who day after day must walk this earth and till the land for their daily bread that give him the right to abuse them today. That is the person to abuse them, but I will always remember this.

Imagine what the Senate, the Other Place, has come to! Can you imagine members of the House of Commons going into the House of Lords to sit down and eat lunch where you have Monarchs delivering their Throne Speech? His Excellency the Governor-General, visiting dignitaries, Heads of Government go to the Legislature and sit down to hear speeches. What has it been brought to today, Sir? A dining hall for a few lackeys. I regret that I have to use such strong language, but certain members of the other side must be included. It is regrettable.

If the Prime Minister is accustomed to fighting about the road for a pork chop and that kind of thing, at least, when he comes here he should give us a little respect that the people of this country have afforded him. It is not the members of this side that he is abusing. He is disrespecting the country as a whole. That is what he is doing. It is always unfortunate that the Police and the defenceless people are drawn into certain things.

I must say that the Sergeant - I believe he was slow in thinking, but, if he was, it served him well. Here was he bringing a Police Sergeant without asking His Honour the Speaker, who is the chief executive of this House, for permission to bring a policeman to restrain members - not even a Chief Inspector. The Speaker was sitting there and he jumped up and asked, "What has happened, Errol?" 6.25 p.m.

Behind him he had a short, fat man and a big, fat man. The short, fat man snatched two plates of food and went outside, while the big fat man said that he was sorry to see what happened. One was a little too close to the ground. This is nothing that one could be proud of at all, Sir. It is unfortunate, and it is because members on this side should stand up like men to make the Prime Minister understand that he can only be Prime Minister after he is elected by this country; they must give him the votes for him to be Prime Minister. And the hon. junior member for St. Andrew jumps to his feet and he sees absolutely nothing wrong with this! I would ask him how would he feel if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was the Prime Minister of this country and had treated him with this respect. This is nothing else but contempt and a scorn, just like if he is some Kiaiki King; but time heals a wound. Let the 150 demonstrators as checked carefully, I am sure, by the Deputy Prime Minister serve as a warning to the Government that we are here to do the people's business and not to make unnecessary quarrels between 24 noble men.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what do they leave for the people who fight in the fish market? Absolutely nothing. What example can the Prime Minister set the country? He gets up in here with absolutely no defence and all he has done so far is to use his sly scathing remarks about the Hon. Leader of the Opposition! And, of course, I must say - I know that he will probably ask me to withdraw this - that I have him as a giant of lies. *(Asides)* When it comes to fabricating stories, the Learned Prime Minister can be marked down as No. 1. The Prime Minister said that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition told him that he would.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that. (Mr. CRAIG: I beg your pardon, Sir.) The hon. member has said, that a member of Parliament is good at fabricating stories. Will he please withdraw that remark?

Mr. CRAIG: With all due respect to your high office, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw it. Since the Prime Minister can stand up in here boldly, and it is reported that the Leader of the Opposition told him that he would murder his mother for power, the Prime Minister told me that he burned the records at the Hilton Hotel. The Prime Minister told me that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there seems to be no limit to the virulence with which the Prime Minister is attacked whether he is in his place or not; but it certainly could not be within the Standing Orders or within the bounds of decency or fair-play for the hon. member to say that the Prime Minister burned the records of the Hilton Hotel and that the Prime Minister told him that. I deny it in part or on the whole, because it is not true and it has no right to be said.

Mr. CRAIG: I might agree with the Deputy Prime Minister that he does not believe me that the Prime Minister told me so, but I am saying that the Prime Minister told me so. The same way that one could believe, or that members on the other side could sit there and believe, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please stick to the motion which is before the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am afraid that I myself wish to contribute to this debate and I will do so in due season, but surely, the hon. member cannot just say that the Prime Minister told him that he, the Prime Minister, had destroyed the records of the Hilton Hotel. He must realise that this is the most serious thing that anybody could say about a member of the Government, and certainly about the Head of the Government in a community. It is not true, as I know it is not true, and he should withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has said what he says was told to him by the Prime Min-

ister. I do not see anything offensive in that. I should like the hon. member to stick to the Resolution, though.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I really do not wish to be annoying and interrupting the hon. member.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is not a point of order. What is the hon. member speaking on?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, here we go now. *(Asides)* Mr. Deputy Speaker, the difference is that the Prime Minister was in his place and had said certain things about the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was in a position to deny, and, in fact, did so, and no other hon. member had the right to intervene. The case is somewhat altered now; the Prime Minister is not now in his place, and the hon. member has said that the Prime Minister.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House that I have already ruled. *(Cheers from the Opposition.)*

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Deputy Prime Minister can believe what the Prime Minister said, I see absolutely no reason why he cannot believe what I said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to stick to the motion before the House.

Mr. CRAIG: I must confess that I would not be holding up the business of this House much longer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not accuse the hon. member of holding up the business of the House.

Mr. CRAIG: Neither have I said that. I know you wouldn't either, knowing you as well as I do. I have no desire to hold up the business of the House any longer, but I wish to say how deflated I feel over the entire debate caused by the actions of the Prime Minister today in the lunch room which is a part of the precincts of this House. I know, Sir, that none of us around this table could justly feel proud of it. 6.35 p.m.

I wish to assure you, Sir, that when our children's children have been given the opportunity to read today's debate, they will again hang their heads in shame for another outstanding ridiculous display by the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that out of all that has been said here on this Resolution this afternoon, the Leader of the House and the Deputy Prime Minister must be an extremely happy man. Why do I say so? The Democratic Labour Party is already split from top to bottom and I am sure that when at some future date what has happened today - not very distant from now - the matter is brought before the National Executive of the Government Party that the Deputy Prime Minister will see the Prime Ministership resting more closely on his head than ever before in his life because I am sure that they are ardent supporters of the Government Party who feel as sorely as we on this side feel over this incident today.

There can be no doubt that the Prime Minister has found himself involved in a row for food. Make no mistake about that. I tell you that there is a good old maxim, a brief statement of general principle, truth or rule of conduct and it goes something like this; "Those of high birth, wealth or social position must behave generously or nobly towards others." Therefore, if we find today with a degree of certainty - whether it be by the exhibition of behaviour by the Hon. Prime Minister - and we found that he does not fall then within this pyramid, if he does not fall within what we call the noblesse oblige, it is no fault of ours.

We on this side, Sir, are deeply touched. I am particularly so, Sir, in my constituency of St. Peter I think I can say that something like 58.8 per cent of the electorate cast their vote for the Barbados Labour Party. Now, Sir, I am to hear that after the Prime Minister of this country in the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party of 1961 - General Elections 1961 - and with your permission. I would just read one paragraph on page two. It goes like this:-

"Discussions have already been commenced with one of the biggest thermo-plastic concerns in the U.S.A. with reference to the establishment in Barbados of a factory to provide plastic shoes which can be sold at about six shillings a pair for children and less than double that for adults. The shoes are designed for tropical wear and would put an end to people walking about unshod in Barbados."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can stop there. You will understand, Sir, how hon. members on this side of the House must feel after the Prime Minister promised the people these cheap shoes - six shillings a pair - since 1961, the same Prime Minister sweating like a horse collar is going to tell the people about bare-foot, unclad. He promised them cheap shoes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I can say is this. It seems to me that it is impossible for the Prime Minister to think generously or nobly about anybody. He has demonstrated that he cannot think in such terms of even hon. members on his side of the House. If he finds it impossible - too difficult to think in such terms, how can he think better or anything different of the people who supported the Barbados Labour Party at the last general elections?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister is a bit worried. Do you know why, Sir? Because what has taken place here today may eventually see the Prime Minister having to relinquish the Chairmanship of his own Party. But that does not necessarily mean that the mantle of the Prime Ministership would fall on the present Deputy Prime Minister. I want to give the Deputy Prime Minister a little bit of advice. There is a present Senator - the Hon. Attorney Gen-

eral - who is preparing, and prepared, to take over the Prime Ministership at any given chance.
6.45 p.m.

It is not going to be as easy as the Deputy Prime Minister may think. All in all, Sir, something has happened in this Hon. House today that touches on the dignity of this Chamber. What are we hearing? Believe me, Sir, I am becoming increasingly nervous when I hear hon. members from that side of the House begin to tell you of the esteem in which they would like to hold the name of Barbados, because when I sit on this side and have to witness the sorry exhibitions by those hon. members, I must shudder. It seems to me that they have absolutely no sense of values when they say certain things.

The Hon. Prime Minister would like it said, and he has intimated and suggested that we in the Opposition are dragging the country down. Mr. Deputy Speaker, no such task now remains for the Opposition nor the Government. The country is already down. The Prime Minister has been the principal character in dragging it down both at home and overseas. He has done everything that is humanly possible to make very businessman in Bridgetown and the poorest cane-cutter in St. Andrew, St. John and elsewhere feel ashamed of this country. I am satisfied from what happened today that the Prime Minister is attempting to keep the whole from what he calls the broken, but what the Prime Minister has really succeeded to a point in doing is this: he has taken away the cracked from the uncracked. You know, Sir, that bones may be cracked in the foot; but when the head is cracked, it is a different story altogether. I believe that some of his supporters and members have been equally as nervous as His Honour the Speaker. Do you know that from the time I came to this House, I have always had cause to admire the hearty appetite of His Honour the Speaker? He can really give an account of himself at the dining table. Today His Honour found himself so broken, so taken by surprise; and what was the element of surprise? The Prime Minister turned up at the dining hall with jacket off, sweating profusely like a pot cover - sweating and fuming. The Speaker jumped up and asked: "What is all this, Errol", as if to tell the Prime Minister that this does not now become our nation. "Your conduct does not now become us". The Speaker spoke in such terms that anybody other than a madman would have understood that the Speaker was trying to get the Prime Minister to control himself. We are sure, however, that the Prime Minister is protected by the two daily newspapers. His conduct is condoned by them and concealed from the public. With respect to the radio, his Government controls one and his friends control the other, and the Public will not be told about this; but the same Prime Minister will jump up on every platform about Barbados and tell people all sorts of things about the Opposition this and the Opposition that; look what they have brought Parliament to. I may tell you that nobody in this House can bring it to more utter shame and disgrace than the Hon. Prime Minister has done today. There are people who occupied the seats in this Chamber before some of us were born; some of these people have come all the years down; some of them are still alive today. They differed from others on their various points, but they stuck to their guns. Lord have mercy upon us now! What are these people to think of us now?

Really and truly, Barbados is not being dragged down; it has been dragged down already, and we in our position today have a tremendous job on hand to rebuild, to lift and to elevate this country. How can we succeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The chief obstructionist in the rebuilding of this country is the Prime Minister. He gets to his feet today and tell us that he called a policeman to the dining Hall. Why did he call a policeman? Because it had been reported to him that the caterer had been detained against his will in the dining hall.

Now the dining hall is not a place where anybody and everybody can walk in as freely as they like. The dining hall is a place for hon. members of this House; so when the Prime Minister called the Police Sergeant because the caterer, as he alleged, was being detained against his will, it must be taken out of the Prime Minister's mouth that the caterer was being detained against his will by hon. members who had been elected to this Chamber. When he goes on to tell us about committing murder in there and about poisoning, you can understand.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking the hon. member to give way if he will, because I wish to move.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not take the Leader of the House on his word. I do not trust him. The Leader of the House can use his Whips or whatever he likes and communicate with the Leader of the Opposition, and word will reach me in due course. I do not trust the Leader of the House or any member of the Government side on any matter.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sgt. Herbert appeared at the door leading to the dining hall. I sat at the table; I listened to the report the Prime Minister had to make, and it was after I saw that Sgt. Herbert was on the verge of entering the dining hall, I got up and closed the door, because I knew he had not been called by His Honour the Speaker. The Speaker knew absolutely nothing, from what I gathered, about this shifting of the place of dining, and the Clerk of the House had acted merely on the beck and call of the Hon. Prime Minister.

It is a very, very serious state of affairs, because I am to ask at this hour: If an hon. member of this Opposition had been so misguided as the Prime Minister was to have summoned a Police Sergeant, would the Sergeant have moved from where he was on duty? Would he have moved? But we are really and truly seeing something about what is a Police State. When the Prime Minister calls, whether it is to commit murder, or to witness the Prime Minister commit murder, so long as he calls, a policeman will turn up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to my mind, the only person - *(Interruption)* What we are saying is this: The Police Sergeant answered the call, or acted on the direction of the Prime Minister.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order No. 5, Rule 3, this sitting is suspended until 7.45 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt you before you have completed your sentence. Surely, Your Honour might have operated the second part of that Rule. As far as we are concerned on this side of the House, this particular debate on this question can be finished tonight. To sit down without dinner for three-quarters of an hour does not seem to make sense.

The House was suspended accordingly.

7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately prior to the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. He may do so or not, as he thinks fit.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the barefoot people with the saddle patches fought for food today? From the time I came to this House, and especially during the past few meetings, I have seen that some members of the Government, chiefly Ministers, have been dining, not within the precincts of this House, but elsewhere. As my thoughts go back, today being the 30th of the month and it is said that the month of January has more days in it for the housewife than any other month, I am to wonder if it is a case where, as the people often say when it gets close to the end of the month, "the pot turn down".

As I understand it, some of these Ministers have been dining, perhaps lavishly, at Culloden Farm, and we are to wonder what could have gone wrong just a day before the end of the month that could have caused them to be drawing up anywhere about this House, or the precincts thereof, to cause a row as we witnessed here today.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister was aided and abetted by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I understand that prior to being a Minister, the hon. member had done service on board a ship. I do not know if he had been in the catering division or what, but if one could merely recall the manner in which he grabbed the platter today and darted through the door - I did not have an opportunity to get the measurement of his waist-line before, but, with those two large dishes in his hands, one could still see a bulging waistline away ahead as the hon. member turned towards the door. It is that type of behaviour and support that the Prime Minister knows he can draw upon that is responsible, in very great measure, for the distance that he has gone in demonstrating his bad behaviour as he did today.

I remember when the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking, he said that he is a fair man. He said, "I am pretty fair." I am wondering if he really means F E A R. Mr. Speaker, that is over $600 a month in spelling - that word "F E A R", and that is what is sinking the dignity of this Hon. House. It is a case where some hon. members cannot earn outside of this Chamber what they get inside here. 7.50 p.m.

They cannot earn it anywhere. What do you find? As the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has warned them, the Prime Minister might one day lead them to the brink of a cliff, take away his body and let them all go overboard. Honestly, Sir, the sooner the better. References have been made quite regrettably to the parents of members and the like in this House. We do not like to entertain these things at all, never do we like that; but we are coming to a conclusion on this side of the House. We are forced into saying: "Thank God that the parents of some have gone under the cold mould already." You do not like to sing praises at the death of anybody, but when the auctioneer will be calling, God alone in Heaven knows, for sale to the highest bidder - but they are dead. When I heard the hon. junior member for St. Andrew speak and make mention that he is "pretty fair", I knew that he had not concluded his sentence, because he would have gone on to say that he is "pretty fearful" of the Hon. Prime Minister. But, Sir, we on this side of the House are forced - (Mr. CORBIN: We are wasting precious time.) Mr. Speaker, the "Old City Bar" seems to be speaking. *(Laughter)* The "Old City Bar" speaks. *(Laughter)* A breach of privilege of this Hon. House has no doubt been committed. It is no mere joke as to the Prime Minister calling on the Police Sergeant, to do what? According to what he says, to restore the freedom of the caterer of this Hon. House. It means therefore that if the caterer had been denied his freedom, as the Prime Minister alleged, it was being done by hon. members. The Prime Minister alleged that the caterer was wrongfully imprisoned; but if he had been imprisoned, he had been imprisoned at the hands of hon. members of this House. Since the Prime Minister had been very careful to cloak in as witnesses hon. members from the Government side of the House, we are left with coming to on other conclusion than that the Hon. Prime Minister is telling this House that the Opposition members who were in the dining hall at the time referred to, or some of them, had imprisoned unlawfully and illegally the caterer of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, you happened to be present in the dining hall and you know, without my having to say it, that nothing could have been further from the truth. For when you saw, Sir, that something had gone wrong, that all was not well in the demeanour and in the actions of the Prime Minister, you promptly turned to him calling him by his Christian name, and tried to find out what was all that. Mr. Speaker, sitting there this night, I know that you have been hurt; your pride has been wounded like that of hon. members on this side of the House. It was a disgraceful exhibition of bad behaviour on the part of the Prime Minister. But, Sir, what could you have done in the

circumstances? We have got, at this stage, to admire the stand you took; for when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had discovered what had gone wrong and tried to bring it to your attention that he would be making a motion before this Hon. House, time seemed to have been against both of you somewhat and, consequently, we are here today debating this motion until this hour. However one might look at it, people of noble birth, people of wealth or social position must behave generously and honourably towards others.
8.00 p.m.

You and I, Mr. Speaker, are in no way responsible for the Prime Minister's demonstration today. It is proof tantamount that he has fallen short of noble birth, high birth, wealth or social position or if we by some twist of mind believe he is suffering from some physical disability or whatever it might be, he has shown us in no uncertain terms that on no occasion can he be expected to behave generously or nobly towards others.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, Sir, to take the Prime Minister to task whenever the occasion comes. He has got to be stopped at some stage or the other. On no occasion can he stand up and address this Hon. House without using some abusive or insulting language. I know that on every occasion, before you can arrest an opportunity to check him once, he would have gone on three, four, five, six, seven, eight or nine times, but I am asking that something be done to bring the Prime Minister to his senses.

Let him understand that he is one hon. member in this Chamber. Everybody here might not be a Prime Minister at one time; but because he fills that office, he has no more rights, no more privileges, than any other hon. member in this House. I am to say that the Prime Minister seems to feel that even some persons who occupy that Chair are inferior to him. He tries to make us believe that. But I tell you, Sir, if the Prime Minister wants to see a true record of family history, he has got much mess to clean up.

Sir, I have a message for the Hon. Prime Minister. He would not stay to receive it, but I am sure that I would be here and the occasion will present itself for me to deliver that message to the Hon. Prime Minister. This is what I say. He will not look the public of Barbados in their faces again, but they will have known the truth about it. I must repeat that the Prime Minister is not in his place at this moment, but he has got to correct all the mess he has made. He has run and gone.

As I have said earlier, the Leader of the House and Deputy Prime Minister is standing by, perhaps, readying himself so that when the Crown falls, it may rest somewhere on his shoulders, if not on his head. We know what to expect from the Leader of the House. We know that at some times he can jump to his feet and out of the blue, Mr. Speaker, shoot out something that has never occurred, or might never occur; but nevertheless, he will direct our attention to it although it might not be touching on the veracity of anything.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we feel that in the role of Prime Minister, there is a type of behaviour, there is a standard below which he should not fall on any occasion. Mr. Speaker, the name of this island is dragged down in the deepest of gutters. That is what the Prime Minister is doing. What has gone on here today could very well have been avoided because no hon. member of this House came in here expecting any such thing to take place. We came in here today to do the people's business: but what has turned out? For the greater part of the day, the House of Assembly has been discussing a row over food and it was started by the Prime Minister. That is where the Prime Minister is leading this country.

Sir, he is causing the youth of the country to rebel; he is showing the youth by his behaviour here today how they should act outside. Take it seriously. What the Prime Minister has done to the youth of this country today? By the behaviour of the Prime Minister, the youth must accept it as the standard by which they must act. That must be the standard of the behaviour now.

I am appealing to you, Sir, to help us in the Opposition to put the Prime Minister in his place. Sir, when he came out there in the dining hall today, some one told him that he wanted a slap in his face and I did not administer this slap because I was not one hundred per cent sure that he would have found a witness. If I had known with a degree of certainty that he would not have had a witness, I would have planted my hands in his face and told him to go and behave himself.

The Prime Minister of this country has a lot to thank me for. If he is not now in his place, it is no fault of mine. When the Prime Minister was frequenting a brothel, a bawdy house.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to avoid that sort of language which is uncalled for and which is not helpful nor within the scope of the debate. We do not want to hear anything about brothels and bawdy houses.
8.10 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we feel that in the role of Prime Minister, there is a type of behaviour, there is a standard below which he should not fall on any occasion. Mr. Speaker, the name of this island is dragged down in the deepest of gutters. That is what the Prime Minister is doing. What has gone on here

trying to ascertain as best they could the names of the persons who went in and how long they remained. Knowing the Hon. Prime Minister to fill a very high position in this community, I took it upon myself on his return from a trip to Canada to meet him at the entrance of this House downstairs and tell him all I knew that was going on and the actions of the police, and warned him to keep away from this Belleville house. The members on that side of the House are afraid to say anything to the Prime Minister; they are not free to have a discussion with him and try to turn him back. But I did that. Why? He is the Prime Minister and I felt that at every stage of his life, whether public or private, it should be such that it could stand examination. That is my only concern. His life should be such that it could be a mirror. If the Prime Minister looked into a mirror today, what would he see? I feel that at whatever angle he looks into a mirror, he sees Jenkins before him; he sees Black Rock before him, because the Prime Minister as you know once lived at Black Rock; but now the house in which he lived is being rented by a Doctor from the Mental Hospital who takes patients there privately; so that even if the Prime Minister returns to his old home, it is only a question of returning to his old home.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not understand how this house in Black Rock has anything to do with the breach of the privileges of members of the House here.

Mr. HINDS: It is just this, Mr. Speaker. On the conduct of the Prime Minister in this Assembly today, one is entitled, I think, Mr. Speaker, to focus attention on any activity of his life.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I disagree with that, because a Resolution is nothing so wide, and in fact could not be so wide. It says: "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 is obviously in reference to some incident or alleged incident of today. And then it goes on: "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." That I take it also refers to what is alleged to have taken place today. This has nothing to do with the life and history or life and time of the Hon. Prime Minister. It is his conduct today, and that which occurred today.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is the principal offender, according to the terms of this Resolution before us. I am not trying to dig up and exhume, but I am trying to mirror, however critically, the make-up of the offender. It is not to be taken in the same vein as if the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, for instance, had behaved in the same manner as the Prime Minister. If the hon. junior member for St. Andrew had misbehaved himself or had done anything, one would write it off, and a building not far from here would carry the blame and it would end there; but what has the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister reduced himself to? I am to wonder if hon. members on that side still see the Prime Minister as their Leader judging from his behaviour today. Money is responsible for a lot. The dollar, Sir, to some people is still mighty. There are many unemployed who undoubtedly have to try to keep away from joining those ranks.

One cannot say in this House that, for instance, the Prime Minister or any hon. member believes in obeah; but, Mr. Speaker, it seems to us that the Prime Minister has been told that for him to enter the dining hall of this House, he has got to go under the protection of the Police.

8.20 p.m.

That is what we see. I do not know that the Police uniform has even been known to keep away spirits. I do not know if the Prime Minister thinks so. There was a time when the Police had to leave Central Station and hasten to the Prime Minister's residence at Culloden Farm when the Prime Minister was seeing a man going through the keyhole. All of these things are true; you will find them on record in the Police diary. The Prime Minister was seeing men going through the keyhole at Culloden Farm. That is why you have heard, Mr. Speaker, as, perhaps, I have heard, of the many different places that the Prime Minister has slept - not like "George Washington slept there". So, Mr. Speaker, we want you to take all of these things into consideration.

Let me tell you, Sir. I know that some of the hon. members on that side still have what is called shame about them, and some of them are as deeply hurt as anybody on this side of the House. I would like to tell the Leader of the House that the hon. junior member for St. George is bitter; he is hurt by the exhibition of the bad behaviour on the part of his Prime Minister today. He is hurt, and he does not know how to go back and face his people in St. George, after hearing the House of Assembly rowing for food, and the Prime Minister is the principal character.

Why do I make reference to that hon. member? He is not blessed with any Parliamentary Secretaryship that might put a limitation to the exercise of his conscience, and that is why I would like to appeal to this hon. member to get up, whether the Leader of the House likes it or not, and say - let it go on record that he disapproves of any bad behaviour by any hon. member of this House, and moreso by the Hon. Prime Minister who should be setting the Nation an example. I am sure that if the electorate of St. George knew that they had a representative with that amount of stamina in a crisis such as this, they would decide once and for all that here is someone who has been entrusted with small things, and it is our duty to entrust him with much.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I must say that I am satisfied with the part I have played today in preventing Sgt. Herbert from abusing, under the direction of the Prime Minister, his powers as a Police Sergeant. Had Sgt. Herbert generated, or collected, as much steam in his bosom, or his head, as the Prime

Minister, God alone knows what would have happened on these premises here today. While I closed the door as though to bar the Sergeant from entering to bring himself into difficulty with something that does not at all concern him, I am still to compliment him. I appreciate his difficulties, and especially how they are being indoctrinated as if to feel that they are policemen of the Government Party and all that sort of nonsense. But, Sir, further questions will arise.

We now find that the Government Party are withdrawing themselves from other members of the House, when it comes to dining. That is their privilege; let them exercise it. But, Sir, the country is watching their behaviour pattern - the country is following the behaviour pattern of the Prime Minister and his Party. I said earlier that there is a division in the Democratic Labour Party. There is a division in this community.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m., the moment for interruption. The business on hand is, I rather get the impression, somewhat controversial. (Mr. MOTTLEY: How do you know that?) Of that, in fact, I have no doubt at all that the matter is controversial.

Mr. SMITH: I think that we should go on and finish the matter within the next half-an-hour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, we cannot proceed any more with this measure which is obviously, manifestly, and extremely controversial, but we may proceed with other business on the Order Paper, if I have an assurance that any other matter on the Order Paper is not regarded as controversial. We may so proceed until 9 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to continue with Government Business, and I beg to move.....

Mr. SMITH: What is before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Something which is certainly not controversial.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: If there is something that is not controversial, we can deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House says he is not prepared to proceed any more with Government Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There are some things on the Order Paper which are not controversial, and we can deal with them.

8.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House says that he is not prepared to go on with any more Government Business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 13th February, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 13th February, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.35 p.m.