

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, 14th July, 1970.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.40 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q. Co, F. Z. S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J. P., Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J. P., (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Social Welfare) Hon. J. O. C. TUDOR, C. L. M. G. M. A, (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J. P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES,

J. P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J. P. Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour, G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy

Speaker); Mr. C, A. E.

HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. J.B. SPRINGER; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q. C., LL. B. and Mr. ELLIOTT Do MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am informed that the Minutes of Tuesday, 5th May, 1970, have been duly circulated, and, unless there is any objection, I will declare the Minutes duly confirmed. (.Pause;) It is so declared.

Now, the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 12th May, 1970, have also, according to my information, been circulated. If there is no objection, the Minutes of that Meeting will be confirmed. Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 12th May, 1970, now duly confirmed.

INDISPOSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have been informed by Mr. Clerk that he has been officially informed, and I have been requested, to offer an excuse for the absence, through indisposition, today of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Statement on behalf of the Prime Minister

"On 8th July, 1969 a Resolution, which had been introduced into this House by a Private Member, was passed requesting the Government to authorise the payment to the person responsible for the funeral expenses of certain pensioners, of the whole of the monthly pension to which those certain pensioners would have been entitled had they not died before the end of the particular month.

2. Existing legislation provides that any sums due to a pensioner at the date of his death, should be paid to his legal personal representative or, where the sum is less than \$1,000 to the person who appears to the Minister of Finance to be best entitled to receive it. In these two cases the person mentioned might not be one and the same. Nor might either be the person responsible for the funeral expenses of the pensioner.

3. Funeral grants are now payable in respect of. all Government pensioners who have retired since the inauguration of National Insurance and Social Security in 1967.

4. I shall continue to investigate the most satisfactory means of implementing the Resolution at the earliest possible date. "

On behalf of the Minister of Finance I am commanded to lay:

The Customs Duties (Buttons Limited) Order, 1970.

Also Statement showing Annual Abstract Account of Receipts and payments of the Consolidated Fund, and other receipts and payments for the year ended 31st March, 1968.

Also Statement of Assets and Liabilities for the year ended 31st March, 1968.

Also Statement of Public Debt and the Sinking Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1968.

Also Statement of Loans and Credit guaranteed by the Government and outstanding at 31st March, 1968.

Also Statement of Advances and Loans outstanding as at 31st March, 1968.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following

Resolution of authorise the use for the storage of petroleum of the building known as the Powder Magazine situated at Powder Road, St. Michael.

Also Resolution to grant the sum of \$187, 453 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1970-71 Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1970-71, No. 3 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 104 asked by the hon. senior mem for St. Thomas is ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No, 91 asked by the hon. junior member for St. George is ready.

Also Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 94 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter is ready.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that the Standing Orders Committee has presented a Report which reads as follows

The Select Committee appointed to consider and revise the Standing Orders of the House have the honour, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 58, to present the following Special Report: -

1. The Committee view with grave concern the introduction by the Government into the House of Assembly on 30th June, 1970, of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, 1963 which seeks (inter alia) to remove the immunity of Members of Parliament from (i) the institution against them of civil and criminal proceedings in respect of words spoken by them in Parliament; and (ii) arrest on civil process outside the precincts of Parliament.

2. The Committee are of the firm opinion that matters which involve the privileges, immunities or powers of Parliament should be dealt with along certain procedural lines that have been long established, not only in this Parliament but in all Parliaments adhering to the democratic way of Government. 2. 50p.m.

In the first place, the Committee feel that the initiative with respect to any question involving the privileges of Parliament should rest with Parliament itself either collectively or acting on a recommendation of a Committee thereof. The privileges of the House of Assembly have been claimed by successive Speakers for over two centuries from the Queen's Representative in this Island and, so far as they have been consistent with the Royal Prerogative and the Constitution of the Island, freely granted by him on each occasion up to and including the opening of this Parliament. The Committee feel that any revision of these privileges which include the right of freedom in debate and freedom from arrest, both of which are affected by the terms of the aforementioned Bill, should take place only on the initiative of the House of Assembly or a Committee thereof.

3. The Committee note that some of the provisions set forth in the said Bill, especially those dealing with the freedom of speech, to some degree anticipate and replace the powers, functions, and terms of

reference given to the Committee and would make the provisions in the Standing Orders relating to the Rules of Order and the Contents of Speeches at present being considered by the Committee, obsolete.

4. The Committee therefore are of the opinion that, in view of the importance of the matters above referred to, they should make a Special Report, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 58, to the Honourable House drawing its attention to the effect of the proposed Bill upon the work of the Committee.

Dated this 10th day of July, 1970.

THEODORE BRANCKER Chairman.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time and I am advised that Replies are ready to Nos. 91, 94 and 104.

QUESTION re GUN HILL HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 91 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows -

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

Will the Minister consider the possibility of converting Gun Hill House, St. George into a Youth Hostel for the use of the young people of the Island?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows -

" Consideration is being given to the more suitable use to which this building should be put, and the hon. member's suggestion will be taken into account".

QUESTION re QUALIFICATIONS FOR TERCENTENARY SCHOOL OF NURSING AND BARBADOS SCHOOL FOR MENTAL NURSING

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 94 stands in the name of the hon, junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows -

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

Is the Minister aware that the educational requirements for entry into the Teaching Service of this Island have been relaxed?

2. Will the Minister consider making similar relaxation in the requirements for entry in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Tercentenary School of Nursing and the Barbados School for Mental Nursing?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows -

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir. The qualifications for entry into the Queen Elizabeth Tercentenary School of Nursing and the Barbados School for Mental Nursing are already lower than for entry into the Teaching Service, and I do not consider it to be in the best interest of the Nursing service to relax further these qualifications. "

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell this House how many G. C. E. Certificates are required by an applicant seeking to enter the Tercentenary School of Nursing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, up to the end of March, 1968, the qualifications for appointment in the Teaching Service were five subjects at "O" level.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I asked the Minister the number of G. C. E. Certificates required for entry to the Tercentenary School of Nursing, and not the teaching Service. We will come to that later.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind, I am trying to give the hon. member a full reply once and for all, because both points have been raised and the complete answer must be given. I said that up to the end of March, 1968, the qualifications for appointment to the Teaching Service were five subjects at "O" Level which should include English Language and Mathematics. Since then the requirements are four subjects at "O" Level of which English Language must be one.

The requirements for entry into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Tercentenary School of Nursing and the Barbados School for Mental Nursing are two subjects at "O" Level or the equivalent, one of which should be English Language, English Literature or History. If you have another examination of equal level, or failing that, if the Ministry of Education sets an examination of comparable standard and you pass either in English Language, English Literature or History, then you are admitted. On the face of it, whereas the requirements call for four subjects at "O" Level for the Teaching Service, two of which must necessarily be English Language and Mathematics - which is one of the most difficult subjects for most people - in the case of admission to the Tercentenary School of Nursing or the Barbados School for Mental Nursing, the requirements are two subjects at "O" Level and not four. If you have not got two, as I have already explained, an examination is set by the Ministry of Education in these particular subjects, and if you satisfy the examiners that set these examinations, then you are regarded as having the equivalent qualification and duly admitted to the School of Nursing.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that an applicant is no longer required to possess as many as four Certificates at "O" Level for recruitment into the Teaching Service of this Island? 3. 00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Unfortunately for me, I am not the Minister of Education; but speaking on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Education, my latest information is as I gave you. The requirement is for four subjects at 'O' Level and not five as it was in March, 1968. Any further information, I am afraid, I will have to seek further advice and assistance because I am not in a position to say how many subjects are required. If the

hon. member is better informed than I am, then the notes of the Cabinet Papers up to June, 1970 seem not to be in order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the relaxation referred to in my Question No. 94 has taken place since March, 1968 and as recent as in 1970?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am afraid I cannot answer any further.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister coming in here today to answer a question in 1970 based on information up to June, 1968?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member does not seem to be following what is being said. I gave him the history of the entire thing for his benefit and for the benefit of the House as a whole. I said that in March, 1968 five 'O' Level subjects were required; since then it has been reduced in 1969 and 1970 to four subjects at 'O' Level. That is as far as the Teaching Service is concerned; as far as the Nursing service is concerned, it is now two. The hon. member attempted to make out that the qualification for the Teaching Service is higher; it is not so, it is lower.

Mr. HINDS:

Is the Minister aware that in 1970 an applicant for the Teaching Service in this Island need not have as many as four 'O' Level subjects?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that; unfortunately for me, I do not carry that Port folio.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 104 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Minister aware that the scale of costs which can be awarded in Magistrates Courts has not

been adjusted to take account of the very great increase in the Civil Jurisdiction of the said courts?

2. Will the Minister therefore invite the responsible authorities to promulgate a new scale of Magisterial costs as soon as possible?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

(1) Yes, Sir.

(2) A new scale of costs is being prepared for submission to the Judicial Advisory Council.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister give any idea as to how quickly the Judicial Advisory Council is expected to do its work? This has been going on for years with the scale of Magisterial costs being scandalously low.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I will imagine quite soon, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

To no other Questions, according to my information, are replies available; so we will proceed to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the Day in Private Members' Business is in the name of the hon. and learned member for Bridgetown, and it is to resume debate on a Resolution requesting Government to set up a Judicial Commission of Enquiry into the administration of the Barbados Housing Authority from July, 1969 to the end of June, 1970. When this matter was previously discussed the hon. junior member for

Bridgetown moved, and it was seconded by the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas, that the Resolution do now pass; the Hon. Minister of Health spoke and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was speaking when Private Members' Business came to end. That hon. member is not presently in his seat; is there any other hon. member who seeks to speak on this subject?

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, on looking at my Order Paper and hearing from you, I note that the senior member for St. Andrew was last addressing this August Assembly when Private Members' Business came to an end, and one would have thought that in a matter as important as this we would have seen the senior member for St. Andrew in his place even before the Clerk of the House was here. Perhaps through some pressure of business, or some little unfortunate incident in his own domestic affairs, he finds it impossible to be with us today.

At this point I would like to welcome the Leader of the House back in his seat, and, looking at him, I can see he is as fresh as a rose, Mr. Speaker, after his very successful jaunt abroad. I am confident, however, that had he been here last sitting, we would not have seen his face as fresh as it is today. What he did not hear last sitting, I shall endeavour to give him in a picture of the exhibition displayed in here by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, and supported by the hon. junior member for Christ Church to such an extent that I believe there is nowhere in the Commonwealth, no Parliament at all in the world that any Speaker would allow a member of Parliament to speak on a point of order for one hour and forty minutes. A member of this House had that privilege on a point of order, and, Mr. Speaker, again, Sir, if I bring a vote for 'no- confidence' against you on this occasion, I believe you are not going to be in that Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I was not here in my place when the House last met; but if what the hon. member is saying.... ..

Mr. HINDS. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. SPEAKER:

He has risen on a point of order, so I understood him to say.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I will say the hon. member is out of order in the remarks he is making with respect to the Chair, and he should be told that he is out of order. 3. 10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think it is fairly well known now that a substantive motion is the only correct procedure in which to deal with the conduct of the Chair, and I would recommend to the hon. senior member for St. James that he proceeds to discuss the Resolution which is before the House.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, when I started to address the Chair and I was not dealing with the Resolution before the House, knowing you as well as I do, you would have immediately asked the senior member for St. James to sit down or, at least, to withdraw. That is why I drew to the attention of the House that you were also present in the Chair when the senior member for St. Andrew rose on a point of order and spoke for one hour and forty minutes. I am also reminding you, Sir, that I believe I would have been sent outside if I had done that.

However, for me to recite this Resolution is like carrying coals to Newcastle. I heard the hon. junior member for the City, in moving this Resolution, make certain comments. I heard the senior member for St. Thomas, in his own style as only he can, put forward his observations and made certain comments. One would have thought that, with the experience of the senior member for St. Andrew, he would have remained in his seat and allowed every member around this Table to speak on the Resolution and then get up and defend his Ministry. This is not an indictment against the senior member for St. Andrew. We are not here to accuse him of stealing. He said that if we had accused him of stealing he would have made a point. This Resolution deals absolutely with nothing such as stealing. How can we accuse an hon. member of stealing? All this Resolution is asking this House to do is to set up a Judicial Commission to prove to the taxpayers that there was proper administration during the time the Minister of Housing held that portfolio. It is as simple as that. I can -almost sit down at this point.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government refuse to vote for this Resolution, then I say that they condone such behaviour. If they vote against it, then I am inclined to say that they must set up this Judicial Commission. Let the Judicial Commission prove that members on this side of the House are not capable or worthy of carrying out the duties of a Government of this country. Let us have the Judicial Commission; let that Commission prove that we are vicious persons and not worthy of our citizenship in this country.

Sir, I have heard ever so often on public platforms that the Ministers of the former Government were people you could not trust. I remember hearing that there were going to be cases brought before the Courts of this country to prove that the Ministers of the former Government had mismanaged the affairs of this country. I heard that they were going to the various Departments burning the files from 1961-1970, and not a single Minister was charged before the Law Courts for stealing or doing anything which

the Government could prove. We are not accusing the Minister of stealing; we are supporting this Resolution and the allegations contained in it we are accusing the Minister of mismanagement of the Housing Authority. In order to prove that we are wrong, they should vote for this Resolution.

I remember hearing the Junior member for the City and the senior member for St. Thomas, in their addresses to this House, speak about being shot. The Minister says that he will shoot anybody who takes bread out of his mouth. The Prime Minister is the only person in this country who can "fire" the Minister; if he "fires" the Minister, he is taking bread out of the Minister's mouth. The only person the the Minister could be thinking of shooting at will be the Prime Minister. It is as simple as that. We cannot "fire" the Minister; we do not have the power to do so. I remember the remarks of the Minister, and I will recite them. He said that he is going to shoot any man who takes bread out of his mouth. I warn the Prime Minister to look out. I have said that on a public platform.

We do not employ the Minister. The Prime Minister of this country, the Minister of Finance and the senior member for St. John is the person who employs the Ministers of the Cabinet. The Prime Minister can hire and "fire"; if he "fires" the Minister, he will be taking bread out of his mouth; therefore, the only person the Minister could have been referring to is the Prime Minister. In the Minister's address he mentioned that his father had to eat; he was not going to put out his father, and asked what was wrong with giving his father a contract. There is absolutely nothing in this Resolution accusing the Minister of giving a contract to his father. In this Resolution it is clearly stated:

"AND WHEREAS one of the supervisors employed by Mr. Watson....." Now, Mr. Watson is a plumber employed by the Government of this country, and he is from St. Andrew. He is the person we are accusing in this Resolution of having the contract to provide 2,000 houses at a cost of \$1.2 million. Why was not this contract put to tender so that we could have Mr. Smith, a contractor; Mr. St. John, a contractor, and Mr. John Citizen, a contractor, who are supposed to be qualified contractors in the field (a) of painting, or in the field (b) of carpentry? 3. 20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, the contract was never put out to tender; it was just given, and the Minister in his own remarks said that we did this. This is the practice he found in the Housing Authority. We were put out of power at governmental level because these are the things we were accused of doing. The present Government was elected to power to rectify these things; now the Minister tells us that we were right because he is carrying on that same practice. If there is nothing wrong, why then engage Mr. Watson? Why should you rent a compressor from C. O. Williams Construction Company for the Housing Authority unless you could come here and say the re was no other compressor in Barbados to do the job for the Housing Authority? This Resolution accuses the Minister himself of having this compressor at his building site while the taxpayers of this country had to pay for the use of one being rented. If we were really accusing the Minister of stealing, we would know that the Minister would be in a position to

buy ten com-

pressors. We are not accusing him of stealing; we are asking the Government to appoint a Commission to prove if the compressor was at the Minister's home while the Housing Authority rented one from Mr. C. O. Williams. We are aiming at bringing down the Government because they are not worthy of ruling. You have introduced into this country an element of things, villians and criminals. If you look around this country, you will find that night after night the air is filled with criminals abasing the Prime Minister today, the Leader of the Opposition tomorrow, and the next day the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Sir, I warn the Minister to do his own thing now because he will not see Parliament again. As long as the Good God gives me health and strength, I will speak in Orange Hill where the Minister believes he has a chance. Do not let him be misled through the trucks that he sent to bring people down from Orange Hill to a feast at "Melbourne. " They were always labourites and history has proven this. No one should make a speech in here on this Resolution. If the other side was as honest as it claims it is, from the time this Resolution was moved and seconded, members would support it because they would be able to prove to this country that they have honest Ministers who are capable of managing their affairs. The Press is not going to bring this, and we are going to take to the road like Jack on the roads, and last night was a classic example of what this country stands for. Even with the weather threatening, we equalled the Independence Square meeting when you had Prime Minister Forbes Burnham of Guyana.

Sir there is another point which I should like to call to Your Honour's attention. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that twenty-four black men sit around this Table. We are reminded of people like Duncan O'Neale, the uncle of the Prime Minister, and people like Maryshaw, Brains Alleyne, and even Menzies Chase whom we see around here today. All he can get for the struggle in assisting twenty-four black men to come here to take over the grips of the Conservatives of this country that ruled us with an iron fist are the crumbs that he bags from the members of this Parliament. You have no use for him. That is the record by Jackie Opel. "You aint no good, you aint no good at all. '1 I am going to present that to the Hon. Minister and knowing him well enough, he is going to take it too.

Mr. Speaker, nobody is condemning the Minister, In whatever the hon. member St. Thomas said in his address to Parliament, he made it abundantly clear that the Minister had told him so, and there were some times when he said he would not like to betray the Minister's confidence. I am not dealing with anything the Minister told me. The Minister is a young man and so am I. I wish him well. He has the opportunity now of proving that he is capable of managing any Ministry that is put into his hands, Let him vote for this Resolution. I am not putting him wrong.

There is something which even puzzles me more so. When the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was Minister of Agriculture, there was a bit of trouble at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and the

Minister fired the Chairman, Mr. Jeffrey Johnson - Hansard will prove this - and came in here and made the boast that he had fired the Chairman.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, I rose to enquire which Minister, but I understand that the members made reference to a former Minister. I apologise to him.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, there is a thing called the Old Brigade. In anything that comes from the mouth of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I am sure that his heart and soul are still here, but the coppers are over there. We appreciate that.

Sir, it is strange to me that when the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was Minister of Agriculture, there was this problem of some money mix-up at the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I heard of a \$10,000 or \$15,000 cheque, and the Minister proved to Parliament at that time that he was an honest Minister and was capable of carrying out his Ministry and he wanted no corruption. On this occasion I would ask the Minister why he did not look into the Housing Authority. If he knew at the time that we were doing something wrong when we were in the Government, why did he carry on this practice? Why did he fire the Chairman of the B. M. C. and did not decide to fire the Chairman of the Housing Authority? What am I to understand? Is it because Brushmaster is making every poll a winning poll?

Mr. Speaker, I would not say that two smart rats cannot live in one hole. It would be unfair because if I said that, one would have to conclude that that is why Senator Peter Morgan left the Tourist Board, I accept the comments made about his resignation. I could not say the reason why Senator Peter Morgan has resigned as soon as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is now Minister in charge of the portfolio under which tourism falls, because I would know that two smart rats cannot live in one hole; a boar rat has to be among them; but maybe that is why Senator Peter Morgan has resigned and I accept his resignation. I feel he has done this country a service by resigning. 3.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what puzzles me again is that I am sorry that the Leader was not in his seat because that would not have happened. I have never seen any one member fight the suspension of Standing Orders until the last minute. I believe it was one of the most terrifying days you have ever had in that Chair and I will tell you why; you have your allegiance to the Government Party.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member can deal in a substantive motion with such matters; let the hon.

member continue to deal with the business which is before us.

Mr. CRAIG:

I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that I have been in this Chamber for three and a half years and I have made a pretty good study of my duties; that is all I have to say, with great respect to you. Mr. Speaker, what puzzles me is for what reason did the hon. senior member for St. Andrew put up such a battle so that Private Members' Business should not have been discussed at the last sitting. I remember very carefully that when the Resolution was introduced, the junior member for the City prefaced his remarks by saying "The guilty fleeth when no one pursueth. " Even the acting Leader of the House was putting up a battle, but the battle was between Mr. Speaker and the senior member for St. Andrew for one hour and 40 minutes; I wonder why it lasted so long when there is nothing to hide. This should have been an easy Resolution which should have had an easy passage, and we should have had some honest people sitting down on this Commission, and when they report back to Parliament the nation would then decide who is right and who is wrong, if the hon. Minister is so confident in his defence, which was a very childish one. He did not deal with the Resolution at all; all he was saying was that he has never stolen and that his father has to eat and he did not see why he could not build houses as a carpenter. Nobody is concerned with that; all we are asking in this Resolution as it states here, lest hon. members on the other side and in the entire Chamber forget, this is the Resolution; - " WHERE AS a contract to build houses has been awarded by the Barb' Housing Authority without any invitation for tenders; " I immediately find the Minister not guilty, and do you know why? He inherited this bad practice. What I would say is, why did the Minister not change it? "AND WHEREAS an offer to build houses to be distributed by the Welfare Committee of the Barbados Housing Authority at a price of \$2, 400. 00 has been made by a Mr. Bryan the father of the Senior Member for St. Andrew and Minister of Housing in the Barbados Government from July, 1969 until June 1970 which offer has been tentatively accepted without any invitation for tenders; " Not guilty again. We are not accusing the Minister of corruption. "AND WHEREAS the Barbados Housing Authority has agreed to purchase houses built on the premises of the Senior Member for St. Andrew, and Minister of Housing at Melbourne, Belmont Road, St. Michael, but the aforesaid Mr. Bryan; " The Minister owns "Melbourne", the Minister is Minister of Housing and he approves the loans without tender. He is in the frying pan again.

Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS:

On a point of order, the senior member for St. Andrew nor the Minister of Housing - neither of them owns "Melbourne. "

Mr. CRAIG:

If the Minister had listened to me carefully he would have heard that I found him not guilty. I am not concerned with who owns Melbourne; I hope you own it because it is a beautiful place. It was owned by Dr. Emtage -at one time, and I am told that it is now worth more than \$30, 000.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. member not to stray.....

Mr. CRAIG:

I know you will pounce on me now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not pouncing on anybody; I have called to the attention of the hon. member that that does not come under the subject matter of the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG:

Let us bat on a good wicket. "AND WHEREAS the Housing Authority has awarded contracts for painting and repairing of houses owned by the Housing Authority to Mr. Sydney Watson, an employee of Government in the Waterworks Department; " You are guilty now. Is Mr. Watson a painter or a plumber? I challenge the Minister to get up and answer that. Is Mr. Watson employed in the Government as a painter, a carpenter or a plumber? I am told that on his application form for work in the Waterworks Department - where I am told he has been working for 13 years - he said he was employed as a plumber and that that is his trade. That is a trade a boy must learn; you start as a boy and go on till you reach adulthood as a plumber. I am prepared to free you of this charge if you can get up and say that Mr. Watson is a recognised builder, painter or carpenter; so why is it that this contract for the painting and repairing houses should be given to Mr. Watson? And Mr. Watson strangely enough is from St. Andrew, the constituency that the hon. member represents, and it is strange enough that Mr. Watson happens to be a plumber. If you can earn more bread day after day at painting, is it necessary for you to continue your job as a plumber? You are guilty of this charge, and as a Minister if you are guilty of corruption, resign. Do like John Profumo; if you have told lies to this House and you resign now and this Commission comes about, the Prime Minister has no alternative, because, according to the hon. Minister's defence, this Resolution is wrong. 3. 40 p.m.

. To prove that you are right, then resign your Ministerial post. Whenever the Prime Minister calls an election he has to run you as a candidate in St. Andrew; but bear this in mind, if this Judicial Commission is set up and you have been proven guilty, you will not be able to run for a seat. If he does that he would be bringing a Minister who has been proven to be corrupt while he was serving in this Parliament. I warn you, the senior member for St. Andrew, to resign now. You know what it is to be a Minister; you know what it is not to be a Minister; you know what it is to be a Minister and not to get your pension at the age of 40; you know what it is to be a Minister of Housing, and you know what it is to be accused in a Resolution such as this; so you should resign now.

Sir, let them prove to this country that the Ministry of Housing, under the administration of the senior member for St. Andrew, did not rent from C.. O. Williams Construction Company a compressor while he had the machinery of the taxpayers of this country using at his home. That is not fair to the taxpayers. I should also be able to go to the Housing Authority and borrow a compressor, too.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The statement just made by the hon. member is a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Untrue.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Minister for allowing me to conclude my speech. All that I have said before was true. This is the only time he had objected and categorically denied what I have said. I apologise to the Minister and to the august Assembly for lying. I hope the Minister will get up and deny the other things. Sir, I must agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew when he said that a bird that flies too fast will some day fly past its nest. (Interruption.)

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is necessary again for me to draw to the attention of the Chair that, when a debate is going on, the people who have come in here on sufferance should not be laughing when certain things are said. This is the House of Assembly and not a theatre.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, the shoe is on the other foot now, but I support the hon. Minister. I believe that if the people in the Gallery are to come in here and rake part in the debates, then they should also face the electorate. It is needless to draw to my attention the appropriate Standing Order. Mr. Speaker, I think you know very well that if you have a cold and you went into the Gallery of the House of Commons, you will be asked to step out. Do you know why? Parliament is treated with respect. I say that the Government is responsible for it. I would not say Mr. Speaker, because he cannot see everything.

Let us look back at the Independence debates when the people almost slaughtered the senior member for St Joseph and so on. I support the present Minister of Housing wholeheartedly. If people come in

here to listen to debates they should take no part in the debates; they are here on sufferance; and if I have to become unpopular by saying this I do not mind becoming unpopular, because sometimes one must make an error.

Sir, the Minister said that my statement was untrue. I wonder whether he would get up, if I asked him to deny the other parts of the Resolution? Is it true that the Barbados Housing Authority accepted an offer of \$2, 400 made by Mr. Bryan, the father of the Senior Member for St. Andrew, which offer has been tentatively accepted without any invitation for tenders? Is that true? (Asides.) Speak for the Official Reporter to hear you; do not just nod your head; get up and say it is true.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. member continue to address the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am asking the hon. Minister to get up on his feet and deny what I have just said, as he did just now; let it go down in Hansard and be officially recorded; let the Press mention tomorrow that it is true. (Asides.) Do you think you can win a seat in St. Andrew? With what? Sir, the Minister nods his head in approval. This will now be official when I say that the Minister nods his head in approval. The Minister has not denied that he nods his head in approval. I wonder whether the Minister will deny that the Housing Authority has awarded contracts for painting and repairing of houses owned by the Housing Authority to Mr. Sydney Watson, an employee of Government in the Waterworks Department, and that Mr. Sydney Watson is a plumber. Nod or no nod, you are guilty.

Sir, I believe that this Resolution is going to have the support of the Government Members. This Resolution is going to bring you down after all of your hard work. After all of these years of hard work, toil, sweat and tears to win a Government, this Resolution is going to take it away from you. Appoint the Judicial Committee and then we in this country will be able to know whether you are worthy or unworthy to rule again in 1971.

Sir, with these observations and a few comments, I wish the hon. Minister well when this Commission is set up, because we know it is going to be set up. If what is in this Resolution is untrue, I make this statement in Parliament today: I will resign my seat in Parliament and refuse to contest again in 1971. I am going to repeat this in case the Official Reporter misses it. If the Government set up this Judicial Commission, with unrestricted terms of reference, and what is in this Resolution is untrue Mr. Speaker and hon. members of this august assembly, I shall resign from Parliament and will never ever, as long as there is life in my body, contest a seat to serve my country that I love so much.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that whenever a Parliament is dying and everybody knows that a General Election is either a matter of days, weeks, or months away, both sides of the Parliament address themselves to their relative positions which they think they hold in the community and possibly to the positions which they would like to hold after they have appealed to the electorate. 3. 50 p.m.,

I think this is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, because Parliament, in addition to being a legislative machine, is also a continuous electioneering platform. That is what Parliament is as well as being a machine for the making of law. Consequently everything that may be said to agitate the public mind can quite properly be discussed in Parliament, and it need not have the merit of being relevant to any situation, and all of it need not be true. There is another aspect, too, to this matter and it is that all Governments get the kind of Opposition they deserve. If, Mr. Speaker, you were to take all the troubles of each side of this House, all the problems which each of us may have, both indivi-

dually and collectively, and bundle them into a heap and then said to the Government: "Choose which burden you would carry, which cross you would bear", I think we would choose this Opposition, and I suspect, although I cannot speak for them, that if they were asked to choose what crosses they would carry, they would choose this Government, because Governments and Oppositions react to one another in very special ways because they bear a special relationship to one another. Strong Governments will therefore have troublesome Oppositions, because the real test of a Government's strength in Parliament is, of course, the nature of the Opposition it has to contend with. If we did not have this kind of Opposition, I myself would have doubts about the Government's strength. A case in point and then only by way of comparison is the case of the former Government with its Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Opposition, the Opposition of course was a formidable Opposition, but it concentrated its strength and strategy on policy. It knew very well that it could not bring the Government down because Parliaments quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, are not the best vehicles or instruments for the destruction of Governments. It is the electorate, and the electorate alone, which can destroy Governments. Parliament is only a forum of public information and criticism in addition to being a forum for making laws. We must speak with certain frankness on a matter like this because I do not think this debate is any more serious than any other we have had to contend with. I think that protagonists on both sides may wish to give it a seriousness greater than it has in principle, but I do not think so because in the last resort what is at stake is the ability of the Government to defend itself from the terms of attack of a hostile motion brought by the Opposition. The other side may feel that they have singled out the Minister for this kind of exercise, because, I suppose, like any political strategist they must try to see on which front, whether rightly or wrongly, the Government may appear - and, I stress, appear - to be vulnerable, and if they feel - and it can only be a feeling at this stage that it is vulnerable at a particular point, then they probe that point. This is normal political strategy and there is nothing wrong with it. But then, since it is normal political strategy, we cannot ask the House of Assembly - which is, after all, a forum for the airing of public criticism and for the giving of public information - to dabble in judicial matters, and this is why I fear that this side will have to divide the House on this motion.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the Courts -and when I say the Courts, I mean the personnel of the Courts, because if you ask for a Judicial Enquiry, you must mean an Enquiry conducted by a Judge, or Judges, or persons having the status and professional qualification of Judges - can only be concerned with something which comes within the confines of statute or common law. That is what I understand. I may be wrong. If, therefore, you ask for a Judicial Enquiry, it must mean that you seek to bring within the notice of the Courts matters which are quite properly their function and their responsibility to discharge. If they are matters outside the confines of statute or common law which the Courts must deal with, they have to deal with those matters by special authority being conferred on them.

The second point I want to make is that, if you ask for a Judicial Enquiry and you are serious in wanting what you ask for, I do not see how you can prejudice the very holding of the Enquiry by producing allegations - I cannot even say the evidence -which themselves would be the subject of any judicial investigation which you say you want or which may or may not be set up. After all this talk in this House from the other side, suppose the House were to agree to what the other side is asking, how would a Judge or how would Judges set about their work? In a small Island like Barbados, I am sure that even the Judges of the Supreme Court - and I do not say "even" in any pejorative sense, but I mean as far as the Judges of the Supreme Court may - nay, indeed must-have heard something of what has already been said in this House, because after all news carries very swiftly - they cannot help already being informed as to the tenor which this debate has taken, and I would imagine myself though I know nothing at all about these matters, that a judge who had been asked, supposing Parliament's will was made known in this respect, to preside over the Enquiry would at first I think, or indeed would at any time be very nervous of doing it on the ground that both he and his brother Judges, and other people not even members of the Judiciary have heard either by direct listening or by having relayed to them from those who have listened much about the matters which it is said they should be concerned with in a judicial investigation.

It would not be for me, Mr. Speaker, to say to the hon. member who moved this motion how he should proceed. I think as a member of Parliament, elected like the rest of us, he has a perfect right to bring any motion before this Chamber in any form or fashion in which he brings it; but the hon. member who moved it is certainly much more acquainted with legal matters than I am, and I have therefore to assume that when he has asked in the terms of the motion for a Judicial Enquiry, he does not, really want one because he must know much better.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the Minister, as I understand it, must be accusing me of insincerity because I do seriously want a Judicial Enquiry. 4. 00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER; The hon. member has made his point concisely.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member must forgive me if he thinks I am accusing him of insincerity; far from it. I think the hon. member's purpose is served in accepting what has been said, but not using the debate to flog the Government or a Minis-

ter of Government. This is proper political strategy but the only thing is that we cannot accept this procedure. I think the hon. member could have put the situation in a rather different and perhaps broader light if whatever evidence he had, could have been assembled and deposited with whomever it is proper to deposit such evidence - he could also have sworn affidavits or whatever is customary, and deposit whatever evidence there was, with the supporting documents perhaps with the Registrar of the Supreme Court, and then tell the House that certain evidence with respect to the administration of the Housing Authority rests in the hands of the competent authority, that it has to do with such-and-such, and that in the light of this he invites the House to proceed to set up a Judicial Committee.

I might well be wrong on a matter like this, but I simply cannot imagine your asking for a Judicial Committee on a matter on which you have had full debate in this Chamber, in which you have certainly made serious attacks on the character and reputation of the Minister, and therefore by implication and inference the character of the whole Government, and then, after all this has been cleared, whether true or ot, you then ask the House to shift its own responsibility and send it off to the Courts, which after all are only properly called into play when there is a breach of statute or of common law, or when specific powers are given to them to deal with certain matters. I think, therefore, that there are reasons for refusing a Judicial Enquiry) and our reasons will upon examination have nothing at all to do with the hon. member's personal view of the Minister or of the Government. If you are in politics, in public life, you ought not to expect to be spoken well of by your political opponents; their job is to get hold of the Government if you have it, and yours is to get hold of the Government if they have it, and both do this by making appeals over the heads of each other to the electorate, because in the last analysis it is the electorate who has to decide who should have the Government and who should be in Opposition. A strong Opposition, or a troublesome Opposition ought not to be inhibited, in my opinion, from doing its work, and certainly nobody ought to be nervous or in any way put out merely because the Opposition, I would say in the course of its own activities, thinks it proper to harass the Government sometimes by delaying or obstructing the passage of legislation, and at other times by bringing condemnatory motions against individual Ministers or the Government as a whole; al of this is part of the game. We must not mistake what happens in here for the realities of politics outside, because at some time or other when the Constitution al term is up we, both of us, have to appeal to the electorate - we on the basis of achievement, the other side on the basis of promise - and if the people of this Island wish to take promise in place of achievement, they may do so. On the other hand, if they wish to stick by achievement and hold promise at bay they will do so, and that will be the end of the matter; so we know where we stand.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members tell me to talk about the Resolution; unless I am very much mis-

taken this is what I am addressing myself to. But Mr. Speaker, I really cannot undertake to speak as they would wish me to, I must take the motion as I see it and dispose of it and demolish their arguments in the time in which I know I have at my disposal which is unlimited; so that, tedious as it may appear to them, I am afraid they have no other alternative but to listen to me and see me approach point after point with all deliberate speed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the crux of the matter before us is really the formidable - and I used the word advisedly, because I do not think there is any other word to use - but the crux of the matter before us is the formidable appearance which the Minister gives to the other side as a politician. I have not yet had the pleasure of reading what was said the last time the House sat, but of all things which have been told to me that were said by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, to me as a politician with, let us say, 16 years' experience in this House, to me the most significant thing said was alleged to have been said by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I understand that he accused the Minister of having corrupted, not in any moral sense but in a political sense, the people of Orange Hill. I do not know how that would have struck anybody listening to it.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

If the Minister would perm it a point of elucidation, I said he was trying to corrupt. I compared his conduct to the conduct of the old Conservatives who believed that the electorate was there to be bought and not to be persuaded. Perhaps I will ask the Minister to deal with these suggestions that may not have been reported to him; the suggestions that he, the Leader of the House, invited the Having Authority architect to draw up plans for the Minister of Housing to build houses for him in order to purchase his political support.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. member went beyond his point of elucidation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I can deal with that any time but when I come to deal with that I will also deal with other things, like how it was said of a certain hon. member of this House that he ate a crapaud all of this I can deal with. If the other side would only possess themselves in patience, they will get their money's worth out of this debate; I can promise them that. I think the hon. member interrupted me to put me right because he said he accused the hon. member of attempting to corrupt; putting aside the hyperbole, the extravagance of the thing to me, Mr. Speaker, that is the crux of this whole debate. 4. 10 p.m.

In other words, the Minister is entrenching himself too much in a particular constituency which
Laughter.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since I have been brought into the debate, is the Leader of the House suggesting that there is a constituency called Stanmore Terrace, one called Melbourne or one up at Kent, or any constituency called Chrysler Air-conditioned motor car?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am saying that it was told to me by a member of this House that the reason why he could not support a particular Bill which the Government was keen on passing is that if two other members on his own side had that kind of power they would go into other people's places looking for something to steal. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be drawn into these irrelevancies; we can deal with them in the course of this debate, or even other debates. Let me get on to the main theme, because it is an important point. I contend that the crux of this whole matter is not the allegations, however extravagant they have been worded, not even the attitudes which have appeared against the Minister in the three speeches which have been made on that side of the House. I do not think the heart of the debate lies there at all.

I do not believe that, because quite frankly the other side, as experienced politicians, have noticed the grip which the hon. member is making not only in St. Andrew which he represents, but also in that part of St. James which, under the new system, is going to be within his area, and after all.....

Mr. GRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Am I to understand from the Minister, from what he said about making a grip in St. James, that it has anything to do with the corruption in the Housing Authority? The Resolution deals With corruption in the Housing Authority, but the Minister is dealing with a grip on Orange Hill, St. James.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

It is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but it is a relevant point; it illustrates what I am saying. They cannot admit that the Minister is too formidable for them. They cannot admit that; they would be foolish politicians if they ever did, because you have to go down fighting even if the odds are terribly against you; because they cannot admit that he is too formidable for them, they have to find ways of destroying him if they can or of distracting him if they must. That is the whole secret of it. (Asides.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member tells me to behave myself. This happens to be my analysis of the situation, and the hon. member will have his. I am trying to shift the debate on to the real ground on which it should stand. The allegations, of whatever nature, are not seriously believed by the other side. That is my contention.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I object to that. The Minister and Leader of the House is accusing not only myself, but other members on this side again of insincerity by stating that we do not seriously believe in the allegations. We have alleged these things, we believe in them; we have evidence to prove them, and we challenge the Government to appoint a Judicial Commission of Enquiry.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If, Mr. Speaker, they believe them and they have evidence to support them, then the hon. member knows better than I do what to do with evidence. It is true that I am older than he is, but it would be impertinent on my part to tell him how to handle evidence and the proper quarters in which evidence should be lodged. As a matter of fact, if the hon. member really wanted to take the Government by surprise and leave it without a limb to stand on, this thing should have been exploded by us or by the Minister, or whoever is said to be at fault, being suddenly confronted.....

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister said that if the other side wanted to take the Government by surprise. Am I to understand that the other side knew about this before, and we have not taken them by surprise?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must not understand that, because nothing I have said would indicate that. I am merely saying that if the object is to embarrass and to pull down the Government and cause us to be discomforted in the eyes of the electorate, there was a better and more sensible way of doing this by confronting the House, so to speak, with a fait accompli. By now saying that they have the evidence, I think the members on the other side have compounded themselves. If you come here and ask for a Judicial Commission, and you spell out in the Preamble of the Resolution and in the course of your speeches some of the things which you say will be part of the evidence, then you yourself, Mr. Speaker, have no confidence in the judicial process and certainly no respect for judicial officers. That is what I am saying.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister is not aware that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew spoke at length last week and did not deny; any of the first 7 allegations set out in the Resolution; he just tried to explain them, and it is not a question that we now have evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that is not a point of order, but may I remind the hon. member that he is entitled to another speech, but not on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Neither did he affirm them. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection at all to being interrupted by hon. members. We are in Parliament and that is part of the game. They, certainly, would not drive me in a panic, or rattle me, or throw me into any contention with the Chair. They certainly will not be able to do that. The fact that they want to put me off the theme with which I am presently engaged makes me suspect that I am on even better ground than I myself would have imagined. They fear the formidable nature of the hon. Minister's strength in a particular part of the Island; and by a process of prognosis, Mr. Speaker, this strength may spread over the adjoining areas and cause the persons from that side who are involved in those areas to be inundated in the flood which would be let loose.

- Now, all politicians do not know how to deal with political difficulties. It would be incumbent upon them, if they felt that they were losing influence in a part of St. Andrew-or all of it, and a part of St. James-to try and redress that imbalance by hard, political work. Again, there are difficulties presenting themselves, because they are working against a politician who, although he may be younger than some of them, understands as much about politics as they do and quite properly in my opinion, sees his duty as a Minister to assist his constituents and to help them in any way he can.

Now, imagine, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who spoke before me not having the wit to see that the more you accuse the Minister of assisting people in St. Andrew, the further you are driving him into the affections of the people in St. Andrew. How could it be an accusation against the Minister when he looks after his constituency, if he employs people from his constituency, if he has any employment or any benefit to confer within the range and proper scope of his duties as a politician he confers it on the people who elected him? Do you want to tell me that serious politicians on the other side are saying that this is the main charge they could bring against the Minister? If you separate everything else that has been said, then this is the main crux of the matter.

Sir, the same hon. member who drew attention to the Minister's growing strength in Orange Hill is the same hon. member who says that he exonerates the Minister from any charge of stealing, and that he has no' found a shred of evidence to prove the Minister's dishonesty. 4. 20 p.m.

This I understand is also said.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, it is one thing to say, espacially if you are a lawyer, that you have no evidence that somebody is stealing. Stealing means taking up something without a claim of right that it is yours and moving it away. It involves asportation, animus furandi and all the other legal jazz, to use that expression. I have never said that the Minister cannot be convicted of dishonest conduct. There is a grave difference between stealing and mere dishonest conduct, and I c an conceive of nothing mo re dishonest than forming a Waterworks plumber and your father into an organisation to reap the benefit of a million dollar contract which you have created when you are Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that was no point of order.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Let me emphasise. I never said the Minister was not guilty of dishonesty. I said I had no evidence that he was guilty of stealing.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point, on this occasion, succinctly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member has only confirmed what I said I heard he had said, that he had no evidence that the Minister is guilty of stealing. Well, if you are going to take the trouble of attacking a Minister in the course of a debate and you end up saying - if it was at the end of the speech, I do not know where it was - that you have no evidence to accuse him of stealing, I would conclude that it is not that at all that you are worried about. You are not worried at all about what the Minister may or may not have done, if in fact he did anything. You are worried about the impact of the Minister's politics on a particular constituency in a part of the Island.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of elucidation. The Minister is ascribing opinions to me. I must explain myself. I have spoken already in the debate, and the Minister is now telling me that I am not worried about what the Minister did; I am worried about the effect he has. That is not true. I am worried that any Minister should be giving out million dollar contracts in the way this was given out. If it were the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, although I think he is above that, I would be just as attacking, although I do not think he is in any danger of getting a seat at the next election,

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is beyond any point of order, elucidation or even anticipation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

But here again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, who, I believe, would take the trouble to find out anything he wanted to, must know that there is not the slightest shred of evidence that the Minister gave out any contracts. As a matter of fact, I do not think he has said so; he could only have let the House know this by inference; but I do not think he accused the Minister of giving out contracts because he must know this is not so, and he must know what the Housing Authority as a Statutory Board is empowered to do.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the Minister must not try to create slander cases for his political associate. What he has said is perfectly true and I will not now get up and say otherwise; but I just repeat, if the Minister wants an assurance, that what I accuse the Minister of is forming a Waterworks plumber and his father into a body to take advantage of a contract created by the Minister. That is a different matter. The Housing Authority gives out the contracts, but the Minister gives them contracts to give out. Will the Minister deny that materials were kept at his house?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No, no. The hon. member cannot go on with a second speech unless an amendment is made.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am well content that the line I have been taking has acted as a catalyst in this debate because it has shown where the heart of the matter is. The heart of the matter is that the other side, for reasons best known to themselves, but for reasons which I can understand - particularly the hon. senior member for St. . Thomas - is concerned about the political strength which the Minister has acquired and which reflects credit on our Party in St. Andrew because St. Thomas is adjacent to St. Andrew. I think this is really what this argument is all about, and I cannot believe that they are really serious in wanting a Judicial Enquiry because three of them are barristers. We have not heard from the hon. senior member for Christ Church; so I do not know what his views are and I have to assume that he supports the Resolution moved by the other side; but I would have thought that some instinct would have warned them that if they wanted a Judicial Enquiry, there is a way to do it. And the way to do it is not to bring in a little of the so-called evidence, air it in ? public forum and then expect action to be taken on it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now 4.30 p.m., and time for Government Business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have a slight suspension of the sitting for a quarter of an hour,

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I say that would be appreciated by the Chair?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for fifteen minutes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended

the sitting accordingly. 4.30 p.m.

On resumption

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that a quorum is not present and to ask that the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am indebted to the hon. member; let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the day under Government Businesses in the name of.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, we are not proceeding with that Order at the moment; I bag to move that No. 2 be taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

No. 2 is the instance Order of the Day and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister; it is to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for regulating the carrying on of insurance business in Barbados.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw to the attention of the Leader of the House that this Bill has not been in our possession for ten days and we are objecting to this Bill being done at this stage.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there can be an objection to the conduct of legislation in that you only had ten days to read it because even the slowest reader should not take more than an hour and fifteen minutes to read a Bill of this size. Quite apart from that, I have every intention of going on with the second reading today; I cannot have the people's business being held up by vexacious and frivolous objections.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to those remarks.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On what grounds?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are on their feet. I do not deem that expression to be unparliamentary, but I would ask the hon. member to proceed with his speech on the second reading.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I was the only person taking objection and the Prime Minister said that this objection was frivolous and vexacious; I think it is entirely unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not rule that expression to be unparliamentary. Could the hon. member proceed with his address on the second reading of the Bill?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, how can we expect to do a Bill that only came out ten days ago? I do not care if the Prime Minister intends to do it today; we on this side do not intend to do it today. I do not think that we are going to allow our-selves to be railroaded by any Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have heard the hon. member. Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY I am going on. Mr. SPEAKER On what?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On my same objection, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that I have to overrule the objection that the time has been too short; it is not shorter than any time which has been prescribed, and it may well be that there is no intention to proceed other than with second reading speeches today.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, notice of this Bill was given on the 19th May.....-

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is my ruling.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am not questioning your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Therefore if the hon. member is not questioning my ruling, the hon. member is entitled to proceed to move the second reading.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting on other grounds, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The motion has been carried that this be the next Order of the day; so the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is entitled to proceed to move the second reading.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member cannot make a point of order at this stage because nothing has risen. I have ruled that this matter may now be proceeded with; let the hon. member proceed to move the second reading.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BORROW:

Mr. Speaker, before I.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid I cannot entertain a point of order if nothing has risen which would quite possibly cause such. I have given my ruling that this matter may be proceeded with.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, notice of this Bill was given way back on the 19th May, 1970.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There can be no point of order; I have ruled that this matter will be proceeded with.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

How do you mean there can be no point of order, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid I cannot entertain any point of order at this stage. The second reading of this Bill, I have ruled, may now be proceeded with and proceeded with it shall be.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There can be no point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Last week when I got up to speak, the Minister got up on a point of order, and you did not stop him. All I said was "Mr. Speaker" and he got up on a point of order and spoke for one hour and you did not tell him anything; but because it is the Prime Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that it is grossly unfair to the Opposition that this Bill that was given notice of on the 19th May has taken until last Tuesday or Wednesday to come into the possession of the Opposition should be discussed today just because the Prime Minister is here today. This Bill was on the Order Paper and nobody worried about it, but because the Prime Minister wants to do it now it is being dealt with today. I think it is grossly Unfair to the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point. Let the hon. senior member for St. John proceed with the second reading.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I want to put the record straight. This Bill is some 130 pages long, and I have been waiting week after week for an attempt to be made to get the passage of this Bill negotiated at least through the second reading stage. I intimated to two or three, or the senior and more superior members on the other side that I would be willing to have the cyclostyled copies of the Bill circulated, so that they would have time.....

. Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have just heard what the Prime Minister had to say about circulating cyclostyled copies; we want to draw to Your Honour's attention that no member on this side of the House has been in receipt of such a copy, and as the Prime Minister has said this is 130 pages long and it is not to be expected that hon. members on this side are to be required to merely read a Bill. We on this side have got to read it and understand it and discuss it amongst ourselves to be able to do justice to it on an occasion such as this,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. HINDS:

One other point I want to make. The importance of the Bill is what should cause Your Honour to take consideration of the position of the minority of this Hon. House. I cannot attempt to challenge Your Honour's ruling, but we are trying as carefully as possible to put our case and we feel that our case is one which certainly deserves the consideration of Your Honour the Speaker, because the Bill is one, as we understand it, of very far reaching importance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have noted the hon. member's point, but I rule that the time has not been too short for the second reading of this matter to be considered and that it may be proceeded with. 4. 55 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, you say that it may be proceeded with, but you did not say that it must be proceeded with.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It may be proceeded with, and the hon. member in whose name it is, is seeking to proceed with it.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I gather that the hon. Prime Minister is desirous of proceeding with this Bill. It is true that we got it late last week. I do not have any cyclostyled copy, but if the Prime Minister is going to proceed with the second reading of the Bill and send it to a Select Committee where we can discuss matters with the Parliamentary Draftsmen and the Legal Draftsmen together with members of the Opposition, I think it will be all right. Has the Prime Minister given that assurance? That is how I feel about it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying, before I was interrupted, that to at least three of the more sober members on the other side whose sobriety is not in question on each and every occasion I had to apologise since the 10th May for the Bill not being printed because of the mistakes which were found when it came out of the Government Printery. I had to send it back again and again, and on the last occasion when I said it would soon be ready, I said there were certain amendments which I would be moving, because to send it back to insert the amendments would take up another three months. At that time I offered to circulate cyclostyled copies of the Bill. This is over three weeks ago, and I indicated to two members on the other side that, in any event, the Bill will be going to a Select Committee to give members a more ample opportunity to digest the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill was sent to the legal profession several times during the past three years, and several members over there know about the provisions of the Bill. All I said was that, in view of the importance of the legislation which I, personally, have been trying to get through since August 1962 - this is now July, 1970. Hon. members will remember my making a speech in here about how difficult it is to get things done with the kind of inertia - the psychological inertia - that we have from Colonialism. On any new measure they want to spend to the end of time, because it is something new in Barbados and they feel that the world is coming to an end. Hon. members agreed with me when I spoke of the difficulties of getting certain responsible people in this Island who are paid to do a job to do it.

Now, as far as the Government Printery is concerned, I apologised since the middle of May every time we had the Bill on the Order Paper. I said we could not do it because it was not printed according to law. In my humble opinion, when we come to amend the Standing Orders, I think it would save the taxpayers a lot of money if Bills were never printed at all, but just cyclostyled and, after they are passed by this

Place and the Other Place, they could be printed at that stage. Now, when the old Standing Orders we re contrived, we did not have the modern equipment that we now have for typing out Bills and so on, and it is quite right that the Legislature should have decided that Bills should be printed in the Official Gazette, because they would be incomprehensible to members if Bills were done laboriously in somebody's longhand as is done in the Registry of Barbados up to today; but in these modern days there is no justification whatsoever for spending taxpayers' money in printing something that takes up a lot of time in the Government Printery, and has already been cyclostyled and laid here as the official document. The official document is still the cyclostyled copy, and I invited the hon. members to accept that if they wanted to get on with the Bill.

I want to correct the hon. junior member for St. Peter on this particular point. I never said that I had circulated these copies. I said that I had offered to circulate the copies, and that can be verified by two of the members On that side. The Bill is 130 pages long. This means that even the most uneducated of us, if there are any uneducated people here, or even the most illiterate -it means 13 pages a day, or roughly I page in every two hours. We admit that you must have time to eat and time to sleep. Let us say that you read 5 pages an hour or spent 21/2 hours a day at the rate of 5 pages. If I have to spend 10 days reading a Bill like this before I vetted it for the printers, I will have to read at the rate of between 500 and 700 words a minute or I would never be able to get through Government's work. To suggest that 10 days is not enough to read a Bill for the purpose of second reading, when for three years it has been bandied about between the Law Society, the Bar Association, the Insurance Companies, and every single member in here knows about it - I have all the letters in this file. Do you mean that from August 1962 to July 1970 is not time enough to get the Bill done?

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I suggest that the Rt. Hon member proceed. He has given the assurance which the hon. senior member for the City has asked for.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

It is an assurance which I have given on three consecutive meetings in this House. In 1962 I indicated in this House that I intended to introduce legislation to regulate Insurance Companies in Barbados. When hon. members talk about the rights of the Opposition, they talk as if the common man in the street doe snot have rights. I notice the tendency that when legislation is being introduced to regulate the vested interest in this country, we hear all kinds of tales about democracy and people's rights being taken away. I am making no pretence. This Bill is a Bill to regulate the practice of Insurance Companies in Barbados, and it should have been regulated a long time ago. My only frustration is that it has taken me one month short of 8 years, if there is no further filibustering, to see my plans implemented for the regulation of Insurance Companies in Barbados.

During the course of the Committee stage - as I indicated, I think it is the kind of Bill which ought to go to a Select Committee; so if the members on the other side are moving a motion to that effect,

whether they do so or not, we are prepared to send it to a Select Committee. I have asked the Clerk to circulate the amendments which I have considered as a result of representations made by the Insurance Association and other interested parties since the Bill was laid on the Table of the House. I should like to mention that the Bill was sent to the Insurance Companies some five or six weeks in its present form before the first reading was made in this House and before it was laid on the Table, but the comments and the subsequent amendments did not come to light until two or three weeks ago.

Now, as far back as 1962 when I indicated that I thought something should be done about the business of Insurance in Barbados which, with the exception of one Insurance Company and one.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There have now been presented 8 foolscap pages of amendments to the same Bill that we are now to proceed with to Second Reading stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that these amendments are for the consideration of the Select Committee which has been assured us.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, do you not think it is reasonable that hon. members should have these amendments at their homes to study?

Mr. SPEAKER:

They will have them at their homes before the Select Committee meets.

Mr. HINDS:

Why not before the second reading is proceeded with?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Because, as I understand, they do not affect the principle of the Bill. 5. 05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

MR. Speaker, I heard the Prime Minister say that draft copies of the Bill went to the Law Society, Insurance Companies and everything else, and hon. members of this House had them just a few days

ago. We are to make it into law, do everything and he held responsible for anything that goes wrong with it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made nig point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member, I am sure, appreciates that second reading speeches deal with principles. As far as I am concerned, the Bill as it is now can pass. These amendments that we are introducing are out of deference to representations which have been made to us. This is a product of my research and labour along with the officers of the Ministry of Finance. The amendments of eight pages that you have are out of deference to responsible associations, and one or two typographical and printing errors; but as far as I am concerned, they do not have to be in the Bill because the Bill would be a lot stronger if we did not have the amendments. Representations have however, been made and I am putting forward those amendments for the consideration of the Select Committee, which is the proper place for such amendments to be made. Suppose the Bill were not. going to Select Committee, you would not move in amendments to the second reading speech, they would be done at the Committee stage. I hope I am correct in my assumption. We had a United Nations observer here in 1962, Mr. Van Gersdorf and in discussions with him he made certain recommendations about the stage of insurance in Barbados. We then had a model Ordinance sent down from.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would speak in undertones... I understand that the shorthand writer may be taking down what the hon. member is saying. Let the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister proceed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Late in 1962 we received a model ordinance, and, to show you the care which has been taken, the time which has been spent and the mature consideration which has been given to this legislation, we secured the services of Mr. W. E. Phelps who was Joint Secretary of the Fire Officers Committee in the United Kingdom. He came to this country by special request and we had meetings with Government officials, representatives of Insurance Companies and so on. At that time we considered the model Ordinance unwieldly for a country like Barbados, and the Secretary of State was requested to seek the assistance of the Board of Trade in preparing a simpler version of the model Ordinance which we were considering at that time. I feel that legislation of such weight - certainly as far as the size and the volume of the legislation are concerned, - does merit some kind of historical development,

It was not until 1965 that a Draft Insurance Bill was ready, and this was based on the model provided

by the Insurance Branch of the United Kingdom Board of Trade, but I seem to remember that in 1958 the Board of Trade itself brought out anew Insurance Companies Act in the United Kingdom, and it was on this Act largely that the recommendations had been based. During the period from 1965 until the time when the Bill was laid on the Table of the House and immediately after, we have been in active consultation with all the representatives of Insurance Companies operating in the Island, with the Board of Trade, and with various other bodies such as the Law Society and the Bar Association who are likely to be affected and who may have to work on the implementation of the legislation itself.

At this juncture I should like to make an observation which I am sure the members of the Legal Profession on the other side will bear me out on and probably try to do something about. It is my experience that whenever we send legislation to the Law Society and the Bar Association, they do not even convene a meeting sometimes for a whole year, and I have issued instructions that within twenty-eight days of submitting any draft proposals to any of these bodies they should at least indicate to us a reasonable time within which we should expect replies. It is rather remarkable that these are the very people who will have to work with legislation and they are not keen enough students to get in on the very ground floor when the actual drafting is being done so that all the snags can be taken out and be debugged and made simpler, and all the paths made straight for even the uninitiated. This something which I think you are well aware of, Mr. Speaker - the difficulty of getting legal associations together to consider anything of a serious nature and I regret to say that in many instances we have had to proceed without the benefit of their advice or consent in order to get the people's business done.

The objects and Reasons of the Bill, in my opinion, adequately set out its main provisions, but there are certain significant features of the legislation which at this juncture I feel myself constrained to draw to the attention of the House, firstly there is the requirement that insurance companies have to be registered as local companies or as foreign companies, and there are certain requirements as to the deposit of a proportion of their premium income or a lump sum as the case may be dependent upon the nature of the business which the companies may be carrying on, with the Supervisor of Insurance Companies. I should also like to disclose at this juncture that since insurance in the Commonwealth of India has been for a long number of years completely under the control of the Government of India, I have made a request to the Indian Government for someone to carry out a training programme in insurance, and probably to seconding an officer in the first period, say for about two years, as Supervisor of Insurance. In that way of course, we can draw upon the expertise and the experience of this highly qualified personnel from the Government of India, and also ensure that there would be a considerable degree of impartiality in the discharge of the office of Supervisor of Insurance Companies. 5. 15 p.m.

Roughly speaking, the requirements in the unamended form as to the deposit of funds will be that a company must have a minimum paid-up share capital of \$200,000, in the case of a company carrying on long term insurance business such as life insurance policies, and in the case of companies carrying on short: term insurance business such as the insurance of motor cars which are yearly expiring contracts, the share capital should be \$100,000. I think the part of the Bill which would cause most concern to the

Insurance Companies are clauses 23, 24 and 25. Clause 23 requires every foreign insurance company to deposit with the Supervisor in cash or approved securities or partly in cash and partly in approved securities and amount equal to \$200,000 before registration and before they are allowed to carry on their business.

First you must have a share capital or at least \$200,000, and secondly you should deposit \$200,000 in cash or securities or a mixture of both to the Supervisor of Insurance, and then clause 24 empowers the Supervisor to require any Insurance Company to make a deposit of such an amount and in relation to such class of insurance business as may be specified by the Supervisor, if the Supervisor considers this to be desirable in the interest of the policy-holders. The reason why we have this additional safeguard is that there had been the shooting-up of one or two mushroom companies in this island, particularly in the field of accident insurance not so much in the life insurance field, but certainly in the motor accident insurance field; they have collected premiums from persons for the insurance of vehicles and when claims are made against the companies they have been both unwilling and unable to pay, and there was no legislation by which any prosecution could have been taken against those mushroom companies, and I have had to take drastic measures in the case of, at least, one company and ask the operators to leave as quickly as possible.

The Supervisor will supervise and control this because he will not allow or permit anyone in the business of insurance unless the necessary deposit has been paid and the company is duly registered both with the Registrar of Companies and with the Supervisor of Insurance Companies. Then there is the third requirement which is contained in clause 25 which empowers the Supervisor with the prior approval of the Minister for the time being charged with the responsibility of insurance to give directions to Insurance Companies regarding the investment of their funds. Therefore, there is a three-tier safeguard built in. First, you must have \$200,000 or \$100,000 in paid-up capital; secondly, you must deposit an amount equivalent to \$200,000 in cash or securities or both with the Supervisor before you are registered; thirdly, the Supervisor can call upon you to deposit additional amounts in respect of each class of business that you may be carrying on, and fourthly under Clause 25 the Supervisor has power to direct you to invest a certain proportion of your premium income. The Supervisor would have power to lay down or to stipulate what class or type of securities an Insurance Company must invest in.

I have had representations from the Associations on this particular score, and one of the amendments which I will be proposing to the Select Committee is not to delete this provision altogether but merely to give a list of securities and then let them select the securities. Individual companies themselves will select the particular type or the particular security that they want to put their funds in. In other words, as the Bill now reads, the Supervisor of Insurance Companies can say to an Insurance Company and I am not being ridiculous: I am being serious -but the Supervisor can ask the company to invest \$100,000 in Fix-it-right Garage, \$50,000 in Banks Breweries, another \$75,000 in Shipping and Trading, \$25,000 in Government bonds and \$15,000 in 90-day Treasury Bills; this is the Act as it now reads. The amendment would merely give the Supervisor the authority to prepare a list, and on this list will be the

companies which each company may invest money in. It is possible in the way the amendment is drafted that the Supervisor on direction from the Minister, may include Government securities in other Caribbean countries depending on the types of business which are being held, and if they have a Head Office here we may give them authority to invest in St. Lucia debenture bonds or in the Caribbean Development Bank which is located in Barbados and which is functioning and has been receiving money but not yet paying out any. Anyway, the whole idea would be that in no circumstances whatsoever should we import the bad example set by previous Governments - and I use the word "Governments" in the plural; I am not identifying any simple Government - by investing in unremunerative investments in countries that we cannot even pass within the three-mile limit of. 5. 25 p.m.,

My idea is that, like the National Insurance Fund, these funds should enure by their investments to the benefit of the economy of Barbados, in the first instance, and to our immediate neighbours in the Caribbean, in the second instance. I am a politician. The only people who tell me that I am not a politician are my fellow-Ministers. Let me say that I am in politics. It is impossible for me to get up and make a mealy-mouthed, self-righteous speech unless I pointed out the deficiencies of previous Governments, because we are dealing with a long historical development of exploitation by foreign companies in this country, aided, abetted and compounded by the ignorance and malpractices of previous Governments in so far as the development and the economy of this country are concerned. These are historical facts. Some of us are ashamed of them, but there are, nevertheless, facts; and, had any other Government been in the position in which I am today, looking back and seeing the mismanagement and the way the economy of this country was allowed to slide downwards, they would have been entitled and justified in drawing attention to the lack of national consciousness on the part of the previous Governments Conservative or otherwise. The Conservatives, of course, we can understand them, because they have no vision and are not supposed to have any. I am merely giving the House the assurance that, as long as I am Minister, I will have the authority to direct the Supervisor of Insurance Companies that this list will be a restricted list. The list is restricted to the develop-

ment of this country in the first instance, and in a wider context to the countries which are trading with us in the Commonwealth Caribbean.

This, Mr. Speaker, I consider the most significant economic aspect of the Bill. Naturally, we could not get a consensus from all the Insurance Companies who operate in and out of Barbados' When a Bill, not very much dissimilar to the one which we are now discussing, was passed by the legislature of Trinidad and Tobago, at least four Insurance Companies left Trinidad and Tobago and came to Barbados. I would like to think that their loss is our gain. I am not altogether convinced about this, but after my discussions with the representatives of the Association - when I say 'my discussions' I mean indirectly by correspondence and not by viva voce discussions - I have no indications that any Insurance Company now carrying on business in Barbados is disposed to leave this country and go to another country.

There are Insurance Companies who have premium incomes of less than '\$100,000; there are Companies, you will be surprised to know, operating in Barbados who have premium incomes of over

\$1 million. The total amount of premium incomes derived in this country and spent on insurance that I can trace is phenomenal, considering the small size of the economy of Barbados with a gross domestic product, perhaps, of \$230 million, and over \$4 million is being subscribed by the community towards Insurance Companies, nearly all of whom are foreign Insurance Companies. One of our large Insurance Companies is the Barbados Mutual and that has a considerable premium income and has a good portfolio investment in Government Securities.

The Barbados Fire Insurance is not now owned by Barbadian shareholders, but by Eagle Star Insurance, and they do most of the fire and earthquake risk in the country. Altogether, the premium income of the Insurance Companies in Barbados is \$4 million. That is the annual intake for people who are paying premiums on Insurance Policies, whether they are life, fire, industrial Insurance, or medical insurance.

The main object of these financial restrictions, if you like to call them that, is twofold. First, the people who in good faith take out policies of Insurance must be protected. This is the rationale of registration and having a minimum share capital and depositing a fixed amount with the Supervisor of Insurance; but as with banking, there is another motivation, and that is that they are creaming off something like 2 1/2% or 2 3/4% of the national income of the country, and we can no longer afford this money to be leaked away in payments of dividends to shareholders in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States of America which are the main sources of the insurance business which is carried on in this Island. If we had in the sterling area much stronger restrictions on the movement of capital from one country within the sterling area to another country within the sterling area, then perhaps it would not be so necessary for the Government to insist that you should have this deposit and investment in approved local securities of a proportion of your premium income.

Although the Bill is a long one, Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure hon. members, who are slow readers even, and those who find it difficult to digest even the simplest Resolutions that are presented in this Chamber that the Bill is really simple. All of the clauses which make it lengthy are not necessarily clauses which go to the root of the matter, but clauses which are necessary to make the .. Bill more explicit, to explain the functions of the Supervisor, the functions of people who have inspection to carry out, the duties of the Insurance Companies, the administering and accounting requirements for the Insurance Companies, and things that we find in any ordinary company registration such as judicial management of the companies, and the winding-up of the companies, and so on.

We also have clauses which deal with Associations like underwriters and definitions, and this is very important. Along with the clauses which deal with the registration of Insurance Brokers, Salesmen, Agents and Sub-agents because we have found, particularly with Lloyds Underwriters, especially where poor persons - let us say fishermen- are involved, that they would write insurance business, encourage

people to take out policies with them, and when something happens which would justify the people making a claim against the Insurance Company, they would go to the office where they originally took out the policy and to which they had been making regular and systematic pilgrimages to pay in their premiums and file their claims to be told by the Lloyds Underwriters that they do not represent the Insurance Companies, but they represent the man who is coming to make a claim.

I have named certain companies already, but I do not want to do it again in this place. Of course, everybody knows who they are. Some of the chief offenders are not too far removed from this place on the other side of the Wharf. The hon. member can bear me out; we do not agree on everything, but when it comes to Law and questions of fact these things are incontrovertible. They tell you that you are not insured with them, and that they were only putting you in touch with people in London, and, if you want to file a claim, you must bring a representative action against one of the underwriters listed at the back of the policy in the High Courts of Justice in the United Kingdom.

One of the main provisions in this Bill is that you must have a registered office for service in the Island of Barbados, if you want to do any insurance business at all; so that if a fisherman loses his boat, or gets it damaged, all he has to do is to take out a writ, if he does not get his claim satisfied, and drop it, or leave it, or have the Provost Marshal drop it, or leave it, at the registered office which is registered with the Supervisor of Insurance Companies 5. 35 p.m.

This is a great step forward. No independent country can countenance a situation in which foreign persons may be carrying on business in the country and yet they are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Courts of this Island. We have eliminated that in this Bill. We have said, further, that anybody who pretends or holds himself out to be doing insurance business is deemed to be doing insurance business not as an agent for the person who goes to ask him about a policy, but for the person who is collecting the premiums and sending them overseas or depositing them in accordance with the directions of the Supervisor of Insurance. This is one of the main grievances which I feel this Bill has remedied, so that the average man in the street does not have to concern himself about retaining a solicitor in London with all the attendant and concomitant extravagant costs which will be involved, but he can go to a foreign qualified but locally practising solicitor or barrister. I hope the day is not far off now when we hope to have the Law Faculty established, after much hard work on our part, in Barbados, so that he will be going to seek the advice of a locally qualified barrister to bring a local claim against a locally registered company, and this is how it should be in any independent country. So herein we remove and eliminate one of the last surviving vestiges of the worst aspects of colonialism from our legal framework.

The Bill, of course, also goes on to make provision for the regulation of Motor Vehicle Insurance. I suppose members remember that we have before the House now on the Order Paper a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles (Third Party Risks) Act. This, of course, is in extension of and not in substitution for the

legislation which we are now considering.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, without going into the details of the amendments which have been circulated, Part VII will deal with purely formal and procedural matters such as the keeping of registers, what happens when a policy is lost, the jurisdiction of the local Courts, the Inspection of documents and service of notices, the making of regulations, exemptions, offences against the Act and the penalties which are therein prescribed.

With that short introduction to along Bill, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this Bill is going to provoke a debate at this time. I understand that the Government is agreeable to the matter being sent to a Select Committee, and the debate on the respective clauses will probably take place at a Select Committee. As a matter of principle, we on this side of the House are in agreement with the need for a Bill to control the operation of the insurance companies in Barbados.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, with your leave may I nominate, with the advice and consent of the Acting Leader of the Opposition, the names of the members of the Select Committee?

They are as follows: Mr. Speaker, ex officio; the hon. senior member for St. John; the hon. junior member for St. Philip; the hon. senior member for St. Michael; the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; the hon. senior member for St. Thomas; the hon. senior member for St. James; the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Unless any of those hon. members who have been named by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister object to serving on this Committee, I will declare each and every one of such hon. members to be the members of that Select Committee, and I now so declare.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will trouble the House any further today, but we will have to come at 12 noon next week, because we will have an accumulation which I think will take us next sitting to do.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 21st July, 1970, at 12 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. 5, 43 p.m.

