

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1966 - 71

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th January, 1970.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker) Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY, C.B.E., J.P.; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology) Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M.A., (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. R. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. c. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; and Mr. J. B. SPRINGEH.

Prayers were read.

Hon. C. E. TALMA entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minutes of the meetings of Tuesday, 11th November, 1969, Tuesday, 18th November, 1969, and Wednesday, 19th November, 1969, have all been laid and ready for confirmation.

If there are no objections, these Minutes will be confirmed. There being no objections, the Minutes of the aforesaid dates are now confirmed.

LETTER FROM AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Auditor General re Statements of Account of the Accountant General and Appropriation and Revenue Accounts for the Year 1968-69.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. YEARWOOD and Mr. SMITH entered the Chamber and took their seats.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Senate acknowledging the receipt of the Message from the Hon. the House of Assembly regarding the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament. It reads as follows

"THE SENATE

TO

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Senate has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Message from the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament to consider the organization of the Offices of Parliament, and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that it accepts the invitation and has appointed a Select Committee comprising the following members to consider, jointly with a Committee of the House, the aforementioned proposal:

His Honour the President

Senator the Honourable P.M. Greaves

Senator the Honourable F. G. Smith

Senator H. F. Alkins, C.B.E.

Senator R. G. Mapp.

(Sgd. E. S. Robinson)

PRESIDENT. 17th December, 1969."

Accounts and Statement, March 1968, prepared by the Accountant General, have also been laid.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay Statement of Monies paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police for the quarter ended on 31st March 1969.

Also, Statement of monies paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police for the quarter ended on 30th June, 1969.

Also, Agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Sweden relating to Air Services.

Also, Agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Denmark relating to Air Services.

Also, Agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Norway relating to Air Services.

Also, The Development Plan 1969-72.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the year ended 31st December, 1967, and

The Customs Duties (Supreme Industries Limited) Order, 1969.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Trade and Tourism, I am commanded to lay The Eighteenth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Natural Gas Corporation for the year 1968-69.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the Note to Item 15 of Head 102-Communications and Works, Part II - Capital of the Approved Estimates for 1969-70, and

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of several parcels of land in St. Peter as described in the Schedule to the Resolution for purpose of Highway Improvement.

Hon. J. C TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the lease to Dr. Charles D. Russell, of a parcel of land in St. Peter, as described in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. YEARWOOD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by

the Crown of a parcel of land at Farmers, St. Thomas as described in the Schedule to the Resolution for the provision of a playing field.

Also, a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at Belleplaine, St. Andrew, as described in the Schedule to the Resolution for the construction of an out-patient clinic.

Also, a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at Hopewell Plantation, St. Thomas, as described in the Schedule to the Resolution for use as a playing field, and

A Resolution to place the sum of \$11, 308 at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates, 1969-70, Part I - Current, as shown In the Supplementary Estimates, 1969-70 No. 55, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 50 asked by the hon. junior member for the City is ready.

Hon. J. C, TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 63 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John is ready.

Also the Replies to Parliamentary Questions' Nos. 44 and 45 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 24 asked by the hon. junior member for St. James.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 30 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 34 asked by the hon. junior member for the City.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 38 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next sitting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The first Notice stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph re sick people and taking of photographs at Photo Centres.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister-

1. Is the Minister aware that there are a great number of sick people who are unable to go to the various Photo Centres to have their photographs taken before the closing date?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister at the next meeting of this House state what steps will be taken to help such people to have their photographs taken before the scheduled date of closing of the photo centres?

12.25 p.m.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will the Minister consider the advisability of having the Registering Office at "Verona", Bank Hall, St. Michael, open at all times during the normal working hours for the purpose of registering all electors from all the parishes as soon as they reach the voting age, in order to avoid the big rush when the time is due for revising the Voters List?.

PRIVATE MEMBERS¹ BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution-

WHEREAS there are a great number of old sugar workers who should qualify for pensions under the Sugar Workers Provident Fund Act 1968-54, but who having been employed by "owners" (as specified under paragraph 2 of the Agricultural Credit Bank Act, 1961-15) are denied their legitimate benefits under the Provident Fund Act;

AND WHEREAS these workers, now being too old and weak to work any longer, should be entitled to the same treatment as their fellows who worked on the lands of larger plantations;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to amend and clarify the law so that all workers employed on lands of ten acres or more become eligible for all benefits under the Provident Fund Act.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. JOHN CONNELL TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. John Connell be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO HON. LEADER OF THE HOUSE ON AWARD OF C.M.G.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before any other business of the day is proceeded with, I think this is an occasion when hon. members should sink Party politics and offer congratulations to the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, especially when, as I have said in here on another occasion, one of African descent has had conferred on him by Her Majesty the Queen the Companionship of the Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. I think we all will agree, whatever Party difference there might be, that the hon. Leader of the House has always distinguished himself on the floor of this House and outside as a gentleman, and it is a good sign for us that the hon. member has been awarded this honour, because it does show us that in the present Government there are hardly any signs of following the pattern which some of our neighbouring colonies do of turning up their noses and saying that certain honours will be and others will not be accepted when they are awarded to certain people. I have much pleasure in congratulating the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, and I hope this will be a stepping stone to greater things.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this occasion when I rise to speak, I intend to make a completely different speech from the last occasion when I spoke in here, and unlike the last speaker, I would not make any comments on the merits or demerits of the system of awards. I think, however, that in as much as they are meaningful to some people - and I think they are meaningful to the hon. Leader of the House - I would like to extend my personal congratulations to him.

Sir, I believe that as a parliamentarian I am the least qualified, being the most junior member, to make a speech in this Assembly, but I claim some sort of rank, and I make a speech, not so much as a parliamentarian, but as a past pupil of the Leader of the House during the late 1950s. Sir, I think I would be more than dishonest if I said I did not benefit from the experience of being his pupil; but the mere fact that I was his pupil then does not prevent me from criticising him now. I think he recognises the necessity for this because perhaps my ability to criticise in some respect is due to him. Nevertheless, as I said, I do not want to make any comments on the merits of the system of awards, but I think you will agree that everybody who has seen the Leader of the House operating inside this Chamber would say that the award was a well-merited one, because I have noticed from time to time that if he is out of the Assembly and within the precincts of the building and things are not going too good for the Government, one just sees the Leader of the House come in and his ranks seem to close because he is in the House; and if for nothing more than this, his presence seems to lend something to this Assembly. Once again I want to offer my personal congratulations to him.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not sit here and not contribute a few words along with my other colleagues in complimenting the hon. Leader of this House who has been awarded an honour in this country. Sir, some people pay very little regard to awards of this nature, because you hear some ask what is in a name, what is in a few letters behind one's name, and they say that there is very little difference with letters behind A's name and none behind B's. But this is not the spirit in which it should be taken, because awards of this nature show that the person has done something for his country, and has sacrificed himself for his people and is still doing something to help them. 12.35 p.m.

The only token of appreciation would be to recommend the particular individual to Her Majesty the Queen for awards of this nature so that his whole country will know that he is doing something for the country. With those few remarks, Sir, again I compliment the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Now, Sir, you may notice that an award was given to another member of this House by another newspaper; you will also notice that that award did not come from Her Majesty the Queen, but it came from "His Majesty of Corruption."

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and congratulate the hon. Leader of the House and I join with other members in congratulating him. As my memory goes back, I think he actually started in the early days campaigning for the Party to which I belong and I have always found him to be one way in life - a gentleman. In my opinion, he as Leader has certain things to undergo, and I would say that he can certainly deal with matters in the appropriate way. He is always among the members of

the Opposition and the members of the Government, and you can approach him at any time and get an understanding of what is going on. With those few remarks I take pleasure in joining with the others in congratulating the Leader of the House on the great honour conferred on him.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that justice would best be served on an occasion such as this by disposing of such elements that have unfortunately crept into the situation, and I hasten to do so before I attempt to offer any congratulation whatsoever to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph stated on the floor of this House that another newspaper had sought to confer an honour on another member of this House. I want to say here and now that the Truth newspaper published a front page article to the effect that the senior member for St. Joseph would be awarded a C.B.E. We maintain that, and if the senior member for St. Joseph is now saying that that honour came from "His Majesty of Corruption, it is a very striking incident that "His Majesty of Corruption's knew exactly where to direct his awards of honour; nowhere else.

Let us now proceed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the matter at issue. I have been associated with the Leader of the House for a very long time, and I would not say for a single moment that in this hon. House he does not have to prove his worth time and again. But my view is that his greatest achievement is not merely leading the House; his greatest achievement is in having been able to serve under the Prime Minister of this country. I remember on the 21st February, I think it was, when the Rt. Hon. Roland Michener, Governor-General of Canada, paid a visit to the Legislature of this country, and on that occasion the Leader of the House wept - and wept bitterly; but this is what we have all lived to see that his weeping was not in vain. He did not weep for fun; he wept for a C.M.G. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will say this, that the Leader of the House has some qualities about him which can make to some extent for the good of his country: I want to give that to him. I want to say that he has striven on many occasions to steer the ship of which he has charge not necessarily on an even keel, but to see that it was brought safely to shore. I wish to congratulate him on his being awarded a C.M.G. but at this particular time when we are being led to believe that Her Majesty the Queen, whose award it is, is little more than a figure-head-that is the impression we are given - she can mean but little, so to speak, to us a an Independent nation. 12.45 p.m.

We are to ask ourselves, then, exactly what is the meaning that we must associate with a C.M.G. It would appear to us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from what we are being told about Her Majesty's role in the Commonwealth, that we have to learn that awards and honours such as C.M.G, C.B.E., and, O.B.E., etc., are losing their meaning. Nevertheless, since Her Majesty has been advised that the Leader of the House, by his conduct and the services he has rendered to this country, is entitled to be given that honour, I feel it my duty today, bearing in mind my long association with him - and it dates back very many years before he was the Leader of the House - to offer him my sincerest congratulations.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the tributes that have been paid to the hon. Leader of the House on his distinguished attainment in having been decorated with the Order of C.M.G., . Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. When I see my colleague decorated that way, after many long years of experience and long years of service, and the great distinction which he rightly deserved, when he was a student, as President of the Oxford Union years ago when we consider and think of his family background - in my case. I happen to know many of these things fairly intimately when we think of the assistance and contribution which his father and his family have made over the years since the riot days of 1937 and the founding of the Progressive League and the Labour Movement and things of that sort - I happen to know that he, personally, played a great part in assisting in the time of need.

I remember that he has served very faithfully and very efficiently as one of the early founders of the Democratic Labour Party. I speak of 1955 when he and maybe eight or ten other colleagues -some of them have been gathered to their fathers: Mr. Broome, Mr. A. Lewis, etc, , but the fact remains that some are still here - founded the Movement in 1955, and he was the General Secretary. I know that he rendered yeoman service for many years in that capacity. I think that by virtue of the work he has done and the services he has rendered over the years, he has qualified himself to merit the decoration and to merit anything which he has achieved in the New Year Honours List.

I should also like to say that I am very happy - although he is not a member of the House - to know that my former Senior Assistant Secretary, Mr. A. S. Howell, who has done great work in the Ministry of Health, Local Government and Community Development, etc. - he merits even, in my opinion, more than the M.B.E.; but if he gets it in money - if the Minister of Finance who, fortunately, is present here now sees that the Public Service Commission, on his recommendation, makes him a Permanent Secretary and he gets it in kind and not in name or decoration, it may, probably, be more useful assistance. I am making that personal recommendation here on the floor of this House.

I am very pleased with the honour which has been bestowed on our Leader of the House because the Leader of the House is an excellent man in defending the Government, and he fights out of difficult corners every now and then in dealing with Ministries with which he is not very well acquainted. When the Leader of the House comes here to defend the Government, I think he makes a very good job of it; he can keep a debate going for many long weeks to the satisfaction of the public and the Cabinet. It is for these reasons that I feel happy to be here today. I wish him long health, future prosperity and greater success not only in Barbados, but far afield in places where he can make a bigger contribution, as he has done at the United Nations.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to thank hon. members on both sides of the House for the interesting - in some respects - and generous - in most other respects - tributes which they have made to me on the occasion of the recent honour which has been bestowed on me. I, first of all, would like to say that I deeply appreciate the gracious gesture of Her Majesty in thus considering me, and to couple that with my appreciation to the Prime Minister for having recommended me. At this point, I take the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter very well indeed when he says that it is my greatest achievement to have worked with the Prime Minister. He has stated no more than a fact on that. An equally great achievement would be that I could forbear, even when the hon. member was talking, answering him as he deserved. I think those two achievements must certainly rank among my greatest.

I wish to say that I really do appreciate the gestures made by hon. members, and I thank the hon. senior member for Bridgetown very kindly for having initiated these gestures. I would like to associate with that the remarks made by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, who acknowledges that he was my pupil and has, even when he attacks me, learned the fire and form of such attacks from myself. I wish to thank the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. James, and from my side my revered and respected colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

I wish to say also that I believe in a very real sense that I should like to share this honour with members of the House, with my colleagues and with the country generally. I wish to thank most especially the people of St. Lucy who made this possible, because when I went to them 15 years ago I had nothing to recommend me but a flare for political understanding and, perhaps, a good speaking voice, and they took me on trust until I could deliver, alongside of my colleagues, all of these things which were but vague and dimmed ideals at that time. I am glad that they have supported me through 15 years to enable me in this Parliament and in the preceding Parliaments to hand over some of the promises as fulfilments about which we spoke so long ago in 1954 when they first reposed their confidence in me.

Lastly, I would like to say that I am a monarchist; I have always been and propose to be until I draw my last breath. Consequently, I am happy that the Prime Minister of my country and the Head of my State have, without even consulting me, given me additional reason for supporting not only the Tyrone of my country, but the wellbeing of my people. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, again before the business of the House is proceeded with, I should like to draw something to the attention of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Before the hon. member proceeds, my learned friend the Speaker of the House, regrets his inability to be here on this occasion, but he asks me to say that he joins with me when I say that I associate myself with the landatory remarks made by hon members of this House in tribute to the hon. Leader of this Chamber.

re REPORTING IN "ADVOCATE-NEWS" ON HOUSE ALLOWANCES TO PERMANENT SECRETARIES

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I crave your indulgence, before the business of the House is proceeded with; to draw to the attention of this House a matter that is of paramount concern to members on both sides, and it does not matter whether you are in the Government or you are a backbencher. There was the occasion when the Prime Minister delivered a speech concerning the house allowance for Permanent Secretaries, and members of this House were very critical of it, especially when the Prime Minister referred to members of the Civil Service as an army of occupation and said that this was blackmail. While we cannot direct the reporting of the Advocate in this House, it is very shameful that three reporters would sit at the back of this Table reporting the business of this House and not publish a single word to the effect that anybody raised objection to the payment of money to Permanent Secretaries to rent or to live in their own houses. A week later a leading article was written to the effect that the Senate alone had raised this question, and that the members of the Opposition in the House had possibly done nothing about it. I think myself that to withhold general public information and deny members of the House the fact that they made criticisms of something which was not libellous in any way is, to my way of thinking, very dishonest, and I think the, Advocate should be told that the time will come when somebody will have to move that they be expelled from this House if they come here and sit down and make fun of the Opposition - or any Party for that matter. They made no reference at all to what was said in the House, but members of the Government in the Senate could meet you and ask "Why didn't the members of the Opposition say anything?" You will appreciate the fact that members of the Opposition, including myself, did. As a matter of fact, in the leading article, the exact words used by one of the members of the Opposition were used. I think we should let the Advocate know the exact position. It is about time that we spoke to the Editor of the Advocate, and it is time that they either do fair and unbiassed reporting or to be banned from this House. There was a time when the Advocate refused to report one word of any speech delivered by the present Prime Minister of this country for one year. It does not matter to me, because I have reached the stage now when it does not matter. On the question of giving Permanent Secretaries money for renting houses, the Prime Minister said that they were an army of occupation and that it was blackmail; the members of the Opposition actually supported him in this, and the Advocate, reporters sat down in here and reported nothing! All they are interested in is to come here and go into the dining room and eat food. It is dishonest, and I have a feeling to move that they be banned from this House for one year. This is ridiculous, and I hope that other hon. members will support me in this matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it that the hon. member is speaking on a question of privilege. He did not say so, but I am also speaking on the same question of privilege. We have ceased to complain about the Press in this country, because we have discovered by an examination of the statistics that no political Party that has received the accolade or blessing of the local daily Press has ever won an election; so we are very worried when they report us in the Press because they usually misquote us, anyhow. But I think that as far the privileges of the House are concerned, we do get a lot of distorted reporting. We have been the victims of it more than the people over on the other side for very obvious reasons, but now the shoe is pinching on the other side. However, speaking as a member of Parliament, I entirely agree with the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that they have a duty - not to report verbatim everything that is said, but if they are going to report on a matter of public interest, they should try to, at least, publish a fair and unbiassed report, even if it is only a precis of what has been said. The hon. member who has just sat down alluded to the occasion when I was banned from the Press for a whole year. I had committed the cardinal sin of saying that the Advocate had been talking about race, and as far as I was concerned there were only two races on earth - the members of the Advocate and mankind. I was therefore banned for a whole year just for saying that. I remember an occasion on which there was a very interesting debate in this Chamber in which they said that five members spoke in support of the Resolution -Mr. Tudor, Mr. Walcott, Mr. Mottley and Mr. Vaughan. In other words, they could not even publish that the fifth person who spoke on the Resolution, indeed who actually introduced the Resolution, was your humble servant. This is the standard to which journalism has degenerated in this country. But I do not think that the Legislature should be treated by the Press in the way in which some of these young upstarts do. I do not like to use that expression, because it was used about me when I was a little younger than I am now, and before my hair had started to change its tint. When I first entered politics, they called me a young upstart. I do not like to use that expression, but people who have no foundation at all, who do not even know who the Governor-General of Barbados is, come in here purporting to be reporters; they are completely innocent of knowledge of shorthand. Apparently, there is a disqualification nowadays to have the same kind of proficiency that Mr. Gus Maynard, Mr. Wynter Crawford and Mr. Joe Brome and people like that had as young reporters. You are disqualified from even applying for the job if you know shorthand, and to be a Parliamentary reporter, if you knew what Pitmans was, then you would have to go and watch football; you could not come in here at all. When you see them sitting down there with their mouths wide agape, and drifting in and out to have a cigarette outside, and then you see something appear in the newspapers which is completely alien to our own and your own personal experience of what took place, far from what may have transpired, it would not transpire through any action on their part to inform the public how the business of the country was being run.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is only on those grounds that I support the hon. member - not because I am worried because they do not report me. But this, after all, is the Legislature of Barbados; and whether you like the people in it or you do not like the people in it, you have a duty to the public, and you have a duty to your own newspaper to be fair and accurate in reporting. But to ignore what is said in here and then to inflate out of all proportion people who - again I do not like to use this expression - did not have to go and face the tape, as it were and say that they are the people who are protecting the interests of the

taxpayers, and to make it appear that we are negligent - when even I myself begged leave of the House to make certain criticisms personally, though as a Government Minister I had to support the Resolution, because it was the outcome of collective bargaining - is unfair, because I said that as a citizen of Barbados I did not like the drift and tenor of what was taking place. 1.05 p.m.

The fact that they do not report me does not matter; but if they go to the Other Place and report everything verbatim and make it appear that we, the elected representatives of the people on either side of the House, do not pay proper attention to what is being done for the country, then it is a great disservice to this House, and I think Your Honour should draw it to the attention of the Speaker that we consider that some kind of warning should be issued on the breaches of privileges of this House.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister said that it should be drawn to the attention of the Speaker, but I am drawing it to your attention. We ought not to have to be going with hat in hand begging the Advocate; to publish anything we say in here. This is a Government with a radio station, television and a printing press; why do we not get-up-and-get, and have everything published through our media? Can you expect the Advocate to bend over backwards to publish certain things only to hear later that the Chief Justice has fined them \$20,000 for libel? Last year they had to pay out a good few thousand dollars to a good few members from Another Place; do you expect that these people are going to put themselves in hot water? They do not know when they are breaking the rule; they do not know when they will be put before the Court for libel; so before they bring themselves in trouble and pay out money, they are saving themselves thousands. If they publish anything about me that is considered to be libel, I would make them pay me too, because some people open the newspaper every morning only looking for libel, and the Advocate knows that and they are not going to stick out their necks any more.

I have a Resolution before this House asking the Government to have the speeches broadcast, and to have the speeches, as they said in their Manifesto in 1961, published and sold to the people at a cheap rate. They would get every word in that particular pamphlet or newspaper, and then they could ask the Advocate to do as they like. We have it in our hands; the only thing a Government cannot do, as I was told, is to turn a man into a woman and a woman into a man. We can bring down a Resolution, as early as next week, to put the necessary equipment at the Press up there and have these debates published, and we would have no further trouble. Does a big Government want a little Advocate to bring itself into trouble to please them? I was beginning to reckon how many thousands of dollars the Advocate paid out for libel, and they were so many that I got sleepy and could not total them. I think that about 10 or 12 members got thousands out of them; do you think the people are satisfied with that? Do not expect them to publish anything in here; it is not fair. (ASIDES.) They are paying taxes too; why should you ask them to keep out of this Chamber? Why must you ban them? They are contributing to this Chamber. If you catch them again, hold them; if I catch them, I will hold them.

We must do something here; it is not fair to us that on the other side you can get them to publish what is said there, and not down here. We have the matter in our hands now, and I ought not to have any trouble in getting the Resolution passed when I bring it. Put it over the air; put it in the Press; sell it to the people cheaply in newspaper form, and every man will buy one and the Advocate would not sell much. They could do without printing a Wednesday paper; they would not sell 10 Wednesday papers, and we would have the bull by the horns. I am surprised after the Prime Minister's approach, which is too clumsy. They pay taxes and they have a right to come in here like anybody else.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no doubt that if any of this debate at all is carried in tomorrow's paper, you will see that the senior member for St. Joseph is defending the Advocate and not in fact what took place. I doubt whether the Advocate will carry any of this debate at all; this only shows the kind of journalism that has now become prevalent in this country. It is because of the system which we now have whereby we allow one overseas company to have established a monopoly in respect of the newspaper industry of this country, and this is the very reason why we have to complain today of the conduct of the reporters of the Advocate and the general policy of the Advocate newspaper. I am not surprised that the Advocate would report what is said in the Senate in preference to what is said in the House, because anybody who attends a debate in the House of Assembly would know that most of the speeches come from the Opposition, and this would prove very embarrassing to the Advocate if they had to carry from Wednesday to Wednesday articles that were highly critical of Government. They prefer to go to the Senate where there are only two Opposition members and where most of the speeches made are made in favour of the Government. This is the sort of policy of giving one side of a story, this sort of policy of trying to reflect the Government image alone. This happens, not only in the Advocate, but it also happens at the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. You can forgive the Advocate on the grounds that it is a privately-owned newspaper, owned by a foreigner whose sole object is to ensure that at the end of every financial year he has made a certain profit from his capital invested in this country. You cannot forgive the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for doing the same thing because it is a Government-owned corporation, and I think the Prime Minister has said that the public is entitled to know what is going on in here. 1.15p.m.

The Caribbean Broadcasting Company would not send anybody to the Barbados House of Assembly at all, because they know that if they come to this House and if they must report the proceedings of this House honestly, then they must be highly critical. In order to avoid being highly critical of the Government, the Caribbean Broadcasting Company does not send anybody to the House of Assembly to report the proceedings.

Sir, when this sort of attitude is condoned by the Government, some day they will be in the Opposition and they will be sorry that they did not allow a more free and full discussion on television news-reporting.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to let the hon. member get away with that nonsense. It is unfair and almost dishonest for anybody to give the impression that the reason why the Advocate does not print what takes place in the House of Assembly is that the Advocate is in favour of this Government. I drew to the attention of my Parliamentary Secretary on more than one occasion that the Advocate went through whole debates of this House of Assembly and mentioned only what the Opposition said and not for one moment mentioned my name, although I was the introducer of the Resolution.

I have seen editorials written in the Advocate and, in order not to use my name, reference was made to the Minister of Communications and Works. Of course, everybody knows who the Minister of Communications and Works is supposed to be. The point is that it was done deliberately. This debate was going quite well until "Junior" got up and put his foot in his mouth. If he is going to attack the Advocate, he should do so; but he should not use devious methods and say that, because the Advocate does not print what takes place in this House, it is in favour of this Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have drawn the attention of the Government on several occasions to the fact that reporters from the Press sat in this House drumming their fingers during the time the Prime Minister was speaking, and, the moment somebody from the Opposition started to speak, the reporters will start to write. I do not know what they were writing, but they started to write. How can anybody honestly come in here and say that the Advocate is being favourable to this Government? I would not like anybody to be favourable to me as the Advocate is favourable to this Government.

With regard to C.B.C., the Opposition makes use of C.B.C. more than the Government. They get more publicity from C.B.C. than the Government. I had to give an after-dinner speech a few nights ago during the Christmas holiday at Rediffusion. I said then that, in my opinion, Rediffusion was at that time performing a better service than C.B.C., and I was accused of attacking C.B.C. The truth is that, in my opinion, Rediffusion is putting on better programmes. Any time I am going anywhere and my Ministry tells the Press that the Minister will be visiting so-and-so, Rediffusion will send to find out what is taking place, but C.B.C. would not do that. The Minister of Education had to complain about the same thing. How then can anybody truthfully say on the floor of this House (ASIDES.) - even if we were monopolising C.B.C., we built it.

I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Thomas say that his Party has more yard fowls up there than we have. (ASIDES.) I am speaking rhetorically, please. A yard fowl is one that is not in a cage. It is a fowl that takes up anything from anywhere and carries it somewhere else. I have heard the senior

member for St. Thomas boasting about the amount of support that they have at C.B.C. There is no wonder you do not hear anything over C. B.C. about the Government or its Ministers. (ASIDES.) You will hear one or two things, but not as much as you hear about the Leader of the Opposition. If the Leader of the Opposition sneezes, C.B.C. says that he sneezes; If he catches a cold, they will talk about it as if catching a cold is something new and as if he was not catching a cold from time immemorial.

I got up to put this House right. As I said before, the senior member for St. Joseph and the Prime Minister were on good grounds, but as soon as "Junior" got up - (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, who is "Junior") I am going to ask "Junior's" father to get a bigger pair of boots for him, so that when his foot slips into his mouth he will be unable to open it. I merely got up to put the record straight, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I agree that the Advocate does not print anything that is said in the House of Assembly. As the senior member for the City pointed out, they are trying to give the impression that we do not know what we are doing. The Other Place is called the Upper Chamber, and because we are in the Lower Chamber they think we have no sense. That is the kind of thing you get.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am very glad that this matter has been raised by the hon. senior member for the City and supported by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and other members, because for some time now this matter has been causing great concern among members on both sides of the Chamber. Order No. 70 which deals with permission to the representative of any Journal to attend the sittings of the House is not quite clear. However, I can assure all members of this Chamber that within the next 24 hours I will fully discuss this matter with my learned friend, the Hon. Speaker of this House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 be taken as the First Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Item No. 3 is the instant Order of the Day; it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the implementation by the Government of the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Development Bank and for purposes connected therewith.

CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT, 1970?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the 18th October, 1969, as Minister of Finance, on behalf of the Government of Barbados, I signed in Jamaica an Agreement establishing the Caribbean Development Bank. The Caribbean Development Bank arose out of the recommendations of a Tripartite Commission which was appointed by the Government of the United States, the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada to examine the economic requirements of the Caribbean Area and to make recommendations thereon.

As a result of the Report published by the Tripartite Commission, a Regional Development Agency was set up with Headquarters in Antigua, and the recommendation was made that a Development Bank along the lines of the Asian and African Development Bank be established for the Caribbean Area with regional and non-regional members. The Government of the United States did not see fit to become an equity shareholder of the Bank, and although the Government of Puerto Rico indicated an interest in contributing to the equity share capital of the Bank at a meeting held in Georgetown in 1968, subsequently that offer was withdrawn; so that the non-regional members of the Bank which will be holding equity shares are the Government of Canada with 2,000 shares and the Government of the United Kingdom with 2,000 shares. 1.25 p.m.

The total number of shares being held by all participating countries will be 10,000 shares, so that 40 per cent of the equity share capital of the Bank is being held by two non-regional members of the Bank - the Government of Canada and the United Kingdom. There are 16 other participants, the Government of Jamaica with 2,240 shares, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago with 1,540 shares, the Government of the Bahamas with 660 shares, the Government of Guyana with 480 shares, the Government of Barbados with 280 shares, the Governments of Antigua, British Honduras, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent with 100 shares each, and the Governments of Montserrat, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands and the Turks and Caicos Islands with 25 shares each (or 100 shares between the four of them), making a total of 6,000 shares of a majority

shareholding by the regional members of the Bank who all signed the Agreement in Kingston on 18th October as I have before indicated. I signed on behalf of the Government of Barbados.

It was also a requirement that the instruments of ratification of this Agreement be filed with the United Nations before 30th April, 1970. I signed the instrument of ratification on 16th December, 1969 after the Agreement had been approved by the Cabinet and I had been so directed by the Cabinet to sign on behalf of the Government of Barbados as Minister of Finance. What we are doing in the introduction of this Bill is not so much to ratify, because we have always maintained that the question of ratification is a prerogative act and is done by the Government, but in view of the fact that funds have to be voted for our contribution to the Bank, and that we axe the country which was designated as the Headquarters of the Bank subject to confirmation in Nassau on the 31st of this month, there are certain obligations which rest upon the Government of Barbados, quite apart from the financial contributions which have to be made.

In the Bill which we have before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are making provision for a charge on and payment out of the Consolidated Fund as our obligations under the Agreement; we are making provision to empower the Minister of Finance to borrow funds for the purpose of payments under the Agreement; we are making provision to designate the Eastern Caribbean Authority, which has its Headquarters in Barbados, or any other financial institution to act as a depository for the holding of currency, and fourthly, we are giving effect to the provisions of Articles 48 to 55 of the Agreement in respect of the legal status, legal process, immunity of assets, immunity of archives, freedom of assets from restrictions, privileges of communication, immunity of bank personnel, and exemption from taxation. These are the matters which we are dealing with in the Bill which is before the House.

I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill, but at this stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since we have not had much discussion in here on the Bank because we know the history of its formation, I am very proud to think that the speech which I made at the University of New Brunswick at Frederickton in 1963, calling for this Tripartite Commission to examine the economic problems of the area, has borne some fruit and that we have a tangible manifestation in the establishment of the Caribbean Development Bank. The only reason why I say that is not because I want to get credit over and above any other Barbadian or member of this House, but I notice an unfortunate tendency in the other territories of the Caribbean to try to take credit for things which have been initiated by the people of this Island. I will go back now to the beginning; I go back to the 1890s. There was a reference in the Press earlier this week to Sir Herbert Greaves. It was Barbados that initiated the move to get the grant for the sugar industry of this Island, and we were the only country that had the foresight to set up a Sugar Industry Bank. In 1947 it was within Barbados that the whole idea of a Commonwealth Sugar Agreement originated, from which all the Commonwealth countries including Australia, Jamaica, Guyana, Mauritius, even the Union of South Africa at one stage, benefitted; but they want to give the impression that this was some dispensation handed down by the United Kingdom when in truth and in fact we had to fight the Ministry of Food and Agriculture in the British Government to get them to

recognise and acknowledge their obligation to the area which had supported them during the Second World War, and to whom they in the United Kingdom had made payments for sugar which were unremunerative demands made in the Interest of the War effort to the sugar-producing countries in the Caribbean, and we said that in consideration of that, If you wanted stability In the area, you should have some commodity agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the sugar-producing countries of the Commonwealth.

Similarly, the Caribbean Free Trade Area Agreement originated in this country. We hear now that some Minister in some other country is the King of CARIFTA, and every day you see in the Press - I doubt he understands what CARIFTA means - that he is the King of CARIFTA and he is going to do this and do that, and our Ministers go down there with constructive proposals on the Agreement which we drafted here in Barbados and consummated at Dickenson Bay in Antigua, and we do not hear any reference to Barbados at all! Now I am not claiming credit for myself, but I think that we in this country have been hiding our light under a bushel for too long and allowing people to get away with things.

When we come to this Caribbean Development Bank, I want to very briefly bring you up to date because of what is likely to happen at the end of this month in the Island of New Providence, capital of Nassau in the Bahamas. When we went to Georgetown with the first draft of the Charter of the Bank, -it must be now some 18 months or two years - the precise date I cannot remember - at which the United States was represented, Puerto Rico was represented, Canada was represented, the United Kingdom was represented, and the United Nations Development Programme who had assisted us with the preparing of the draft, the other territories in the Caribbean came to that meeting with a proposal that the headquarters of the Bank should be in St. Vincent. One of the requirements of an institution of this nature is that it should be able to inspire confidence and attract not only the equity capital which is committed in any event at the signing of the Charter, but throughout its operational life the Bank should be able to attract loans from other countries who are well disposed towards the Caribbean. 1.35 p.m.

The Federal Republic of Germany has indicated an interest; the Government of France and the Government of Japan as well as several other Governments who are members of the United Nations Organisation have also indicated their interest in the Bank. There was a certain amount of horse-trading going on, and the Governments of the Caribbean with the exception of Jamaica and Barbados, made an agreement that if they put the headquarters of the Bank in St. Vincent, there would be some consideration given to its being put there - and there are a lot of political considerations and I listened to them very carefully - and I said that the United Nations Development Programme experts had come to the meeting with certain criteria which should apply to the location of the Headquarters of the Bank. I make no apology for what I said; I said I was part Vincentian myself - as a matter of fact, Bequia is the greatest tourist attraction and the island where they claimed that I was born; but I was born right here in the northern part of this Island which has supported the Speaker of the House and the Leader of the House and which has produced many former members who have done the greatest service to this country, people like the Massiahs. The only Barrow that it has produced as far as I know is myself, and I

do not necessarily claim membership of that distinguished company of legislators; but whether they are Conservatives like the hon. senior member for the City or like Dr. Massiah, even Conservatives sometimes can make a contribution, and the hon. junior member for St. Peter would have been the last person I would expect to say that Conservatives cannot make contributions. Sir Archibald Cuke was a Conservative, and he was the person who fought for the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement.

Now to get back to the debate, the point was that before the United Nations Development Programme even put forward the criteria which they had been asked to examine for the location of the Bank, they came in and they said that the Bank is going to be in St. Vincent. That was ludicrous because St. Vincent has not got the communications nor the standard of educational institutions, and for these reasons I said that I could not support it. I was not asking for, it for Barbados, but we have to be realistic. In my opinion, the only three locations for the Bank would be Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago or Antigua because Antigua was also a centre for Communications. I remember that the delegate from Grenada came into the meeting in Georgetown late and said that whatever the non-regional members were supporting, the Government of Grenada was against. This is the kind of atmosphere that sometimes obtains at these important conferences. Mr. Deputy Speaker, although the majority had voted for St. Vincent, they realised that there were very serious objections and the only reason why the Bank was not placed in St. Vincent was, not because of my speech so much, but I have reason to believe that the non-regional Governments let it be known that they were not contributing to an institution in a place which did not conform with the requirements set out by the United Nations Development Programme.

We all know that the Minister of Finance of Jamaica reacted violently at the same meeting. The matter was then reconsidered in Antigua a few months later - I think it was April 1968 - and the Chief Minister of Montserrat proposed that Barbados should be the headquarters of the Bank, and 8 members voted in favour and 4 against. The Minister of Finance of Jamaica said that Jamaica was not taking part in any Bank which would not be located in Jamaica because it would be a piggy bank. Mr. Seaga then went on the air in Kingston and in support of his stand he quoted long extracts from my speech which I made, and he said that there was horse trading, which was true; but nothing in my speech should be taken to mean that Jamaica was the only place in the West Indies where the Bank could be located. In quoting large extracts from my speech the Minister of Finance of Jamaica also left out very important parts of my speech; I took it up with him, and the Press also in Jamaica set out that Jamaica was the only place that was known in international monetary circles.

I want to say this; the Government of Barbados has never had to withdraw any issue on the New York market, or the London market, or in any other places, neither under this Government nor under any other Government; the Government of Jamaica, shortly before Mr. Seaga made that speech extolling that Jamaica was the only place where the Bank could be located, had withdrawn three issues because they could not get the loans raised. Furthermore, when they had an issue in 1962 on the New York market because they were then breaking into the New York market, the issue was not subscribed, and they had to get a Wall Street firm to get six insurance companies to underwrite the loan, and this is the only way

they got a loan on the New York market at a tremendous discount. But I was not trading or making exchanges with the Minister of Finance in Jamaica; they said that if the Bank was not in Jamaica, Jamaica was not in the Bank. We held a Heads-of-Government meeting here in Barbados last year under my Chairmanship, and the Prime Minister of Jamaica attended, and the Minister of Finance of Jamaica attended and they said - I do not want to misquote them, but the gist of it was that they would reconsider participation in the Bank with certain reservations, because having said that they were not interested, they had to go through a kind of face-saving operation. 1.45 p.m.

I pointed out that they had already made an announcement shortly before coming to Barbados that they had reconsidered the matter and would be going back into the Bank, and nobody in the Opposition in Jamaica or in the Jamaica Press had raised any objection, I felt very suspicious of their motivation in saying that they had certain reservations. One reservation which they wanted to write into the Charter of the Bank was that the whole question of the location of the Bank should be reconsidered at the first meeting of Governors of the Bank. They wanted that put into the Charter, but I said that, even if we agreed to it, it was a once-for-all operation and, therefore, it should be attached as a protocol and not as a main article in the Charter of the Bank itself. Eventually, all the Governments agreed to that.

We went to Jamaica on the 18th October; we signed the Agreement, but nobody signed that protocol. The protocol should have been signed, but it was not presented to me for signature and it was none of my business to tell them how they should do their work. Up to now the protocol has not been signed. There is an understanding that on the 31st January this year at the first meeting of the Governors of the Bank, the Governors will be allowed to vote again on the question of location. One would have to ask himself why. It appears to me that there are certain elements in Jamaica in the Government - not a view universally shared even in the Cabinet of Jamaica - who feel that this is a great prestige matter for them and somebody's political reputation may be at stake. I do not know. It appeared to me to be a device not so much to save the face of the Jamaica Government, but to give them time to canvass support from the other territories to remove the location of the Bank from Barbados to Jamaica

I think it is my duty to warn hon. members that they axe going to vote on the location again. As far as I am concerned, I do not care where the Bank is, and I have said that at every meeting, I think that Barbados is a suitable place for the Bank. We are interested in what the Bank does and not where the Bank is. Even if they put the Bank in Jamaica, the Bank has to be regulated by certain rules set out in the Charter. Loans will be made according to certain principles. The mere fact that the Bank is in Jamaica does not mean that the Jamaican Government can get hold of all the funds and spend the money on themselves. Mutatis mutandis, if the Bank were put in Barbados, the Government of Barbados will have certain obligations. We would have to provide office accommodation and assist in other ways, but the Government of Barbados could not expect to get the lion's share of the loan capital which would be available merely because the Bank was located in Barbados.

It is very difficult for me to understand why people should be making so much fuss about the location of the Bank. As far as I am concerned, the responsible representatives of the Governments of the Caribbean - I say that advisedly, because non-regional members did not vote - made a decision in Antigua. It will be very interesting for me to know with what justification any of them could reverse the decision which they took in Antigua when they decided that the location of the Bank should be here. It is still my duty to point out that that was one of the requirements the Government of Jamaica made for re-entry; that we should vote again on the site of the Bank,

The second requirement was that no single regional project should absorb more than 15% of the available loan capital of the Bank. Now, this is a very strange stipulation, as far as I am concerned, because the Bank was a Regional Bank and its first priority, according to its Charter, would be to support projects of a regional nature. There is Jamaica stuck 1, 100 miles to the West of us stipulating that no regional project should absorb more than 15% of the available loan capital.

What I found extremely alarming was that the small Islands of the Lesser Antilles supported the Jamaican rider, or the condition of their re-entry into the Bank, so that no single regional project should absorb more than 15% of the available loan capital of the Bank. I will give you an illustration of regional projects. The Shipping Service is a regional project. Shipping is something that we may require for the whole of the Eastern Caribbean and, therefore, the Shipping Council, or the Shipping Corporation, should be able to go to the Bank and borrow money for a regional project of that nature. But according to the Jamaicans, any regional project which in any one year is going to cost more than 15% will be disqualified from getting a loan. It means, therefore, that an individual territory can get a loan for a purely domestic operation of up to 85%. Not that it would actually happen, but, because of the way the protocol is written, that is the understanding and this is a Regional Bank. We must have very serious misgivings about the motivation and the actual way in which such a requirement will operate when the Bank, is established.

Again, we have the Windward and Leeward Islands supporting Jamaica on this, and that must give us some great amount of misgiving when we go to the meeting which will be held on the 31st January this year. Even more alarming is the fact that at a meeting which, I believe, is taking place now, or took place last week, in Trinidad on the appraisals for the future development of the University of the West Indies, the same Minister of Finance of Jamaica has put forward a political document which contends that the Windward and Leeward Islands should be read out of the University - literally read out. We all know in Barbados what 'reading out' means, because when one transgresses one is denied fellowship with the congregation.

You would think, Sir, that anyone who is being read out of fellowship would be indignant, that he

would protest, that he would say: "I have paid in my collection to this Church over a period of years." The Windward and Leeward Islands have paid their contributions to the University of the West Indies. The Minister of Finance of Jamaica is proposing that we should add up all of their contributions and pay them out - get them out of the University - but let their students come in as if they were still contributing to the University! In some cases it would mean that some of these Governments would get \$2 million. They are so shortsighted that the Cabinet of Barbados had to make a serious decision on this matter.

Sir, the same Windward and Leeward Islands regard the proposal as a friendly gesture on the part of the Government of Jamaica that was reading them out of the University, because they sought to immediately gain \$1 1/2 or \$2 million, the sum total of their contributions to the University over a period of 21 years. We had to direct our Minister of Education to take a very strong line on this matter. It is my understanding now that some time last week, on Friday, after a very strong protest from : the Barbados delegation, that Paper was withdrawn.

Sir, you cannot look at that Paper in isolation. You have to look at it in the general political atmosphere which existed prior to the meeting of the Development Bank in Nassau. Here is the Government of Jamaica, which was the first to secede from the Federation, which was not to have anything to do with the Piggy Bank if it was not in Jamaica, now pretending to be the champion of the Windward and Leeward Islands who have to vote on the issue of where the Bank should be, how the Fund should be operated and so on. What is more alarming is that these same Governments who are being treated with disdain should be susceptible to the kind of blandishments which axe extended by the Minister of Finance of Jamaica. That is the kind of atmosphere in which regional politics are being conducted. 1.55 p.m.

We have told them at each and every meeting that the Government of Barbados is not making any deals on anything, and that we are voting for everything that comes 'up on its merits. We are not trading the site of the Bank for B.W.I.A. or for the Law Faculty, or for the Vice-Chancellorship of the University or for anything else, as at one time they said these were the things. Mr. Richards, the Attorney General, said at one meeting that the way the Government of Trinidad and Tobago looks at regional cooperation is that everything has got to be a package deal - the University, B.W.I.A., the Regional Development Bank, the Regional Shipping Service, the Meteorological Council - and they started to enumerate. They said that the Government of Barbados has already got the Caribbean Meteorological Institute, the Government of Barbados is getting the Law Faculty, a Barbadian is being appointed Vice-Chancellor of the University of the WestIndies, a Barbadian is being appointed Registrar of the University of the West Indies, Barbados is going to be the headquarters of the Regional Development Bank; and I listened to them and said "yes" all the way through, and they said that in view of all these things, then Barbados now must come into the package deal and arrange to do certain things to help them. My reply to the Attorney General of Trinidad and Tobago is that when the Government of Trinidad decided to nationalise one of their oil industries, British Petroluem, they did not offer the Government of Barbados any shares, nor have they offered us any shares in any oil fields down there.

They are only offering us shares in anything that could lose money, and as far as these regional conferences are concerned, I am not making any deals with anyone about the Bank. You have heard me say this before, Mr. Deputy Speaker: we have brought nothing into this world, and it is certain that we take nothing out. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away; Blessed be the Name of the Lord" - and that is still my attitude. We have brought nothing into this world, and if they in the other territories think that they have more to gain by a Bank which is far removed from the scene of operations down here in the Eastern Caribbean, it is a matter for them; but we are not making any package deals with anyone, and If they choose on the 31st January this year in Nassau to vote against Barbados as the site of the Bank, I make no apologies to the House. I am doing nothing to canvass their support; I am doing nothing to drive it away; I am just stating the facts. I am making no deals with any country of the Caribbean to mortgage the future of the taxpayers of Barbados. If the Bank comes here or goes there, we will see that we have paid our contribution, and we will make sure that we get our fair and equitable share of any loans which are being made available.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is...

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us move the second reading and go out before it is put. (Asides) I do not want to speak in Committee; I am speaking now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2.30 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. today.

On resumption:-

Mr. LOWE:

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

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained. PETITION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is one Petition standing in my name, and I will ask the hon. junior member for St. John to present it on my behalf.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your behalf, I beg to present a Petition praying the House to incorporate the Barbados Association of Professional Engineers. The Petition is respectfully worded, and I beg that it be taken as read.

PRIVATE MEMBERS1 NOTICES

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Association of Professional Engineers.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Association of Professional Engineers be now read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Peter is asking leave to give notice of a Resolution, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows-

WHEREAS the demands of the youth of the Nation for recreational facilities are ever increasing;

AND WHEREAS it is incumbent upon Government to play its part in meeting these demands;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House calls upon Government-

(a) to implement, in stages, development of the Farley Hill National Park, to provide immediately playing fields and other necessary recreational facilities to meet the demands of the growing number of youths in Indian Ground, Roebuck, French Village, Welchtown and nearby districts;

(b) to acquire lands at Boscobelle from such residents as are disposed to sell, or from Springhall Co., Ltd., to provide a playing field, recreation centre and such other facilities as are required for the physical and social uplift of the people at Gays, Mount, Nicholas, Castle; and

(c) to provide a Community Centre and Playingfield at Maynard - Ashton Hall Area to provide adequate recreational facilities for the youths of the said area including Rose Hill, Mile and a Quarter and Mount Brevitor.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time, and the first Question is No.63, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

Is the Minister aware that the system at present used for the payment of vouchers at the Accountant General's office is time-consuming and leaves much to be desired?

Will the Minister adopt the system for posting all vouchers, after they have been cleared for payment, to the payees named in the said vouchers, so that payment of same may be made, when presented, without any delay?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows-"1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Government proposes in the next financial year to introduce a payable order system using postal facilities which it is hoped will eliminate the present delay now experienced at the Treasury.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister satisfied that postal facilities will facilitate or expedite the payment and the receiving of sums involved in these vouchers? 2.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the assumption on which this is going to be based. Apparently these payable orders will be posted to the respective payees by whatever Ministry or Department is responsible, and they will be cashable at any Branch Post Office, or of course, at any bank.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question No. 34 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for the City.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister-

Will the Minister take urgent steps to provide for (a) proper drainage and (b) proper surfacing of Bedford Lane, Green Field, Bridgetown.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows Bedford Lane is part of a private tenantry and will be considered for improvement with other private tenantry roads in the Government's programme for the repair of private tenantry roads.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

What about the drainage in the vicinity of the Church?

Mr. LOWE:

This also will be included when we are fixing the tenantry roads.

Mr. HINDS:

Has any communication been sent out from Government to the owners of Bedford Tenantry road?

Mr. LOWE:

As far as I know, letters have been sent to all owners of private tenantry roads, and all I can say at this present moment is that many of them have not yet replied to the request of Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I wonder if the hon. junior Minister would be more specific and state whether in this particular case any letters have been sent to the owners of Bedford Tenantry.

Mr. LOWE:

I would like to inform the hon. junior member for the City that at this moment I would be unable to say.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the senior member for St. George, who is the junior Minister in charge - is he giving this type of reply in the face of coming here today to deal with this specific question of Bedford Tenantry? We are not asking the hon. member what he is able to say or what he is unable to say; what we want to know is whether the Government has sent any sort of communication to the owners of this tenantry. The hon. member has told us that this is a private tenantry, and I would like to know how he knows that it is a private tenantry.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this is only wasting time; the fact is that the Question was asked if the Government would do something to Bedford Lane, such as resurfacing the road and improving the drainage. The Reply states that in the coming 1970-71 roadworks programme Bedford Lane would be

considered both for resurfacing and drainage; so whether or not letters were sent to the owners does not arise. This matter has already been dealt with in this House; it is a Cabinet decision that all private tenantry roads in Barbados will be repaired by this Government, but it is only a question of priority. If the hon. member had asked...

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no hon. member on this side is "axing;" we simply "asked".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question No. 50 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for the City.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Minister aware of the existence of the drug called " cyclamate" ?
2. Is the Minister aware of the effect of cyclamate and other artifical sweeteners on the health of a human being?
3. Is the Minister aware of the test carried out on the drug cyclamate in the United States?
4. Is the Minister aware that the Diet Rite Cola made in the United States by Royal Crown Cola has been banned by the Federal Government in the United States because it is considered dangerous to the health of human beings?
5. Is the Minister aware that the Diet Rite Cola Barbados is made under licence of the Royal Crown Cola of the United States?

6. If the answer to any of the above is yes, what steps, if any, will the Minister take generally to ban the drug cyclamate and in particular Diet Rite Cola that is made in Barbados?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Replies are as follows-

1. Yes, I am aware of the existence of the drug called "cyclamate".
2. No evidence has so far been produced that cyclamate has any adverse effects on human beings.
3. Yes, Sir.
4. Yes, Sir.
5. The local distributors of Diet Rite Cola have announced that the product has been withdrawn from the market.
6. The use of cyclamate will be prohibited in articles of food and drink, but its continued use for medical purposes will be permitted.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The Minister in answering the Question said that the use of cyclamate in food and drink will be prohibited; what steps will be taken to ensure this prohibition?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In accordance with the advice of the Chief Medical Officer, proposals have already been submitted to the Cabinet that the use of cyclamate be prohibited in articles of food and drink, and the matter is now receiving the active consideration of Cabinet. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at No. 5 the hon. member said that the local distributors of Diet Rite Cola announced that the product had been withdrawn from the market. What assurance has Government, apart from the announcement by the distributors, that Diet Rite Cola or any drink containing cyclamate has been withdrawn from the market?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter has been examined by my advisers, and the Chief Medical Officer has reported, after investigation, that Diet Rite has been taken off the market in the U.S. A and the local distributors have announced that the product has been withdrawn from the market here. I can only go by my advisers; I am no expert.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, can the Minister tell us if cyclamate has been withdrawn in the form of Diet Rite and is now being offered to the public in a drink by another name by the same distributors? Can the Minister state whether cyclamate has been withdrawn in the form of Diet Rite and is now being offered in another drink by the same distributors to the same public that they are alleging they have withdrawn Diet Rite from?

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister would take this as an admission that it is a failure on Government's part to have banned the use of cyclamate, when a Question was asked many months before the present Question was asked?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in so far as the last Question is concerned - I refer to the Question raised by the hon. junior member for the City. His Questions were asked on the 28th October last year. As far as my file goes, without having investigated other previous Agenda, there is only one set of Questions dealing with cyclamate. The matter may have been discussed, but I am not aware of it. If subsequent Questions were asked, then I cannot say whether that is so, offhand. There could hardly be two files dealing with the same subject matter. This is a matter for investigation. On this file there is only one set of questions asked by the hon. junior member for the City which I am attempting to answer on the advice of my Medical Advisers and the people who are connected with these matters.

In so far as the point which the hon. junior member for St. Peter has stressed that it is still in use in a different form, I am afraid I will have to investigate that; I am not aware of that, but, if that is the case, it will certainly be dealt with and dealt with in the right way. You cannot fool the public by putting cyclamate in a different drink, because the dangerous effect would be the same. That would be circumventing our intention and the intention of the Questions which were raised.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Minister cause tests to be carried out on all beverages offered for sale by Bim Beverages Limited to ensure whether or not their drinks contain cyclamates?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give the House the assurance - and the hon. member in particular - that I will make a special note of the matter on the appropriate file and will give the answer within a week or two, or as soon as I get it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister aware that some time previous to the banning of the drug, cyclamate, in the United States, his advisers in Barbados had recommended to the Barbados Government that the drug, cyclamate, be banned?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems evident that the members of the Opposition want me to read the entire file. Providing I can make out some of the writing by some of my advisers, I will attempt to do so. The Chief Medical Officer reported to this effect

"We are aware that a group of artificial sweeteners known as cyclamates. No evidence has so far been produced that any other artificial sweeteners have any adverse effects on human beings. I think that now the matter has been ventilated here and the specific offender has been named, it may well be that the follow through will be very simple and our people who drink these soft drinks with these dangerous drug artificial sweeteners be given the necessary protection."

I will make a note of what has been said here, and I will report to the House - and the Opposition in particular - within a week or two, or as soon as I get the information.

FIRE ESCAPE FOR TREASURY BUILDING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question No. 30 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister-

1. Is the Minister aware that there is no fix escape in the building known as the Treasury Building?
2. Will the Minister remedy this obvious oversight as soon AS possible?

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows

1. No, Sir.
2. The fire escape provision in the building has been made in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief Fire Officer and is considered adequate.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I ask the hon. senior member for St. George whether one has been put in since this Question has been asked, or whether one was there with the original planning of the building?

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I know, there was always one present. There are two stairways in the Treasury Building. If you are talking about a fire escape, there is no fire escape in the Treasury Building. The Chief Fire Officer states that having two stairways is quite adequate, and it is not necessary to have an outside fire escape. That is what the Fire Officer has stated. Since he is the technical source, we will have to abide by what he says. The architect built the building; you wanted the necessary protection for the people who are working in this building; the Fire Officer was brought into the matter; he looked around and he has stated that the people have adequate protection in case of fire, and that is the position. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not understand. The hon. member seems to be either confusing himself or I am confused by his Reply. He says to Question 1, " No" I understand from that that there is no fire escape in the building known as the Treasury Building; yet he comes back and says that there are two stairways which are supposed to be fire escapes in the Treasury Building. Then he says there is no fire escape outside the building I wonder if the hon. member would admit that there is a possibility that the architect could have done this as an oversight - or are we to accept whatever the architect says? Would the hon. member say that an architect has always been right?

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not really think that is a supplementary Question at all.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member for St. George happened to be on the third floor of this building and fire breaks out on the ground floor, what is his position?

Mr. LOWE:

That is another supposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He is using the supposition right now that if I were on the third floor - but this is only a supposition that the whole ground floor would be in flames. If the complete ground floor were in flames, it would mean that outside would be in flames; so the fire escape outside would not assist at that moment. We always use suppositions to bring out certain points, but the fact remains that since the technical people..... (Asides.)

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for St. George whether he would agree that two stairways in a building cannot considered fire escapes In modern day architecture? I challenge any

architect to say that two stairways inside a building is good enough in a seven-storey building in modern day architecture. And the hon. member is telling me about a Fire Officer 11 thought you would have taken technical advice from the architect, not from the Fire Officer. I say it is an oversight. I simply ask the hon. member to answer that supplementary. If he is unable to do so, then he should bow out gracefully, but not just sit back and cool out. This is no mock sport; this is a place where you have 700 or 800 people working.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This is not a time for speeches; this is a time for Questions.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a note here which says that the hon. senior member for St. George said that there is no fire escape at the Treasury Building. Is that a correct note of what the member for St. George said?

Mr. LOWE:

I said I am not aware that there is none there, and that is why I say "no".

Mr. HINDS:

My note would now read therefore that the hon. senior member for St. George is saying that he is not aware that there is none there. In other words, he is saying he is aware there is a fire escape there. Is that a correct interpretation of what the member would like to say?

Mr. LOWE:

I am aware that there is, in the capacity of two stairways.

Mr. HINDS:

Are these the same two stairways that afford entry into the building under normal circumstances?

Mr. LOWE:

In normal circumstances the people go up by elevator.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sincerely hope the Minister of Communications will come back and defend his portfolio and avoid the hon. senior member for St. George making a mockery of what is happening.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am afraid that is not a supplementary Question.

QUESTION re SECRETARIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question No.44 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows-

To enquire of the Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware that students, after qualifying from local secretarial schools, are finding it difficult to obtain employment due to the very low standard of instruction obviously received at these secretarial schools?

Will the Minister carry out a full investigation into the curriculum, teaching methods and general policy of the local secretarial schools?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows -

"The attention of the hon. member is drawn to Standing Order No. 12 (2) (b) and (c)."

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Standing Order No. 12 (2) (b) states that a Question shall not contain statements which the member who asks the question is not prepared to substantiate.

May I ask the hon. Minister in his capacity as Leader of the House how he can determine whether or not I can substantiate the statements which I have made by way of Questions?

Standing Order No.12 (2) (c) says that a question shall not contain arguments, inference, opinions, imputations, epithets, or tendentious, ironical or offensive expressions.

What is offensive in my Question?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am afraid I have nothing to add to the Reply just given.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, paragraph 2 of the Question reads as follows -

"Will the Minister carry out a full investigation into the curriculum, teaching methods and general policy of the local secretarial schools"?

Sir, did the Minister carry out such a survey! Is it anything against the Ministry carrying out such a survey?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said, I am sorry, but I cannot add anything to the Reply just given.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Minister admit that the Ministry attempted to carry out such a survey, beginning with Duffs Business College in this Island? 3.05 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Minister convey to the person who wrote 'the Answer a statement from the House of Assembly that it is very rude and offensive?

Mr. CRAIG:

I am asking a supplementary. Would the Minister state what is offensive in my Question? In his Reply he referred me to Standing Order 12.2(b) and 12.2(c); how can the Minister determine whether or not I can substantiate any of the statements in that Question, and what was considered to be offensive in that Question? The Minister is an old Parliamentarian and one worthy of his honour; so I am calling on him now to answer these two Questions. I think this is an admission of failure of the Government's policy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This is not the time for making a speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have already answered the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the Reply that has been given to Question No. 44, are we to take it that no hon. member on this side can succeed in getting Government to carry out an investigation into all of the Private schools in this Island that are robbing the taxpayers and the people's children by pretending to be teaching them subjects for which they do not have the qualifications? Is that what we are to understand?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG:

I must confess that I do sympathise with the hon. Leader.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member asking a Question?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Is the Minister aware that a lot of girls coming from the secretarial schools cannot spell properly? If you look at the bottom of the Civil Service you will find that this is true.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have here before me a list of 438 names of girls.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This is Question Time; if you want to make a speech, you can wait for the appropriate time. Question No. 45 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. CRAIG:

To enquire of the Minister of Tourism

Is the Minister aware that at International Airports, "Red Caps" are provided with luggage trolleys?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister provide local "Red Caps" at Seawell International Airport with similar facilities?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The porter service at Seawell Airport is subject honesty upright, fair and Just way, that to all hon. members they would be one feeling - that we have a Speaker dignified, one to be admired, one to be proud of. These, I think, were the reasons behind the tabling of this Resolution; but I feel that the Speaker ought to have suffered enough by all that has been said and done. With this motion hanging over his head I feel that he should have undergone enough suffering in the interim, and I urge upon the mover that he brings the Resolution to a close.

The Speaker is not a little child that can be put across the lap and spanked; he is a man and one who knows what is right from what is wrong; he knows what it means when a sitting of this hon. House is in session, and he is not permitted to occupy that hon. seat at present occupied by Your Honour. He does not, and could not, like to be placed in this position too often, and I sincerely hope that the Speaker will realise, not that we have set out to chastise him, but that he take what we have said to heart and let us see in the future that he will neither lean to the right nor to the left - in other words, that he will neither show favour to the Government Party nor to the Opposition, but that he will rule in such manner that all hon. members will have to respect that ruling, whether they agree with it or not. At the same time, I hope that we do not find His Honour importing unnecessary interpretations into Rules for the convenience of the Government Party, or for that matter, for the convenience of the Opposition. That is what we do not want, and I hope that this debate will close with His Honour being spared the chance once more to prove that he can live up to the highest, the best and the most dignified seat that this House has ever seen. That is the charge I now lay before His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would appear to me that all hon. members on both sides of the House have either attempted.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. mover of the motion winding up?

Mr. CRAIG:

I did not see any other hon. member rise; so I took the opportunity to wind up the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House was on his feet and you got up; so I asked him to give way.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I do apologise.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a motion of censure against the Chair in parliamentary assembly is the most serious proceeding, and history has shown that in nearly every Parliament such a motion gets carried largely because, on the basis of what is said in support of it, the whole House is seldom convinced that the Chair on a particular occasion or series of occasions has offended a majority of the House. Secondly, the seriousness of such a proceeding inevitably dictates, and it should not be undertaken for frivolous reasons. In every parliamentary assembly, no matter where in the world, from time to time charges are laid against the Presiding Officer; it may be that he misinterprets the Standing Orders of his Parliament, or that he does not rule with that degree of dispassionate impartiality which one normally expects from the occupant of the Chair, and this is a gauntlet which all Speakers must run from time to time. The best Speaker is he who is assailed on both sides, and from both sides, of his Parliament as being unfair, because they are sure, as both question his rectitude to that extent, and gets a good guiding line laid down, that his actions are correct.

3.45 p.m.

No Speaker can hope to please, at any time during his career, all the members of his Parliament. He is lucky indeed if for some portion of his occupancy in the Chair he manages to gain the unqualified assent of all or nearly all, and under the conditions of parliamentary democracy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since all Presiding Officers hold their tenure by the will of the majority, or the assent of the whole House, motions of censure against the occupant of the Chair cannot succeed unless and until the majority Party wishes to use that method of showing its dissatisfaction. I say advisedly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, "wishes to use that method."

Speaking now for the majority in this Parliament, while we may have from time to time certain reservations about the conduct of parliamentary affairs so far as the occupant of the Chair is concerned,

we are neither so alarmed nor so distressed at that conduct as to wish to lend countenance to what would be a most drastic measure to withdraw the support of the majority Party from the Chair. I want to make that very clear. The majority Party will not consent, or give countenance, to the passing of this motion.

Having said that, I want to analyse a little of the background which may have led to this. It is unfortunate that this particular motion should be moved in this House by a relatively junior member. Not that such a member should have, at any time, been denied his rights, but, inevitably, it must happen that the least time you have been in a parliamentary assembly, the least it qualifies such a member to use the sort of judgment which is required on a matter of this sort. The fact that an hon. member feels aggrieved by a particular decision is not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my opinion, a sufficient reason for wanting to censure the Chair.

I have been a member of this Parliament for 15 years; I sat under three Speakers; with all of them I have disagreed from time to time, perhaps, with this one more than the preceding two although I have maintained more silence in this Parliament over my disagreement than I have under the preceding two Speakers. On one occasion only with the second Speaker, whom it has been my honour to sit under, I took a drastic step because I felt aggrieved at his action in denying me my right as a member of Parliament. It was in this wise. I rose three times on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, as he was then, refused to hear me on a point of order at a time when no other hon. member has risen, when no hon. member was addressing the Chair and, therefore, when nothing could have precluded his hearing me on a point of order. I rose because I felt that, in refusing to hear me on a point of order, he was grossly repudiating and setting aside my rights. I moved from my chair, and removed the Mace as a gesture of my dissatisfaction.

I did, subsequently, speak on it and explained to the House my own reasons for taking such a drastic step, but I was careful to say that on that occasion that I was not necessarily the best judge of the lightness of my own cause because I was angry, and the worst possible ally to a cause is anger. There have been other occasions when I disagreed with the Speaker of this Chamber. One is my colleague now, and I have had to voice disagreements at rulings which he gave between 1948 and 1961 with which I disagreed; but never in my time here - and it is 15 years - have I until now noticed this continual barracking of the Chair by some hon. members who feel that it is their God-given right to have things all their own way in a parliamentary assembly. It is certainly not true. Let me put it this way, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All of the faults which Mr. Speaker may or may not have committed in the course of his tenure of office as Presiding Officer of this House, I think the least fault attributable to him must be the charge that he favours the majority Party as against the minority Party. This is certainly not our experience.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even if it were true that he favours the majority Party as against the minority Party, the fact is that the minority Party is saying it would be answered by us that, in our view, the boot

is on the other foot and the happenings, so to speak, are the other way around. If charge and counter-charge are going to be laid against Mr. Speaker that he favours one side more than another, and if the charge is laid from both sides of the House this, I believe, is as good a guarantee as you could wish that Mr. Speaker is trying under difficult circumstances to perform his duties. The circumstances in this House are peculiar to this House. As a General Election approaches, hon. members opposite will wish to fight it even here, not realising that they can only properly fight a General Election at the polls. You cannot start an election in Parliament, because Parliament by definition is the place of deliberations after elections are held; so because some hon. member opposite feels aggrieved by certain rulings which Mr. Speaker may have given - rulings which, if I may disclose and point out to them, are reluctantly given and in some cases not forcefully applied - if hon. members are aggrieved by those rulings, it should not be beyond their wit, judgment and capacity for parliamentary manoeuvre to get their way without embroiling the Chair.

You can only have one Speaker at a time, and it makes nonsense of Parliament to berate the Speaker on the ground that he is a member of the majority Party. All the Speakers who have been presiding over this House in my time have been members of the majority Parties, and it is not their membership of the majority Party as such that made them good or bad Speakers. It was their ability to command respect and the attention of the whole House. 3.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one last point I wish to make. I cannot prescribe to Mr. Speaker how he should preside over this House. That is not my business. My business is to get the Government's legislation through. Mr. Speaker's business is to keep an even balance in debate and see that the Rules and Standing Orders are not transgressed, and I would not presume to tell him his job. I only remind the whole House that Mr. Speaker has been elected in two consecutive sessions and on each occasion he was elected not by a majority, but by the willing assent of the whole House; and perhaps to that extent, if to no other, he is the Speaker of the whole House. It was open to hon. members, when they had a chance to elect the occupant of the Chair, to show their dissent by nominating another hon. member and letting the majority decide. They did not so decide. They agreed with the nomination which we made, and so the whole House assented to his election.

Another point is this: in this very Session of Parliament - that is to say in the five year Session - very early in the Session a motion of censure was moved against Mr. Speaker. This was moved and debated very fully. An amendment was moved from this side negating the whole tenor of the motion moved by the other side, but stressing the House's thanks to Mr. Speaker and its congratulations to him, because at that time he had completed more than 30 years' continuous service as a member of this hon. House. In this very week Mr. Speaker celebrates his 33rd unbroken year of membership of this House. This is something of which any hon. member can justly be proud, and it ought to be a mark of satisfaction to the rest of us to know that we have sat in a Parliament with some hon. member who had been in this Parliament when some members of the present Parliament had not yet been born. Whether you dislike Mr. Speaker or not, he is an elected member of this House and he shares with us to every extent all our

failures and all our triumphs. It would be as well, therefore, if hon. members opposite did not press this motion to the kind of conclusion which its very tenor would suggest. If it is pressed to a conclusion, it will be defeated; but I do not think that this side of the House wants to rush to the defence of the Chair in these circumstances which we consider entirely unnecessary.

The hon. member who moved the motion, having spoken his mind, and having, as it were, released the grievance which he personally may have felt against Mr. Speaker which is not universally shared by the whole House, has performed what I think is a fitting parliamentary duty, and if he asks leave to withdraw the motion, this side of the House would not object to it.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, "whence all but he had fled"! One would observe that I am not "the boy on the burning deck". Maybe out of ignorance or courage that boy did not flee. May I inform my colleagues on this side and my colleague on the Government side that I have the courage to stand on this occasion on the burning deck. I am going to vote in support of this Resolution, and history will record that I brought a Resolution before Parliament where members of the Government side and on my side were in support of it, but did not have the courage of their convictions to vote for it. If the word "hypocrite" was parliamentary, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have to say in no uncertain terms that my colleagues on both sides of the House are hypocrites. I cannot do that because it is unparliamentary, for I cannot see how honourable men can come in this Chamber elected by the people to do justice, expected to be sincere and honest, and say that they are in agreement with something, when the tenor of their speeches prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that they are in support of this Resolution, that they have no confidence in Mr. Speaker, but yet they cannot vote for the Resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how would you feel before a jury knowing that your client, the accused, is not guilty but has been brought guilty by the jury? I would like to start off, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the speech made by a very senior member of my Party, and I have made a few notes. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph in his speech said that he agrees that Mr. Speaker is not doing the job that he has been asked to do, and went on to say that he would have supported the Resolution if I did not treat him like a ten-cents boy; I should have notified him that I was bringing this Resolution. May I draw it to the attention of my honourable and experienced colleague that I would have notified him, had I been reporting tomorrow morning for work at the Fix-it -Right Garage. I notified the Leader of my Party, and it is my Party Leader's duty to notify my colleagues. I am going to make minced meat of their arguments in support of my Resolution, because it is hypocritical to make a speech in favour of a Resolution or Bill and then vote against it. How can the electorate feel about you, especially when one talks about 24 years of unbroken service? Shame on you!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the text of my Resolution:

"WHEREAS certain Rulings of His Honour the Speaker have been inconsistent with established parliamentary procedure and with the rules of commonsense;

AND WHEREAS the standard of order and discipline in this hon. House has steadily deteriorated due to the inefficacy of His Honour the Speaker as Presiding Officer;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House has no confidence in His Honour the Speaker."

Would it be really honest for a member to get up and say he agrees with the Resolution, that he would have voted for the Resolution, but that I did not notify him? What in truth and in fact he is saying is this.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order. The hon. member must think that I am afraid to get up, but I never said that I was in agreement with the Resolution, but because he did not notify me I was not going to vote for it. I said he did not bring it before the Party, but those members of the Party who agreed with him, where are they now? I would never support it in the way he brought it. He had to beg the hon. senior member for Christ Church to second it; otherwise it would not even be seconded.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are remarks made by certain hon. members at some times which I must ignore. On his point of order he said he would have still supported it if I have notified the Party, which means that my Party, according to my colleague, agrees with the Resolution. Even at this stage my colleague agrees with the Resolution. Let us accept that I notified my Party; is he in agreement with it? If so, it is his duty to vote for it. I can only conclude, if what I am hearing from my colleague is correct, that when he casts a vote in favour of something he necessarily does not agree with it, but supports it for some reason. However, this fancy idea about being around all these years means nothing to me; am I to understand that because I was sitting in Parliament for a mere three years, somebody sitting for 25 years can push me around? If a lawyer, a Doctor of Law or a Doctor of Medicine or some professional man had spent six months in here you would hear that he knows the ropes; but I happen to be one of those unfortunate black people of Barbados who can serve my country and serve it well.

The senior member for St. Michael has boasted on many occasions that quite a number of people have asked him to vote against Mr. Speaker, and I remember when the hon. member said that the Speaker allows the junior member for St. Joseph too much room to operate and he does, not give the same latitude to the most junior members of this House. I would even venture to suggest that had the senior member for St. Michael been in my position, he would have no confidence in Mr. Speaker. I said that the way Mr. Speaker conducts himself in here is making a mockery of Parliament, making himself look like a Fourth Form boy to people like George Evelyn, and like a Third Form boy to the senior member for St. Peter. When members on the Government side can get up and accuse Mr. Speaker of inconsistency and support the Resolution, then say that they are not going to vote for it because the hon. Leader of the House was not informed of it, they may not have to answer for this in here but at the Judgment Bar they will see the face of the great Jehovah, and I can only say that this is a hypocritical approach.

This Resolution says that we have no confidence in the head of the House and therefore it is the duty of the head of the House to resign; if not, it is the duty of the servants of the House to call on him to resign. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what kind of Speaker could this be that in three short years there have been three motions of No-Confidence moved against him, and among them one of the most experienced politicians and statesmen of the West Indies, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, brought in two! I remember very carefully the Leader of the House said that at times he does not hold favour with all members and he recalled the incident when he removed the Mace from in front of a former Speaker on that occasion because he was not in favour of Mr. Speaker's ruling. That is an admission from the hon. junior member from St. Lucy, the Deputy Prime Minister of an Independent nation. I am not going to remove the Mace, but I am going to exercise my democratic right by voting for this Resolution; what type of person could I be to bring a Resolution and then withdraw it? What do you think my constituents would think of me? They would say that I am a half-baked politician.

I would like to make reference to my colleague, the junior member for St. Peter. If there was ever a speech made in Parliament that touched my soul and one which would cause me to withdraw my Resolution, it was the speech made by my colleague; what he does not remember is that at times I have a heart harder than Pharaoh's. On the very evening when the vote of no-confidence was being debated before you, the Prime Minister on his feet looked at the Speaker of this hon. Chamber and addressed him like this: "Man, why do you not rule"? 4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker said not a word. He got deaf in his right ear overnight. The Prime Minister, the person to set an example, the person who envisages that there is going to be inflation within 18 months and that Barbados would be more costly than Bermuda or the Bahamas - God help this country. He is the Minister of Finance, Bachelor of Economics, Doctor of Laws, and all of those fancy things, and he was able to address the Speaker thus: "Man, rule"! Not a word was heard from those members who were in

here for 20 or 30 years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also like to draw to your attention that I witnessed in here, when my colleague was making a speech for nine or ten hours on his feet on one Head, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, what took place. When you were sitting there, the hon. senior member for the City broke all of the traditions of this House, and yet this evening the senior member for the City was telling me that I should withdraw my motion because traditions are there. I wonder whether he could remember walking in here coatless! What was he then doing with the traditions? Did he not throw them through the door? Would he have done that in the presence of G. D. L. Pile or Mr. Evelyn? No. He had no respect for Mr. Speaker, and I cannot respect Mr. Speaker.

If both sides agree that Mr. Speaker should be the Chief Servant of the House, then I say this: at that time I was feeling my way like a child walking in the dark. I am not so slow a thinker; I am observant, and whatever I observe I make my comments on. These are the comments I have to make this evening. I have heard a lot about tradition this evening. I have heard that when one brings a motion of No-Confidence against the Speaker, one is banishing him. I have heard what the Leader of the House and other members had to say. Why did they banish him and then withdraw? They say that it is a question of tradition; it is a law laid down and you have to follow the pattern.

Now, the senior member for the City walked in here coatless. Was he breaking the traditions? Was he then thinking about traditions? No. He took the attitude that "Branks' is in the Chair; so who cares?" We are all one. That is the attitude, Sir. You could not do it to the Piles or the Evelyns. Then you talk about Black Power. We already have Black Power, but we do not use it correctly. Government reigns supreme. The only thing a Government cannot do is to change a man or make a man. What Black Power do you want? Do you want Black Power to have it abused?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was told that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph used to be as quiet as a lamb in 1948-49 and in 1953. You never heard his voice, but since we have come together I have heard that he is the rugged lion from St. Joseph. He was a lion without teeth; he is a toothless lion when he says that he agrees with this Resolution, but I did not notify the Party of it. He has no conscience; he is afraid to support me on this matter. I am going to vote for it. Even if I am dumb, by indication, you can accept my vote, Sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not attempt to hold up this honourable House of Assembly much longer, realising that a few persons have returned to the ship. Though there is a fire, they are coming back to put it out. I believe I have touched them. I look forward to the hon. senior member for St. Michael. This is a

free vote; it is not a question of Party policy or Government policy, and you have a right to cast a free vote. If your conscience can afford you to speak in the vein in which you have spoken, , 'then let your conscience afford you to support this Resolution.

I call, Sir, on many of us in here who, I know, do not agree with Mr. Speaker, his poor rulings, his inconsistency and his ineffective approach to things. (At this stage Mr. SMITH withdrew from the

Chamber.) Sir, there goes another boy from the deck. I heard that Jubie Reece once said that he liked the money, but he was not going to vote. I have to say this about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: history is going to recall that he has made his shortest speech of all times in Parliament when he said "I second the Resolution because I believe it should have a full debate". He then sat down. I also recall his very famous words "The professions of lawyers and actors are the strongest unions in the world". How could he vote against. Mr. Speaker who is a legal luminary like himself?

I, therefore, beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Resolution do now pass.

The question was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. W. R. LOWE; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY and Mr. SMITH - 8.

AYES:

Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HINDS - 2.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Itemll be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am also asking that No. 2 on the Order Paper be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is for you to rule. Please rule; I am on my feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is not for me to rule; I am not the Leader of the Opposition, and I cannot rule on that point. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking you to rule. I am on my feet.

I beg to move that Item No. 11 be the next Order of the Day, and my reason for doing this is because I think this is a rather important Resolution. It deals with the minimum weekly wage Bill, and I am under the impression that, as our harvesting season is approaching, the Government would be quite willing to support this Resolution so as to put the machinery of this Resolution into gear. (Asides.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member for St. James still addressing the Chair?

Mr. CRAIG:

I beg to move that Item No. 11 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am also asking that Item No. 2 standing in my name be the next Order of the Day. I take it that anything on this Order Paper is of great importance, and you, Sir, will note that this Resolution was on the Order Paper since 10th June, and Resolutions, including the one which has just been concluded.....

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The time now being 4.30 p.m., the House will revert to Government Business.

When the sitting was suspended earlier today, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown was about to speak on the Caribbean Development Bank Bill. He may now proceed,

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C.E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to Clause 1. The figures "1970" are to be substituted for the figures "1969".

I beg to move that Clause 1 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 2 was called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment in the third line of Clause 3 (2). It should read "non-negotiable and non-interest-bearing". The word "non" is to be inserted before the words "interest-bearing."

I beg to move that Clause 3 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were called and passed. The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of Bill as amended in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO GUARANTEE LOAN TO BARBADOS HOUSING AUTHORITY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be the next Order of the Day, and I am asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Housing to take charge of it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day and permission is given to the Hon. Minister of Housing to take charge of it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. George to take charge of Item No. 4.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. George to take charge of Item No. 4, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. senior member for St. George to take charge of Item No. 4.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS, 1969**

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

4.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO.54

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that. Mr. CHAIRMAN The question is.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that this Resolution be recommitted.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes our labours for today's sitting. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 20th January, 1970 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.40 p.m.