

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, 28th July, 1970.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Sir. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q. C. F. Z. S., (Speaker); Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J. P., (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J. P.; -Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Social Welfare); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C. M. G., M. A., (Leader of the House); Hon. Q. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J. P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J. P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Labour, National Insurance and Housing); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J. P., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS-

Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J. P. and Mr. L. S. CRAIG. Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are, I am afraid, according to my Notice Paper, no Minutes available for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Training Report for the year 1st April, 1969 to 31st March, 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968 (Act 1968-51) in order to implement the budgetary proposals made by the Minister of Finance to the House of Assembly in respect of the Financial Year 1970-71.

Also a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act 1906 (Act 1906-6) in order to implement the budgetary proposals made by the Minister responsible for Finance, to the House of Assembly in respect of the Financial Year 1970-71.

On my own behalf a Bill to amend the Immigration Act 1952, (1952-26).

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend Part IVA of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (Act 1937-16).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these Bills I believe I hinted to the House last week that we might have to meet on another day after today, and we will consult as to which of the other days this week will be convenient; but I have brought copies of these Bills to be circulated. They will not be proceeded with today, but in another day or two days' time, after hon. members have studied them, we may therefore finish our business before we rise.

I also beg to give notice that Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 111 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter is ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968 (Act 1968-51) be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act 1906 (Act 1906-6) be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952, (1952-26) be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed I would like to give excuses for the absence of the hon. junior member for St. Philip, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, both of whom asked to be excused from today's sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend Part IVA of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (Act 1937-16) be now read a first "time.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

. Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the first Order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 3 stands in the name of the hon. Junior member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Minister of Housing, and it is to move passing of a Resolution to approve the Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations, 1970. 12.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. member under whose name this item is, is no longer the Minister responsible, I am asking.....very well, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, this matter is a simple one. My view is different from that of the legal boys. I did not think that this is necessary in order to have this completely rectified.

As the Addendum sets out, this Resolution is to amend the Wireless Telegraphy Regulations, 1940. My opinion is that this should be done by an amendment to the Resolution, but the legal boys felt that it could not be done by an amendment to the Resolution. It is a simple matter., It is only to give C. B. C. permission to collect licences themselves for T. V. There was some short point that they raised that was not completely clear to them, and therefore they asked that we make it explicit. This is something that the House has already approved.

Hon. Members will see from the Addendum that the purpose of the amendment is to rectify this situation. What happened before was that these licence fees were collected formerly by the Electrical Department. Now we are regularising so that C. B. C. can collect these licence fees or delegate whom they want to collect them.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC
(AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS, 1970**

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the same hon. member, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1970.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I remember seeing these signs being passed around for hon. members to inspect them. All that we are doing is bringing Barbados up-to-date by using international signs. I am sure that members have seen these before. It is only regularising so that when we go out side we will be accustomed to international signs, and people coming in will be already accustomed to these signs I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass. Hon. G. G. FERGUSON I beg to second it.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that this needs no debate; but there is one thing I want to draw to the Minister's attention in as much as, we are having these signs - we should have had them before. I am throwing it out to Government that when these signs are erected they should be erected where they are visible. Sometimes these signs are erected in places where canes overhang them or they are badly painted or they are in positions where you can hardly recognise them. I also hope that instead of making them as small as they are now, they will be made larger so that they can be more visible. That is the only thing I wish to say at this stage.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I want to give hon. members the assurance that we are fully cognisant of this problem of people planting canes alongside the road. The Barbados Workers' Union has been asking plantation

owners repeatedly not to plant, canes alongside the road. Only a short time ago I reminded people In Barbados in general that it was an offence to have trees overhanging alongside the road.

As regards making these signs bigger, I do not think that we can. I would be glad to, but Barbados is so small. When you go to a big country, you see a sign post nearly 15 to 20 miles away telling you where you will get to. If you do this in Barbados, we will take up the whole road with the signs. If you get somewhere over someone's land, they do not want you to trespass. I have noticed that in order to read some of our signs you have to stop and get out and go up to the sign. The problem, as I said, is that we do not have enough land mass so that we can put up these big signs. It is not that the Government is unmindful of the situation, but it is one of these paradoxa-something that you know should be done, but we cannot really do it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member for Christ Church intimate what he wants to deal with next?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Item 7, Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with Item No. 7 during the temporary absence of the Leader of the House. 12.35 p.m.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) (AMENDMENT)ORDER, 1970

Mr. SPEAKER; The instant Order of the Day is No, 7 standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of he House to take charge of Item No. 7, and

unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1970.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Spanker, this Resolution abolishes the part time post of the visiting Medical Officer of St. George. This post will now become redundant and the Order gives effect to the abolition,

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C, E. TALMA:

I beg to second that,

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I did not get the Hon. Leader of the House clearly on this matter. I wonder if he would mind making it clear. Is there such a thing as a Part-time Visiting Officer of St. George?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has given way; therefore he may resume.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

As the Hon. Leader of the House has explained, there are certain posts which have become redundant. In the parish of St. George, for example owing to the reduction in the number of Infirmaries from eleven to five and the merging of the Infirmary at St. George with the Christ Church Infirmary, now called District Hospitals, there are certain duties which are no longer necessary as such in so far as the attention of sick patients, the Christ Church District Hospital which had been performed by the two Medical Officers of Christ Church is concerned. The doctor in question no longer has such duties to perform, and he is being compensated for loss of office. The whole matter has been clearly and carefully gone into and is acceptable to the officer in question. He is being compensated and he is satisfied with the present position, and he will be paid for such services which he will continue to perform.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Am I to understand that this is really the Parochial Medical Officer of St. George whose pose is being abolished but you are keeping a part-time man in St. George for attending such out-patients in that parish? This is not made clear. I am willing to give way to the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to know that the pos of Parochial Medical Officer has been abolished. Consequently, the officer who held this post has been appointed as a part-time officer to carry out the duties in the parish. There will be no institution in St. George, and therefore he would not have that amount of work to do. He now becomes a par -time officer, but as the Hon. Minister explained, he will be compensated for the years service which he has rendered as Medical Officer of that parish.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown gave way.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member would give way, I was not in a position to give chapter and verse - not that I was not prepared, but the files were not in my possession at the time. As the hon. senior member for St. Philip has explained, certain posts were abolished as I intimated. After the transfer of the Local Government services with effect from 1st September, 1969, an examination was made of the medical services which were being provided by the former St. George Infirmary. This examination revealed that the volume of maternity cases being handled did not justify the retention of the St. - George Maternity Unit. Dr. F. G. Reader, District Medical Officer of St. George, performed maternity duties at this Unit prior to his transfer to Central Government. He has retained his pensionable status on transfer, and in order to terminate his employment it will be necessary to abolish the post of Visiting Medical Officer of St. George provided under Section 4(d) of the Schedule to the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) (No, 2) Order, 1969 This Officer also performed the duties of Medical Officer, St. Michael South, prior to his transfer to the Central Government. On transfer he was paid a reduced salary, and steps have been taken to pay him the compensation to which he is entitled under the Local Government Compensation Act, 1969. The number of persons attending the Clinic which was held at Cathedral House declined steadily. Tie Clinic was accordingly closed on 31st March, 1970, and the patients formerly treated we re there transferred to the City Clinic. It is proposed' to terminate Dr. Reader's employment as Medical Officer of St. Michael-South with effect from 1st August, 1970. This post is not included in the Schedule to the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order and no amendment is required under the circumstances. Dr. Reader will be eligible for retiring benefits in respect of his appointment as Visiting Medical Officer of St. George and as Medical Officer of St. Michael-South. That is the information,

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I well appreciate what the hon. member has now said, but I am worried about something. St. Michael-South has been reverted to the City, and there is no longer an Infirmary in St. George, therefore the job is being done by the two Medical Officers at Christ Church. What is the position with the poor people in Sweet Vale, Sweet Bottom and Cottage in St. George? Are they to go to Christ Church too? You are continuing to have Dr. Reader to attend people who get sick, but whom it is not necessary to send to an Institution. There should be some outdoor Clinic in the parish of St. George. 12.45 p.m.

I do not represent St. George, but I think I represent the whole Island and not merely the City, therefore I must speak for St. George although I know the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Communications, the member for St. George, would certainly want to ask the same thing I am asking.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has shown that interest on an Island-wide basis, and I want to assure him that there is a Clinic which does exist and to which the poor people who are not inmates can attend. It is situated in the old Matron's quarters near the old Infirmary in that compound.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker is this Clinic to be put into operation now or is it in operation already? I am quite sure that the hon. junior member for St. George should know about this, but he shows a bit of amazement on hearing that there is a Clinic in his own constituency.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Philip should be able to answer this; you cannot abolish these things and then have nothing for poor people.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I asked the hon. Minister a question and I would be very grateful if he would give me an answer. I am quite sure that this is what you call some of the ills of the abolition of Local Government. I would

like to really hear the Hon. Minister on this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the people are being provided for. Do you think we would be guilty of a thing like that? My information is that provision is made for pauper patients in every area, including St. George.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the member would not be guilty by design.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is this an alleged point of order?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Knowing the Hon. Minister as I do, he would not be guilty by design he is being misled somewhere. Let us face facts; there is no Clinic there at all.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point or order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member is an authority on medical matters.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I object to that; this sarcasm I do not like. How could I be an authority on medical matters?

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet. Will the hon. senior member fox the City sit? There is nothing derogatory in being referred to as an authority.

Hon. C. E. TALMA. Mr. Speaker, I genuinely meant what I said. He knows a number of matters affecting the Hospital, and has shown, along with the hon. junior member for St. Peter, more interest in matters affecting the Hospital, Health Centres and medical matters generally than any other hon. member in this Chamber, and I say that with no sarcasm whatsoever; I really mean what I say. I think it is a compliment; if you think it is an insult, it is nothing to be insulted about. I am saying this; the Government in its plan to take over is making provision for all poor people, wherever they are.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, on a point of order, I simply asked the Minister a question from the statement he made before. I got on my feet because the hon. junior member for St. George showed some surprise, and now I am hearing that there is provision made. Is it operating already or is it to be put into operation?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member is so flambouyant that he would not even await an explanation. There is a Clinic which is in existence, has been existing and will always exist. It operates in St. George in the compound of the old Infirmary. I have been there, and I even have a living witness here who showed me where it operates, but I do not care to involve him in this. I was taken there by him and he is present at the moment; but I do not want to get him involved.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would tell us at this point if this Clinic only caters to maternity cases.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that is not a point of order, but of course, the hon. member has not yet spoken.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am on a point of order because I was under the impression that the Minister was only answering a question and not making his final reply.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has not spoken; he rose on a point of order which I thought was invalid. That does not prohibit him from speaking. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution, no doubt, makes good provision for Dr. Reader, but I regret to say that nothing has come forth from the Government Bench to convince anybody at this stage that a similar provision has been made in respect of catering to the poor of the parish of St. George. What we have gathered so far is that there are maternity cases which are referred to the District Hospital at Christ Church, and apparently there are others which even those members for St. George who should know what is going on - and if there is any activity - seem not be familiar with. It is shocking, Mr. Speaker.

This is a matter that concerns the poor, and each and every member on that side of the House will shout to the top of their voice and let it be heard that he represents the poor; but we have seen here today that this Resolution has nothing in it about the poor. It is all in respect of Dr. Reader. The poor must get on as best they can. Are we satisfied that the Minister who is in charge of the Resolution can advance arguments to the contrary that the survey which was carried out to determine the necessity for retaining a Clinic or an Institution in the parish of St. George to cater to the poor did not take into consideration a long enough period? They did not go far enough back so as to be able to bring themselves up-to-date with the possible requirements of the poor of the parish. We have seen that every consideration has been made that where the Doctor has lost here, he must gain there; but there is nothing that tells us that the people in St. George are not going to become ill any slower in the 1970s than they have been in the previous period.

What we find in a situation like this is that the Government is now being caught up, so to speak, with the removal or liquidation of our Local Government system, whether it was right or whether it was wrong. We remember even that they closed the dispensaries at onetime. They did not even care whether the people died or lived. That is the attitude of the Government in catering to the poor.

In these things, Mr. Speaker, one has got to bear in mind, when it comes to a Resolution of this sort, that one has to be satisfied that enough has been said by the other side to convince us that the Government was right in dispensing to the extent that they have of the services of Dr. Reader in the parish of St. George and the closing of any Institution that catered to the poor of the parish.

I would very much like to hear from the Minister how far did his survey go to convince him that the Government was right when they took the decision to close the Institution that they did.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and that is Order No. 10.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of it.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I would prefer if this was left until the arrival of the shadow Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Unless there is any objection leave will be granted to the hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the implementation of certain of the provisions of the Agreement between the Caribbean Development Bank and the Government of Barbados relating to the Headquarters of the Bank.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before the Minister proceeds with this, I have to agree with my colleague on my left, and inasmuch as the Leader of the House intimated that we may have to come back in another two days.

I know that the Government will not allow my colleague's request to go through, but I think we could look at it broadmindedly and hold it over for another day so that we can have a clear picture.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that the hon. member is making a speech which he is not entitled to do.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am not making a speech relating to the Bill, I asked that the Minister grant our request.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, there is no problem about this, except that hon. members may be under the impression that the Bill has more import in it than it actually has. Hon. members will remember that last year we brought before the House all the documentation about the setting up of the Bank and the Agreement signed between all the territories. One of the articles says that there has to be legislation passed in the territory where the Bank is to be sited in respect of the Headquarters. That is all there is to it. Nothing more than that. 1.05 p.m.

(Mr. HINDS:

I wonder if the Leader of the House read the Bill.)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes. Have you? Mr. SPEAKER Of course I have.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The Bank is now functioning, but there are certain legal obligations which the Government of Barbados must assume under the Regional Agreement, and these are embodied in this Bill.

Mr. HINDS:

We are asking, Mr. Speaker, that further consideration of this Bill be postponed until later in the day.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I used to think, at least when I was in the Opposition, that I myself was quite competent to take on Government. The hon. member is now admitting an inadequacy which I am sure he must really feel. Very well, I will postpone it. There is no need, Mr. Speaker, to move that further consideration be postponed because I have not moved the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member was speaking on no motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Like the hon. member opposite, we were both indulging the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

A precedent not to be followed, I hope.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Order No. 8, Mr. Speaker.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 5) ORDER, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Rt. hon. and Learned Prime Minister which, I gather, the Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave to take charge of in his absence. This is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1970. Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, last week the House in Committee of Supply appropriated various sums of money for various Departments in connection with this Civil Establishment Order which, I believe, was made on that day and promulgated immediately. There are several Departments and Ministries involved, and I leave it to hon. members to ask any question which I will answer since I cannot anticipate them.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Addendum to this Resolution tells us that the Order seeks to (i) correct an error in the Principal Order with regard to the number of posts of Laundry Driver at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; (ii) provide for adjustments to the Establishment structure of a number of Ministries Departments.

I want to stop there and deal with these two matters, and I prefer to deal with No. 2 first. There, is something to be regretted, and it is that this very Order does not take into consideration a situation which obtains in the Public Service of this Island. I speak with reference to a situation at the Mental Hospital. There is a case where a female received a letter of appointment - I think it was dated 1st April, 1962, - when she was appointed as a Nurse. That Nurse was put on probation for a period of two years and subsequently confirmed in the post. She has served for a period, now, of eight years, and I think I am right in saying that she had been acting previously. Now with the Salaries Revision which we had last year, the post of Unqualified Nurse was abolished, and there has been created the post of Nurses' Assistant. Now, this young lady who had been appointed as a Nurse since 1962, for some reason which cannot be explained by anybody in Establishment, finds herself salary-wise placed, not at the bottom of the scale of the Qualified Nurses, because this is where in my view she ought to have been placed with the understanding that she would not be given any increments until she became qualified, but instead is no longer considered a Nurse. She has been demoted. Her uniform has been changed and she is now placed in the category of a Nurses' Assistant. I feel that some of these people ought to be bold enough to employ lawyer and solicitors, if they had the money, to bring an action in court and have these matters settled. It was not the girl's fault in 1962 when she was appointed that somebody did not investigate or enquire as to her qualifications or given her a test to determine whether she was qualified before she was appointed. And remember her letter of appointment was on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission which was then in existence.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, was the person on whose behalf the case is being investigated in this Chamber a qualified Nurse as such when she was appointed?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hardly a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence on the Public Service Commission. They recommended her appointment as a Nurse, and it was on that recommendation that she was appointed. That is all I have to say. 1.15 p.m.

She has been serving faithfully and we 11, but since the Salaries Revision she has found herself with changed uniforms and being told that she is a Nursing Assistant. It just is not fair. I think that to assist the Minister I should say that the person is a Mrs. Cobham; I make mention of it so that the Minister can have the matter investigated.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I suppose I can ask a question at this stage. As far as this particular matter is concerned, I would give you the assurance that I will have it investigated. As a general policy the appellation of "Nurse" does not necessarily make anyone a qualified Nurse, and the policy which has been implemented now is to upgrade Nurses in the nursing profession as such, so that, whether they were Assistant Matrons or held other posts, no matter how Senior they might have been at the District Hospitals or any of the hospitals, the policy is now to upgrade them; and you find Assistant Matrons being called Nursing Assistants. If the person is not a qualified Nurse as such, although, she may be a good Nurse who has done useful service, this can happen. Personnel matters do not come to me, but I will have the matter investigated. On the face of it, there seems to be a just grievance and I will use whatever persuasion I can in order to remedy the apparent grievance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think that was a point of order, not very succinctly made; but the hon. member gave ' way.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, all I need say at this point for the benefit of the Minister is this. If it did happen that the Public Service Commission made a mistake in 1962, the best way to correct it now would not be to demote the Nurse since the Salaries Revision, but to let her remain where she was prior to the Salaries Revision and call on her to become qualified if she wants promotion; but do not demote her.

There are so many errors to be corrected in respect of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that I seem not to know where to begin; I somewhat feel for the Hon. Minister of Health, because if this Order is seeking to correct any errors whatsoever, one of the very first errors I would pray God to direct the Minister to set about to correct would be to see that the diabetics at that Institution are not given, as they were fed on Sunday last, dried peas and rice and beets with fried pork chops - this is no joke, Mr. Speaker - and in the evening they were given some thing called West Indian soup which consisted of beef and water. We might even go further, and if this Order is going to correct anything, the Sister who was on duty on Ward B. I on Monday - only yesterday - could have given the Minister enough that would serve him for the rest of the week, which he would have to correct. There she was faced with a pile of discoloured carrots sent to the Ward to serve to here patients: and she was so disappointed, fed up and disgusted that she ordered that they be carried off her Ward and that something better be sent to feed the patients of Ward B. I.

Mr. Speaker, you will understand how difficult it must be when you have these trained super-dietitians at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who, when the menu called for English Apples for the diabetics yesterday, they substituted tinned pears and they emptied those tinned pears in a very large container and poured plain water on them; in other words they washed the pears in water and served them to the diabetic patients. That is the kind of nastiness they are engaging in at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; the word "nastiness" is the best word that suits the situation at that Institution. I can tell the Minister that one of his expert dietitians, Mrs. Kim, has gone further and is now feeding figs to the diabetics at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; so the Minister, I am sure, will soon be answering questions as to the number of diabetics dying at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and perhaps he will be concerned with the rapidity of deaths. But we have much more on this Resolution, and I am sure that we do not want for a single moment to hold it up.

We are going to corns around to School Meals. One would have thought that since School Meals is the baby of the Hon. Leader of the House, he would have set himself what would have been a normal exercise and give this House to understand that from its inception as a pilot scheme in 1963 it has cost this country \$x for the feeding of the children and \$y by way of capital expenditure, and that he would have given information all the way down from 1963 and would have even included what is this year's vote to let us know that when we put our heads down that this is what the taxpayers of this country have been carrying on their backs in the form of a School Meals Programme. I am sure that whilst the Minister has his staff proposals, he cannot attempt in any respect to justify the expenditure on that programme by the slowness of its expansion, if expansion at all it has been in the true sense of the word.

1.25 p.m.

Sir, I well remember in the case of my own constituency of St. Peter that it is well over a year now, and bordering on two years that money was voted or expended to cover the programme at the

Boscobelle School, and there is no sign up to today of the scheme ever reaching them. I am wondering if the Government feels or believes that it is doing itself any good, if the School Meals Programme is a good one, by punishing and depriving the people in Boscobelle and other areas of St. Peter as well of the benefits of this Scheme which is costing the taxpayers so much.

We have a Chief Supply Officer, Mr. Speaker, and he is in the \$13,200 bracket; but Sir, this is what I am in a position to say, that the officer who, I understand, is already functioning has absolutely no experience in supply matters. He is an excellent Accountant, but what? We do not need Accountants in the Government Service today. We are computerising - and not even that, since 1956 there has been no need for Accountants. In the Government Service today accounts means nothing.

So, Sir, one has got to be very careful. We cannot, we will not oppose the setting up of this School Meals Programme as a separate Department. But what we will like to see and know is this; that we have clearly set out what aid we are receiving from overseas and find that we, the local taxpayers, are not still called upon to pay for what we are receiving from overseas. In other words, do not let it overlap.

I feel that the Government should have called on some of our overseas Agencies to supply them with some officer, if needs be, because, remember that the School Meals Programme, according to the terms of this Resolution, has now grown beyond a pilot scheme. It has become an institution in itself, and what we have to guard against - and we want to assist the Minister, we want to see the scheme succeed.

Therefore, Sir, we would invite the Minister to appoint somebody along the ranks, somebody who is not what we normally call a yard fowl of the Government. Appoint someone from the other side who, you know, will be a watch dog. We are not telling the Minister that he himself should make the appointments because I do not want to go into details about these things. Definitely not; but we would like to see that the Minister is in possession of all the facts, all the relevant data concerning the programme from its inception until the very last hour.

We would like to hear his projections. Let us know how soon the Government will install something in the Boscobelle School, and when the children in these schools and other schools will be fed. Let them get their little 10 meal as well. We feel this way about it, that if it has taken the Government almost 8 years to cover the number of schools presently served, something ought to be done, and we hope that the setting-up of this Department will expedite matters rapidly so that when we come to the September term, the new school year, as the Minister says, everybody is going to get.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should try to assist me there because he wants me to get away from School Meals, and I promise him that I will. But we hear now that it took from March 1963 - so they say - with 3,700 children in 6 schools, and they now claim that they are providing lunches for 13,000 children at 68 Primary Schools and they still have 126 of the Primary Schools.

We feel further that you have your Comprehensive Schools and the children in your Comprehensive Schools come from the same type of homes as those of the Primary Schools. They need school meals, too. You must remember that the parents of the children in the Comprehensive Schools are also paying for the meals that the children in the Primary Schools are enjoying. We would wish that the Government would find it possible to include, at least, the Comprehensive Schools in the School Meal Programme in the coming year. 1.35 p.m.

Now I want to speak, Mr. Speaker, on the Ministry of Health under Item-Health Services (Control of Drugs). I really do not know how serious the Ministry of Health is in this very important matter. Now we have evidence that dope in its every form is entering this Island of ours. What we want to say and make abundantly clear is that a lot of people who are peddling the dope are sheltering under the wings of people who occupy benches on that side of the House. I do not want to say of every member who occupies a chair on that side, but they are using their association with members very high up in Government as a shield and protector, and they are doing a brisk trade in this country. That is no secret. Some people have been held up here by the Police, and they were known to be the fastest friends of the Prime Minister of this country. The fastest friends of the Prime Minister have been dope peddlers. What is Government going to do? They are looking for an Inspector of Drugs, and when a druggist in the Government Service is receiving a salary of \$540 a month, the Government is offering a Drug Inspector a paltry \$20 more a month. That is why I asked exactly how serious is the Ministry of Health in this matter. A Drug Inspector has got to be a person who is being paid a salary that permits him to discharge the functions of his office without fear or favour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, for the hundredth time, for the benefit of the hon. member in particular, and hon. members generally, the Minister of Health does not fix anybody's salary. It is done by Establishment. For the hundred and first time, I am saying that I have no say whatever in it, and I hope the hon. member would get it clearly. I have no hand-nor does any Minister at all-in fixing anybody's salary.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Mr. HINDS:

Yes, Sir. Hon. member son this side have got to knock the heads of the Ministers in these matters because we are not concerned with Establishment; we are concerned with who introduces the Bill, and we stay on this side of the House and give him all the lashes possible and get the people's business done. We do not care who fixes the salary; the Minister ought to be sensible enough to tell his Cabinet that if it wants to appoint a Drug Inspector, it cannot say that a Druggist can earn \$540 a month and it is going to appoint an Inspector of Drugs and give him \$20 a month more and expect him not to be bought. You are either doing something or you are doing nothing. We appreciate the fact that the Minister does not fix anybody's salary, but I am sure that each and every hon. member of the House will see the point that is being made. We want to see and know, that when we have appointed an Inspector of Drugs, he can really and truly inspect, and that nobody can point a finger at him or point dollars at him. That is what we are concerned with, and we feel that the matter has not been given that measure of serious consideration that it really deserves. Establishment or whoever else is concerned has not brought to bear upon the situation the weighty judgment that a matter of this sort really deserves.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but just as a reminder the salary scale as set out here is \$6,720 to \$7,200. In other words, it is \$560 a month going to \$600 a month. The policy is always to put you at the appropriate point in the scale by virtue of your experience etc., so that an appointee can very well receive the \$600 from the inception. I just draw that to the hon. member's attention since he is quoting that it is only \$20 more, whereas in reality the person can receive \$60 more, if he has the necessary experience and qualifications which he must have. Let us clear it that way. Do not give the wrong impression that it is only \$20 more when the salary scale is \$6, 720 to \$7, 200. 1.45 p.m.

In other words, the maximum would be \$600 per month for the time being; that is how Government operates. If you are pleading, you are pleading too early; let the person get the job first and then plead for him.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the troubles, that the other side has always assumed that every member on this side knows perhaps much more than he really knows on matters with which they should be more familiar; but that is beside the point. The Minister is certainly not au fait with what goes on in Establishments when it comes to the question of the fixing of salaries, for the simple reason that if Government had any intention of paying an officer a salary above \$7,200 per annum, they would have stated that he would begin at \$6,720 rising by annual increments of so much to \$7,200, and then you go up by so much and so much to so much and so much. You do not offer a salary of \$560-\$600 and stop there and then say if you are more competent than we thought, we would give you a few dollars more. Even in private enterprise it is not done that way, and we ask that if you, with all this dope coming into

the place, want a capable and competent Inspector, you have got to pay him much more than \$20, \$40 or \$60 above the ordinary Druggist in Bridgetown. What the Minister seems not to understand and what the Government seems not to be bearing in mind is that we have a lot of drug salesmen who are travelling around the Island and working for more than what the Government is offering here to a Drug Inspector. It shows quite plainly that somebody does not seem to understand what a Drug Inspector is expected to have to cope with, what will be his standards, the dignity which should be associated with his office, what are his functions; hence you get the situation which we now find ourselves faced with.

We would like the Minister, rather than proceeding with this Item, to have this particular matter re-examined. It is a serious matter to appoint an officer at this salary; you are doing the country no good; you are selling the country, in other words. You are just giving somebody a job to follow on with what is going on about the place now. We do not want that; we want a capable and competent officer who can function as a man, who is paid a salary, who can be called upon and who can call upon people to do what the law requires of them without fear or favour. That is what we want. Something, Mr. Speaker, is definitely wrong in respect of this Item as far as the salary for the Drug Inspector is concerned, and we are urging upon the Minister to reconsider the matter. It is a very serious matter in view of the development in immorality in recent months in this country, and we can do no more than put it before the Government and leave it to them to see how they react to a situation such as this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, from very recent information which I have I could strengthen as much as possible what the hon. member has said in the interest of having a super-officer here. I have got information which makes me wonder why the Attorney General's office has not instructed the Police to bring certain prosecutions against certain people. We Barbadians seem to think it cannot happen here. Marijuana is being grown in Barbados. One parent of a school child, a Boy Scout, who was supposed to be going to Trinidad, was shocked at the thought that his son would be going to Trinidad, because even among Boy Scouts drugs are being taken, and it is being taken here. I have plenty of evidence; but it is only the feelings of parents that have prevented me from asking the Attorney General to instruct the Police to do anything more. I will tell the Minister or the Commissioner of Police such evidence as I might be able to put in their hands.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the Leader of the House is not in his place, because while we are dealing with the legal Department, I am going to use this opportunity to extract from the Leader of the House why is it that commitments that were made on The floor of this House, in respect of certain Departments, of a legal nature, namely the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Judges in respect of a salary revision at a time when the review of the salaries of Ministers and others was taking place have not yet been implemented. The Director of Public Prosecutions' job is equated with that of a Judge, and certain adjustments were agreed upon here as to certain allowances to be paid, and up to this day nothing has happened towards the implementation of that. We on this side were certainly on that occasion taken

in, having regard to the commitment that was made, and we want to know why is it that when a commitment is made on the floor of this House by so responsible a person as the Leader of the House, it cannot be implemented.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

We will look into it; but the hon. member must understand that when we are dealing with matters connected with the Judges we have to have a lot of consultation with them. The matter is being looked into. 1.55 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Included in that is the Director of Public Prosecutions whose salary traditionally is equated with that of a Puisne Judge.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I am just drawing to the attention of the Leader of the House the question of our Standing Orders which have not been suspended.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders No. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45. I give the assurance that Private Members' Business will be taken for its appropriate duration.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON SALE OF ARMS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the Prime Minister to make a Statement,

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker,

Earlier this month, on 20th July, the Government of the United Kingdom announced that it was prepared to consider applications from South Africa for the purchase of equipment for maritime defence directly related to the security of the sea routes as provided for in the Simonstown Agreement of 1955. The Foreign Minister also said that this decision of the British Government in no way implied support for systems founded on racist principles and that the racist policies of the South African Government were regarded by the British Government as fundamentally wrong.

2. I have energetically protested against this decision of the British Government and, like the Prime Minister of Canada and other Commonwealth leaders, I have strongly warned of the disastrous effect which that decision will have upon Commonwealth morale to the extent of probably threatening its existence. My Government rejects the idea that there are arms capable of being used exclusively for external purposes. A Bantu reservation can be as easily destroyed from the sea as from the land. The recently elected government of the United Kingdom is in no doubt as to the unequivocal opposition of this Government to their proposal.

3. The regime in Pretoria is, of all forms of Government, the most odious and detestable the world has seen. It has enshrined barbarity in its Constitution; its Parliament and its Judiciary together compound and promote the most abject squalor which it has been the lot of Black Men to suffer. Where other regimes and governments reserve for themselves even the clumsiest veneer of hypocrisy to cover their wrong-doing, this regime pursues its degradation of Blacks with unabashed and brutal frankness. It

has defied - it is now defying - resolutions solemnly passed by the United Nations General Assembly and has treated with contemptuous disdain requests from the World Body that it be permitted to visit those territories under South African control in order that their peoples should be speedily prepared for self Government. This regime has bitterly insulted the Governments and Peoples of the United States and Britain by its refusal to permit its own nationals to participate in sporting fixtures with Basil D'Oliveira and Arthur Ashe, to name only two.

4. The bitter hostility of all Commonwealth Peoples to this gangsterdom organised as Government, was shown unmistakeably in 1960 when an application from South Africa to remain in the Commonwealth after becoming a Republic in 1961 was flatly ruined down. The Party now in power in Britain was the same then and this British Government is, of all British Governments, most familiar with the bitterness of Commonwealth feeling on this matter,

5. "The preceding British Government in conformity both with a United Nations decision and with Commonwealth sensibilities, ceased to supply arms to South Africa from 1964. It is this embargo which the present Government wishes to lift in deference to the Simonstown Agreement of 1955 which was drawn up in an exchange of letters between Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and Mr. Erasmus. In an interesting enclosure which forms part of the agreement, the Government of South Africa undertook not to require United Kingdom personnel to learn the Afrikaans language, and it also agreed that there would be "no bar to the recruitment and employment at the base of non- Europeans" that there would be "no discrimination based on colour on the rates payable for comparable jobs¹; and that Coloured and African workers, once recruited, "would have the same security of tenure as Europeans and Whites".

6. Everyone knows that these undertakings have not. been honoured. Since 1960 it is illegal in South Africa to recruit Europeans and non-Europeans for the same kind of work; it is illegal to pay Whites, Blacks and Coloured at the same rate; it is illegal to offer Blacks and Coloured the same social and welfare benefits as are provided for white workers. It follows, therefore, that the policies and principles of apartheid have seriously abrogated an important aspect of the Simonstown Agreement. It is on this clearly frustrated agreement that the British Government now relies to frustrate the implementation of the declared policies of the United Nations.

7. The political party of which I am Chairman, is not a latter day convert to opposition to South Africa. When on 21st March, 1960, the world was nauseated by the brutal murder of 69 Africans at Sharpsville this party, then in Opposition, was the first in this island to give voice to the roar of indignation and disgust which swept around the world. The people of Barbados do not trade with South Africa and our diplomatic representatives abroad are instructed to confine their contacts with South Africa diplomats only to the bare minimum required by traditional diplomatic courtesy.

8. The Government of Barbados will under no circumstances weaken in its hostility to the South African Government and its Policies. This Government therefore joins with all other Commonwealth Governments in their united and unyielding condemnation of the proposal of: the Government of the United Kingdom to supply arms to the Government of South Africa. At the same time the Government of Barbados cannot accept that a disagreement with the Policies of a Commonwealth country should cause the dissolution of the Commonwealth. It is high time that more people; in the United Kingdom begin to understand that the Commonwealth is a free association of Sovereign States and not a British embarrassment. The Commonwealth in 1961 withdrew the mantle of approval from the hated South African regime. It did not dissolve itself. It did not, in other words find itself compelled to "burn the whole house down in order to roast a pig".

9. It should not be difficult for the Commonwealth nine years later to promote the exclusion of any other one of its members which finds it more convenient to pursue a policy of accommodation with South Africa than a policy of integrity with the rest. 2.05 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I suggest that in future anything like this, even though you call it a Statement, be at least shown to the Opposition before being made? We do not say that we differ from the sentiments expressed here, but surely common, politeness should make the Government see that they should show the Opposition beforehand.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I entirely agree with the hon. member. I have copies which are being shown to all the members of the House, and in any event the Cabinet Ministers have not seen the Statement before. His Honour the Speaker is the only person who has been given a copy at the same time that I was reading it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

That does not mean that the Opposition should see it only at the time when strangers in the Gallery are hearing it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Rt. Hon. B. W. BARROW. I should like to point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that, when I deliver the Budget Speech, he hears it at the same time not only as the members of the Cabinet that are present at that time. I do not know about any person being present now - but the whole world because it is broadcast, and people in China can hear it at the same time as the members of the Opposition; so I do not understand what is the problem.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock.

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.

On resumption.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be taken for fifteen minutes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is one Question to which, I am informed, the answer has been laid, and it stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

QUESTION re LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

How many Local Government Pensioners have not been paid the \$25. 00 increase recently made available to Government Pensioners?

Why has such a situation arisen?

What steps does Government propose taking to remedy the situation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows

"1. None.

2. Does not arise.

3. Does not arise. "

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that all Local Government pensioners have received the \$25 increase?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes. This is what I am saying, but perhaps I could define this. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member may have believed or rather may have been representing a belief by many pensioners that the cost of living allowance is payable in respect of each pension drawn. This is not so. This will be a mistaken belief. The real facts are that the Government's intention was - and continues to be - that the allowance should be paid in respect of each pensioner and not on each pension, so that if it is a case that a person draws a Local Government pension and at the same time draws a Central Government pension or any other pension, the cost of living allowance, as it is called, is given to that person in respect of his being a pensioner and not in respect of the pensions. I do not know if that assists the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, was the \$25 an increase on pensions?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

It is an increase given to pensioners as, in fact, the \$10 increase in 1967 and the \$10 increase in 1962 or 1963 were given to each person who drew a pension, no matter how his pension was computed, and no matter how many separate pensions from whatever source he drew, because if you argue that the allowance should be given in respect of each pension, then a Colonial Governor would be entitled to claim a separate increase in respect of the pension he gets from Antigua, the pension he gets from Tanganyika or from Hong Kong, whereas in fact he is a single pensioner to whose pension several Governments contributed. If he was living here last or retired here and was a resident of this country, he was therefore entitled to this \$25. He would only get a single sum of \$25 as a pensioner, and not in respect of each part, ion or portion of pension.

Mr. HINDS:

Now, Sir, did Government give an increase of \$10 a month on a previous occasion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I think so. I think there was a \$10 increase in 1962 and one in 1967. There was one certainly in 1967 and one some years before that. So it is a total of \$45 which we have given, and if I may say so, without boasting, rather well. 3.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

What was Government's policy when the amount was a \$10 increase?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

To give it to a pensioner.

Mr. HINDS:

Does the Minister know that persons in receipt of Local Government pensions received the \$10 on the Local Government pension and the same pensioners in receipt of a Central Government pension received the \$10 as well on the Central Government pension?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I am not aware of this; it was never intended to be so.

Mr. HINDS:

Will the Minister say it is not a fact?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The point is, Mr. Speaker, in 1963 and in 1966 the arrangement provided that where a pensioner was in receipt of pensions from two or more scheduled Governments that cost of living allowance payable should be determined on the aggregate of those pensions, and such proportion as the allowance bears to the annual pension, those in receipt of two or more pensions from two or more Governments would receive that allowance. I do not know if persons may have been receiving pensions from two Governments, but certainly if you received pension from a single source here in Barbados, no matter how it is paid out, you will get one \$25 allowance.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that pensioners who had received the \$10 increase were so upset at the treatment they received when the \$25 increase came about that they found it absolutely necessary to write the Attorney General on the matter and explain their position, and pointed out to the Attorney General the precedent that was created when the first \$10 had been made available to them?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister cannot be aware of whether certain persons found it absolutely necessary to do so; he may be aware that they did so and I will allow the supplementary so far.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I certainly was not aware of that and could not have been in the circumstances, because the particular cases have not been drawn to my attention; but perhaps we can go a little further. As regards those pensioners who receive one pension only, whether Central Government, Church Officers or Local Government pensions—each of them received the cost of living issued at the time when the Question was asked with the exception of two persons who actually received Local Government pensions. These two pensioners retired after the 1st April, 1969 and their retiring benefits were originally completed on the old rates of pay. Pending a re-computation of their retiring benefits on the revised rates, the Accountant General authorised the payment of the cost of living allowance. I do not know if the hon. member is making reference to these two cases.

Mr. HINDS:

No; the cases I referred to have all retired prior to 1959.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I do not think there are any more Questions; I beg to move that Private Members Business be now taken for an hour and a quarter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

AYES:

Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR C. E. TALMA., G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC, EDWARDS and N. W. BOXILL Messrs. J. B. YEARWOOD, W. R. LOWE, R. ST. C. WEEKES, and C. A. E. HOPPIN. - 9.

NOES:

Messrs. W. C. B. HINDS, ELLIOTT MOTTLEY, L. S. CRAIG and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS.

- 4.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first item under Private Members Business is in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and it is to resume debate on a motion requesting the 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 last discussed in this Chamber, on the 21st July of this year, the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking up to the time that Private Members' Business came to an end; that hon. member is now entitled to resume. I understand that the hon. member is not going to continue his speech.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

As long as I have health and strength and am a member of this House, I am not going to shut my eyes to blatant dishonesty. 3. 15 p.m.

It is disgraceful to have even a half dozen people saying you want to hear nothing over there because Edwards can pull strings. (Asides. You cannot call people's names in the House. How can we do that?) People in the street do not say the hon. member for whatever parish it is. They say "Edwards. " You hear it all over the Street.

This is utterly disgraceful. Imagine trying to stop a Judicial Commission where men are going to investigate the facts just as a Judge. would tell a jury: "I suggest to you that such-and-such facts are not proved, and you cannot return a verdict of guilty. " Imagine trying to stop a Judicial Commission on any of the details we heard about bribery and corruption and paying people and putting what v might best be described as stool pigeons in jobs, Imagine that causing no surprise; Once upon a time people would have shuddered. You would not have listened to rumours of that sort. Now you hear it spread all about

the place.

Because the Government has a majority, are they going to vote against this? Because there is the suggestion that the Minister does something dishonest, therefore, it should not be investigated? With the evidence I have, I will be prepared to go back to the Bar and put that evidence before the Court to prove some of these allegations that are here. I say from the evidence I have. You cannot get everyone to do it. A man will not say; "I got a couple of hundred dollars to do so-and-so". It is not possible to get all the witnesses that a Barrister would like to get.

I am prepared to get up and challenge the hon. member to sue me for slander for the things I am going to say that I know. When I say I know, I have been told, I have been given the assurance that "if you call me as a witness, I will come and give such-and-such evidence."

After all, let us examine the wording of this Resolution, "Whereas a contract to build houses has been awarded by the Barbados Housing Authority without any invitation for Tender. ' That is child's play to prove. This is a case where the defence would have to put in their particulars to prove that this is untrue, that Tenders were called for in the Advocate newspaper or the Truth newspaper or the Beacon newspaper on such-and-such a date.

The Preamble goes on - "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. " Will it be questioned that Mr. Bryan is the Hon. Member's father? If necessary, that will be proved.

I refer them to the Resolution - "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, by the aforesaid Mr. Bryan. '1 Is there any doubt that that can be proved in the Law Courts?

"AND WHEREAS the Housing Authority has' awarded contracts - "where is the honesty of the Hon. member and members of the Government who will vote against this Resolution? To tell the world that they have something to hide? If the hon. member - I regret to say it - if the hon. member for St. Andrew

happens to be dishonest, he happens to be dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, in saying that if the hon. member for St. Andrew happens to be dishonest he is dishonest, is using language which, in my view, is offensive and insulting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Well, I am sorry. If you say that _ is offensive, I withdraw the words. Let me put it plainly. If it is raining, it is raining. That is a¹; I am saying, It is no use pretending that it is not raining. If someone tells you that it is raining and you are inside the house you do not know if it is raining; but if you go to the window and see that it is raining you say "Yes, it is raining. ' What is wrong with that;?

if it is the last thing I do in public life I will see, if this House does not vote for this, that this matter is brought in the Law Courts. I will go back to the Bar and appear, with all the evidence that I have been given, to prove all that it is necessary to prove, to show that there has been corruption in the matter of the working of the Housing Authority.

Let me repeat. I have been in this House too long and on earth too long just to make empty talk. You do that when you are 16 or 17 years old. Not when you are 70.

To refer again to the Resolution - "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. ' A child can prove that. It does not take a lawyer to prove that, to put witnesses in the box to prove it. That is patent.

Let me anticipate a little. If some documents have disappeared, secondary evidence of them can be give a. If the defence is be ing prepared now, prepare it. There are enough of us Barristers who know enough of the law to prove whatever has been set out in this Resolution,

"AND WHEREAS one of the supervisors, employed by Mr. Watson is the aforesaid Mr. Bryan. " Has it never struck the Minister, has he felt so little of the sense of public honour of Barbadians as to think that he could get away with that? I mean commonsense. If we look at it from the personal point of view,

we would have to say that the Minister thought so little of his sense of responsibility or sense of honour as to insult us by doing things like this and thinking that he could get away with it.

It is like the Government writing me a letter and asking me to be Chairman of the Price Control Commission so that when the public are opposed to high prices they will blame the junior member for St. Joseph; he is chairman of this Commission". We did not reply. We do not reply to insults, but it shows how little they think of the intelligence or sense of responsibility of members of the Opposition.

Again, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Watson is an employee of the Government, and he employs Mr. Bryan as one of his supervisors. I think that from the things said in here and on public platforms by members of the Government as regards members of the Opposition and the attacks they make on us, all added together cannot compare with this. Do they think they can get away with this? 3.25 p.m.

I do not suggest by whom the approach to bribery is done, and I do not suggest who the go-between is, but you know it is said that every man has his price. You offer a man a Ministry and he will go over. That is one price.

AND WHEREAS the said contracts awarded to Mr. Sydney Watson worth over one million dollars were awarded without any invitation for Tenders advertised for in any Newspaper in circulation in the Island of Barbados.

That is a serious matter. Even for tenders worth \$1,000 you advertise, let alone \$1 million without any invitation for tenders advertised for. It is quite unnecessary to make any comment on that. If it is only \$100, you should advertise for tenders, let alone \$1 million.

AND WHEREAS equipment belonging to the Housing Authority has been used at the residence of the said Minister of Housing at Melbourne, Belmont and at a building site belonging to the said Minister of Housing at Stanmore Crescent, Black Rock.

I am told that the Minister has denied that, but he has not denied anything else. He has not denied any of the things I have just been saying. Now isn't it remarkable that the average man who talks about this emphasises that the Housing Authority's equipment has been used at Melbourne while the Housing

Authority had to rent similar equipment from somewhere else? Now there may be two reasons for denial. Either it is not true or the Minister feels that witnesses who could come and give that evidence are not going to come, and he would know why. Even in ordinary cases any lawyer would tell you that sometimes he has a perfect case, but he cannot get witnesses to come for one reason or the other. Either he feels sorry for the defendant, or the money is forthcoming and he was hard-up and he had to take it and keep out of Court, or one or other reasons. A Judicial Commission will prove the truth or the falsity of this statement. Do hon. members think that merely because we are in the Opposition we would come inhere and make fancy accusations, especially against a Minister of Government? After all, the reputation of Barbados and of the Barbados Government is as important to us on the side of the Opposition as to members of the Government. Would we tell the outside world that we have a Government that is capable of corruption and in which you can find a Minister blatantly doing things that he should not do? We have to consider what the rest of the West Indies is going to think of Barbados, because as I said earlier this afternoon, we Barbadians think ourselves superior to the rest of the West Indies, and in some respects we are. We have produced Gary Sobers and so on, but in other respects we can be and sometimes are as guilty of wrong doing as any other Island. If these statements are not proved true, a Judicial Commission will say so. I repeat that these are serious charges, not charges of making a mistake or of wrong judgment, but charges that, if proved true, will show that the Hon. Minister does not deserve a seat in a Government, because he would have been proved ID have abused his Ministerial position. It is a serious thing, if proven, to use a Government Department's material, and then that Government Department has to go and rent from somebody else. The allegation here is that.

"WHEREAS the Housing Authority rented similar equipment from C. O. Williams Construction while the Housing Authority equipment was in use at the Minister's residence and aforesaid building site at Black Rock;"

I repeat, there are two answers to that. The Minister in denying it did no: speak the complete truth, or the Minister feels that witnesses are not going to come and give evidence on that. Why deny that and not deny all the rest, if all the rest according to him is false?

"AND WHEREAS this Housing strongly condemns this abuse of public office and this disgraceful exhibition of nepotism on the part of the Minister and Senior Member for St. Andrew; AND WHEREAS the Housing Authority has privately sold a number of motor vehicles at a price below their real value and at least one of these vehicles has been in the use of the Minister;"

That is something that could be proved or not proven. A Judicial Commission will have the evidence put before it and will say whether the witness is lying or speaking the truth. This is a case to go before the Chief Justice or a Puisne Judge. You swear a man on oath and that makes most people, at any rate,

inclined to speak the truth rather than to tell a lie.

When the average Christian man, or even the non-Christian man, or the average man with a sense of responsibility or sense of decency goes on oath, he is more likely to speak the truth than if he is not on oath.

"AND WHEREAS the Minister has approved loans to Public Officers despite the fact that there has been no meeting of the Public Officers Loans Committee;"

That, again, is a statement that could be proven or not. A Judicial Commission would make the necessary investigation and make a report. I was not in the House for some time, and I am not sure whether this has been mentioned, but an expression had been used earlier today about stool pigeons and people who might get jobs because they are yard-fowls. We know that. That is human nature, and Barbadians are not the only people who do that. Whether this has been mentioned or not. I will mention, that those of us who know Mr. Norman Niles know that a more honest man hardly exists in this Island. I have known Mr. Norman Niles for nearly forty years because he used to be a half of a solicitor and practised in Mr. Sargeant's office when he was a practitioner thirty or forty years ago. A more honest man, a more God-fearing man, a more considerate man could hardly be found. For years and years he would be in Court with me or maybe in the office, and I had every opportunity of knowing him and knowing his disposition and the type of man he was. When it is alleged that he did not favour such-and-such a thing and is not bribable, surely that is a matter for investigation.

It is not for me, Mr. Speaker, to refer to Your Honour's private knowledge, but I think you would not, if the circumstances were different, differ from what I have said about Mr. Niles, knowing him also in the legal profession. 3.35 p.m.

The Judicial Commission will, doubtless, have before it more evidence than has actually been stated in the different reports, I have read, of the Resolution. For instance, I have already said - and I say it again - in your own interest, and by that I mean hon. members on the other side, you should not give the public the impression that you are hiding a colleague, a man on the run, you are willing to give him a bedroom so that the Police cannot get at him. In your own interest, I appeal to all hon. member of the Government Party to see that they should be able to tell the world that they have nothing to hide, they are not condoning any wrong on the part of one of their colleagues; his conduct as a Minister of a Government will stand examination. If one of your colleagues has fallen by the wayside, you can be sorry for him. You cannot tell the world he is a saint; he is honest; he is innocent; he has been charged wrongfully; you have got to preserve your own honour as well as the honour of Barbados.

Believe me, in one respect one of the best things you can do for the Opposition is to vote against this; from the top of St. Lucy to the bottom of Christ Church this will be a platform issue. The public will be asked to judge for themselves whether they are going to return to power a Government that can condone this and try to hide it. You will hear from this side one or two other reasons why we are asking for this Judicial Commission. Selling motor vehicles at a price below their value. Because of these various things, and because I think I have stressed the chief things that deserve to be stressed in this Resolution, I shall do no more now than wind up by using the words used by the mover of the Resolution in the wording of the Resolution: "BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Prime Minister to appoint a Judicial Commission of Enquiry into the administration and operation of the Barbados Housing Authority during the period commencing in July, 1969 till the end of June, 1970, being the period during which the senior member for St. Andrew was responsible for the portfolio of Housing." Let me stress why we are asking for a Judicial Commission; we believe that people will get a fair hearing if such a Commission is established. An ex-Chief Justice of Trinidad or somebody like that should be asked to be on it. You have just had an enquiry into the Broad Street fires the other day; you did not get local politicians or local merchants or local Trade Unionists; you got people who are expected to be impartial and honest. We request a Judicial Commission and we want Judges who will use their experience and you may almost say, their character to make this investigation so that everybody would have a square deal, and so that you do not condemn anybody on suspicion. You condemn people on evidence proven on oath.

This is more important than an investigation into the administration of the Hospital; the Minister can see after that. But the honour of Barbados is at stake and therefore you cannot appoint any local person with political sympathies. We are asking for the appointment of a Judge and some others with him who will conduct themselves as if they were trying a man for murder. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this motion brought forward by the hon. member and supported by other speakers.

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. There is one point in this Resolution calling for a Judicial Commission into the administration of the Housing Authority. I shall not go through the whole Resolution to read it back, but I want to know if you can tell me if the law has been changed. When Local Government came into being I was the first Chairman of the Northern District Council, and I do believe that one point which I was very stern on, and would ever be stern on - I suppose I was a disliked man but it was the law and I stuck to it. I have heard the figure of over \$1 million given out in contracts and I would like to know if that law has been changed for the Government Departments. In Local Government you could spend money, but as soon as you reached \$500 you had to go to Tenders, and that Tenders Committee was a very high Committee. I cannot remember exactly, but it was a Board set up to see the running of the money of the parish was going correctly. After I read this Resolution about so much money being issued out for over millions of dollars in each Department and nothing going to Tender it has struck me really, Sir, that there is something wrong. 3.45 p.m.

I personally do believe that, once a thing is right, it is right. In a simple matter like this there is nothing to hide. If everything is honest and plain, do not vote against it. Support it and everything will be clear. I cannot help expressing my self in a most candid way. I have not discussed this matter with anyone. I am speaking from the bottom of my heart.

Having sat on these Committees, Tenders Committees, I know that under the law no Board could issue Tenders for millions of dollars without advertising. I will apologise to you, Mr. Speaker, for repeating myself. As soon as it comes to \$500, you had to call for Tenders. Here it is the question of millions. I do not mean that one Department is spending millions, but a million this way and a million that way. What has gone wrong?

If everything is clear I do not see why members of the other side would vote against this. Let the public see what is wrong and what is right. I am not going to go over the Resolution or over what has been said by members on this side or the other side. They should know all the facts. I do not. I am speaking as one with experience in these things. I suppose that due to my belief of standing for the right in the face of God, I am saying now, to clear the air by voting for a Judicial Commission, clear the air and keep the good name of the Government of Barbados up.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, ; suppose that for anyone to have become President of the Oxford Union that person must possess some ability at debating. If I remember correctly, as a student in London I was told that in order to become a good debater you must have one essential qualification. Having listened to the Leader of the House over the past two sessions, I think that he qualifies admirably. He has that quality.

That quality, I am told, is the ability to talk nonsense and talk it for a very long time. That is the essential quality of being a great debater, at any rate within the Oxford Union. I see every justification for the Leader of the House to have become President of the Oxford Union.

If I may be permitted at this stage to indulge in a little more borrowing from quotations and adapting them to my own use, having listened to the Leader of the House on the first occasion, I thought of the words of Sir Winston Churchill and I attempt now to adapt them to the speech made by the Leader of the House - "Never in the history of one debate has any one man taken so long to say so many words to represent so little. " That is rather obvious, having listened to the speech made by the Leader of the

House.

He may, I believe, have had passing reference to the law. He may have heard of the defence of self-defence. As I had occasion last week on a point of order to indicate to the Leader of the House, there is no defence for stealing known as self defence. You cannot justify something on the basis that other people stole, and that is, I believe, the tenor of the whole speech made by the Leader of the House - that other people in the past must have stolen.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On a point of order, Sir, is the hon. member saying that I justified stealing by saying that some one has stolen? Who is supposed to have stolen in either case, either by my justification or my criticism?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I said that he in his speech alleged misconduct and stealing on the part of other persons in the past.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR. Perhaps the hon. member is referring to my exhaustive and extensive quotation of the scandalous and scurrilous attacks made by the Barbados Labour Party on the hon. member's father.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am prepared to give way to him and let him make a speech on every occasion. I do not believe that if he makes a speech again it will have any more effect than it has had in the past. I am not referring to what he is referring to. He pointed out that other people stole. He called one member of the Barbados Labour Party who, he said, carried away Union funds. That is the sort of thing that the Leader of the House did in attempting to say that, 'if someone else stole why cannot I steal too? That seems to have been the whole tenor of the speech of the Leader of the House.

If, Sir, I may indulge in more quotations, a quotation of a speech that was made in this House where the speaker said: "Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for reviving the memory of what we have passed through. In a country where freedom of the Press means only freedom to destroy our moral standards and to engineer the destruction of the legally appointed Government of the people, then the answer is the exposure of what has remained covered, to open up what has been closed, to let the fresh breezes blow in the nasty corridors of corruption, to let the light shine in the dark corners of conspiracy."

That, Sir, is the purpose of this Resolution - to expose what has remained covered, to open up what has

been closed, to let the fresh breezes blow in the nasty corridors of corruption.

Sir, a number of speakers spoke on the Government side. Some said that there is absolutely no proof of the facts alleged or set out in the Preamble to the Resolution. I think it was the junior member for Christ Church who spoke first on behalf of the Government, and said that all this Resolution contained was a lot of wild accusations; but immediately he sat down, the Minister of Housing attempted an analysis to show justification of the facts alleged in the Preamble to the Resolution.

The first part of the Preamble dealt with contracts to build houses without going to the award of tenders, and the Hon. Minister of Housing said; "Okay; the Labour Party did it in the past"; What is wrong if he does it now? 3.55 p.m.

I am not one of those persons who believe that because your forefathers did something, this is any justification for your doing it the same way. I use that to show that here was one Minister saying that the Resolution complained of facts that had been wild accusations, and here was the then Minister of Housing getting up and saying that contracts were awarded without tender in the Barbados Labour Party days. How could those be wild accusations when the Minister admits to the facts as set out in the Resolution that contracts were awarded without tender? I go further. He asked whether people did not expect his father to eat. I do not think that is the issue here. The issue is simple, and it is whether the conduct of the Housing Authority in awarding contracts to Mr. Watson, which contract was worth over \$1 million, was awarded with the knowledge that the Minister's family were going to benefit as a result of this contract. We have either got to decide whether we want morality in politics in this country, whether we want to raise the standard of politics and the standard of public life in this country, or whether we are just going to allow it to go on as it is now existing under the Democratic Labour Party. Although the hon. junior member for Christ Church said that the accusations were wild, the Minister of Housing got up and had to admit that his father was building houses, and therefore the circumstances as set out in the Resolution were true. The Minister has not denied paragraphs 3 to 6 of the Resolution which states: that a contract was awarded to Mr. Watson who is a Government employee and that this contract was awarded without any advertisement for tender. Where are all the wild accusations? We have had speeches from the Government side, and none of the speakers has denied that a contract was awarded to a Government employee, a man who is on the Establishment of this country. We must open our eyes and look at who is the real person benefiting from this contract.

Mr. Speaker, if we accept that the Public Service Commission of this country is competent and that they would not keep a person employed in any capacity unless he was performing that work, we must assume that if Mr. Watson is being employed in the Waterworks Department, he must do his work between the hours of 8 a. m. and 4 p.m., and therefore I ask in all seriousness, who then is performing the contract that has been awarded to Mr. Watson? The fact that Mr. Bryan is employed by Mr. Watson

is not denied; yet the hon. junior member for Christ Church believes, that this was a wild accusation in the Preamble to the Resolution; He would have us believe that it is a wild, wicked and reckless accusation made on the part of the Opposition, but the Minister of Housing in replying said that he has no control over whom Mr. Watson employs. The full significance of that is that the Minister has no control over whom Mr. Watson must employ, not that Mr. Watson has not got the contract. It does not mean that Mr. Watson is not employed by the Government of Barbados and has been awarded a contract without tender; it means simply that, as far as the Minister is concerned, he does not care whom Mr. Watson employs. He does not say that Mr. Watson does not employ Mr. Bryan. As it stands, every single allegation set out in this Preamble is true and correct, and one of the most interesting things about this whole debate is that one Tuesday when we adjourned, the Minister of Housing was in full cry defending himself and the Housing Authority, and it is surprising to see that the next Tuesday the Minister came ten minutes after debate had started. The reasons are obvious and the inference clear. The fact that houses were being built in his yard is not denied. The fact that these houses were being sold to people where the money was being negotiated through the Housing Authority has not been denied either. I believe it was the Minister of Housing who said that there was absolutely nothing in the Housing Authority Act to prevent his father from selling houses. That is not the issue at stake. As I said, the issue at stake is simple. Do we want morality in public life? If you do not, all I can say is to do like the Government and vote against the Resolution.

Now, Sir, it was at that point that the Minister finished. He did not go on to justify, not to deny, because no attempt was made on the part of the Minister to deny any of the facts contained in the Preamble to this Resolution. He only made an attempt to explain them and to justify his conduct and the conduct of the Barbados Housing Authority. He did this after the Minister of Health, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, said that the Resolution contained wild allegations and that he could not prove them. What better proof could we want than the fact that the Minister when he spoke never denied one single allegation as set out in the Preamble, but only attempted to explain them and justify his conduct?

Now, Sir, let us look at certain remarks made by the Leader of the House. He talked about the fact that Mr. Watson was a black man, and was not Mr. Watson of Ash and Watson. I do not care what colour Mr. Watson is. As far as I am concerned, corruption knows no colour, creed or class; dishonesty knows no colour, creed or class. If a man is dishonest, I will say he is dishonest, no matter what colour he is. Do not let us believe that because a man may be black, this is a licence to be dishonest, because this is one of the inferences to be drawn from the speech of the Hon. Leader of the House. He said that if Mr. Watson was not a black man, nobody would talk about it. As far as I am aware, dishonesty and corruption have no colour, class or creed. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, in the attempt to put forward an argument, the Leader of the House referred to a prominent member of the Labour Party, not a member of this Chamber, as stealing money belonging to the Union; that is not the first time that I have heard an allegation of that nature being made

in this House. I well remember, before I became a member of this House sitting in the public gallery and hearing another member of that Party referring, to a gentleman who was then a member of this political Party as a drunkard, and that he stole Union funds; so this allegation of people stealing Union funds is nothing new on the part of the Government. It is surprising the extent to which the Government condones that sort of thing that they could at one time say that somebody was stealing Union funds and the next time embrace that same person into their bosoms. However, it has been suggested that we in the Labour Party have been actuated by malice against the Minister and against certain people at the Housing Authority, and it has been suggested that this is the reason why we have brought this Resolution before this Chamber.

It has also been suggested that we in the Labour Party are only attempting to play cheap politics. This is the sort of allegation you will find when the Government cannot stand in here and state categorically that the allegations contained in the Preamble to this Resolution are untrue. All the Government speakers accused us of being motivated by malice, spite, ill-will, and of playing cheap politics; but not one single member of the Government at any time ever said that the allegations contained in the Preamble to this Resolution are untrue; not even the Minister when he spoke, as I said earlier. All he attempted to do was to explain it. Let me state here now that in presenting this Resolution to this Chamber I have no personal interest in the outcome of any Judicial Enquiry; I have no personal interest even in the outcome of this Resolution because in presenting this Resolution I was not motivated by any spite against the Minister or against any member of the Barbados Housing Authority. I did so because I, along with my colleagues in the Labour Party, am disgusted with the low state of political morality in this country, and I presented this Resolution because of the fact that large sums of the taxpayers' money are being squandered. 4.15 p.m.

I present this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, in the sincere hope that the mere bringing of this Resolution and the establishment of the Judicial Commission of Inquiry will be an attempt to wipe out the low standard of political morality. As I said, I present this Resolution to quote the words that I quoted some time ago, "to let the fresh breezes blow in the nasty corridors of corruption" of the Barbados Housing Authority. This Resolution, Sir, is an attempt to ensure new standards of political morality of politicians and other persons who may be in public offices in this country.

The sooner people accept that they have a duty to the taxpayers of this country, the better it will be for this country. I want now to wind up by saying to you, Sir, that the Government has intimated that it will call for a division against this Resolution. It is quite obvious that the attitude of the Government to this Resolution is to condone the conduct of the Minister and the Barbados Housing Authority in an effort to protect dishonesty and corruption in the high offices of Government in this country. We asked for a Judicial Commission of Inquiry. The answer of the Government to that was to introduce a Bill to limit the freedom of speech of this Assembly which was a deliberate attempt to browbeat the Opposition, to try to make the Opposition withdraw this Resolution.

Sir, it is quite clear that the Government of this country is not really aware of whom they have to deal with. There are certain people within their Party that can be treated like this; but certainly no member of the Barbados Labour Party will ever kowtow and be afraid of any member or of any actions of the D. L. P. or the Government of this country.

I wish to say in conclusion that a vote in favour of this Resolution must mean a vote for decent Government in this country. A vote in favour of this Resolution is a vote against corruption and an attempt to bring back sane government to this country. I put the word 'sane' in inverted commas. A vote against this Resolution clearly shows that the Government will condone dishonesty, corruption and mismanagement in the Barbados Housing Authority.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that this Resolution do -

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Order No, 27. I have listened very carefully to the hon. member who wound up on behalf of the motion which he moved himself. I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 27 Kale 2, a right which I intend to exercise now on a motion in which even up to the final recalcitrant words of the mover of the Resolution, the Opposition was highly critical of a member of the Government of which I not only as Leader have an undoubted right of reply, but since the Resolution calls on me to take a certain course of action. Had the Resolution not even been critical of the Government, a Government Minister and a statutory Board, - would have felt myself constrained to ask Your Honour's indulgence to exercise my democratic right.

I do not think, Sir, that I have to quote that Rule. With Your Honour's 31 years' experience you will be well aware of it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no doubt in my mind that this is a debate on a motion which is critical of the Government and accordingly that it does come within Standing Order 27 (2).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; I have farther to ask indulgence to clear up a misunderstanding which

appears to have arisen when -his Resolution was first introduced. The Resolution was introduced, Mr. Speaker, if my recollection, is correct, on the 23rd June. At that time Your Honour intimated that you had not had the opportunity either to read the Resolution or to see the Resolution; and it was during the course of my objection that Your Honour made this disclosure.

I sat down in the middle of a sentence while I was on a point of order on the rightness on the Order Paper of a Resolution of that nature. I think that it was a misunderstanding in that it was not appreciated that not even the Clerk of the House had seen the Resolution at the time of its pronouncement. There was also a misunderstanding on Your Honour's part in that I had exhausted my objections to the Resolution.

I would like to make it clear to Your Honour and to anybody else that I am not questioning Your Honour's Ruling at this stage for allowing this Resolution at all. I am satisfied with my experience of the Chair and my limited Parliamentary experience over 19 years, that had Your Honour been fully seized of the objections which were being drawn to your attention by the senior member for St. Andrew and myself that Your Honour would have taken a little more time to deal with it in the appropriate manner.

Be that as it may, the debate has proceeded on a highly contumacious and derogatory and certainly scurrilous Resolution. I will deal with the Resolution seriatim. It is not for me to counsel the hon. junior member for the City as to whether his quotations are right or whether his quotations are wrong or whether he has reached this lofty height of oratory in which the words which he learned in parrot-like fashion, when voiced by some other more experienced person, possibly would evoke some kind of sentiment of compassion. That is not my duty. He is very young and very brash, and therefore they have led him like a lamb before the slaughter while the Generals lurked skulking in their tents in the background.

I intend to deal with them because I do not at any time allow, or intend to allow the Government's case to go by default. The second point I would like to make at this juncture is that there has been a lot of public discussion about the removing of privileges of members of the House, and the words which the hon. member used just now - I do not want to misquote him - were to the effect that the answer the Government gave was to limit the freedom of members and to browbeat the Opposition in order to stifle debate.

Now, Sir, I am going to deal with the Immunities and Privileges Bill when the time comes, and I am going to deal with it adequately both from the juridical, constitutional and democratic view-point. I do not intend to make a speech on that here and now but I must set the record straight that this Immunities

Bill was not introduced to stifle any debate on this Resolution. In the first place, I have a confession to make that for the first time since I have been Chairman of the Cabinet I did something which was directly contrary to the rulings of the Cabinet, that is, that way back on 17th March, 1970, the Cabinet gave instructions for the repeal of certain provisions in the Bill of 1964, provisions which had been brought in here by us. I confess at this juncture that those privileges which were intended to embrace matters relating to hearings of Committees and to regularise the procedure of the House in Committee of one kind or another, to give them power to subpoena, duces tecum ad testificandum. This was the main purpose of the Bill in 1964, and inserted in it was the conferring of certain privileges from arrest on your way to the House for civil debt and also from actions for defamation of character which in my opinion were ill-conceived, and you know I have always said that we brought nothing into this world and it is for certain that we take nothing out. For the newspapers or any other member of this House to suggest that we are taking away privileges which they enjoyed from time immemorial is a downright lie. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of the Lord. " These privileges were inadvertently conferred here in 1964.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, what is before this House? Are we dealing with the Privileges and Immunities Bill or with a Resolution brought in here by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown? The Prime Minister is completely irrelevant.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is for me to decide. Mr. CRAIG We are asking you to rule then, Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is this Resolution before the House, and the hon. member is replying to some allegation which was made that another matter was introduced in this House because of this Resolution. That is my understanding.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I just want to say this,

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

On a point of order, I draw to Your Honour's attention that the proposed Bill is retroactive, and anything said in here before 7th July comes under the Privileges Act. I ask Your Honour to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Anyhow, I am afraid that that ruling may be considered at some future date, but the time for Private Members' Business has expired.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Hon. G. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 10 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT) ACT, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 10 is the next Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and is the second reading of a Bill to provide for the implementation of certain of the provisions of the Agreement between the Caribbean Development Bank and the Government of Barbados relating to the Headquarters of the Bank,

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the House will be aware that an Agreement entered into between the Government of Barbados and the Caribbean Development Bank was tabled in this House some months ago shortly after the final decision was made in Nassau in the Bahamas - I think on 30th or 31st January - to locate the Headquarters of the Caribbean Development Bank in Barbados. It was, as far as I am concerned, a foregone conclusion, but at the same time other people did not think so and it would not have been right for us to have filed the Agreement, or laid it on the Table of the House until the final decision was made. I should like to say that there appeared to have been at least three or four final decisions in the matter, but we can now consider that since the President has been appointed and has taken up office, and many of the senior officers of the Bank have also been appointed and are occupying a floor in the Treasury Building, the final decision taken in January, 1970, in Nassau in the Bahamas is indeed the final decision, and so at this stage it is necessary for us to clarify the position of the Caribbean Development Bank vis-a-vis the Statute Law of Barbados.

The purpose of the Bill we now have before us is to regularise the position in order that the Headquarters Agreement may have full effect. Apart from the first two Clauses - and there are only five other Clauses - Clause 3 deals with the financial provisions for giving effect to the Agreement in that all sums of money required to be paid by the Government of Barbados in respect of the Agreement will be a charge on the assets and revenues of this country and shall be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. In Clause 4 the Bank according to the Headquarters Agreement has power and authority to make regulations for the full and independent exercise of its functions here in Barbados and Clause 4 also gives these Regulations, which may be made from time to time by the Bank for these purposes, the full force of law in Barbados.

Clause 5, Mr. Speaker, exempts the Bank from the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1952. This is absolutely necessary because in some other Caribbean territories we have had difficulties with quasi - international institutions or quasi - or full regional institutions, so that the Bank may adequately discharge its functions in view of the fact that the countries outside the region are contributing substantial amounts of money, and we ourselves are contributing a share capital of \$50 million within the Caribbean, and it is essential that the Bank should not be fettered in its discretion to employ such staff as the Bank deems fit in order to carry out these functions in accordance with the terms of the Charter.

Clause 6, Mr. Speaker, makes provision that the Regulations made by the Bank should be published in the Official Gazette of Barbados, and Clause 7 merely makes it an offence to contravene any of the Regulations so gazetted. The fine there is a maximum of \$250 or a term of imprisonment not exceeding three months, which is normal in offences of this nature.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. 4.35 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for this Bill illustrates the inability of the Executive to incur obligations which could have the force of law in this country without coming back to Parliament, and it is interesting to see that the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs has brought this Bill, because it illustrates to the public that any such nonsensical statements that have been made in the past which emanated from the other side to the effect that the executive power in foreign relations is vested - exclusively in the Government without reference to the Legislature is mere theory, but with no practical application without its implementation by the domestic Parliament.

There are a few questions that one would immediately ask in relation to this matter; the first is that we are here permitting a quasi-international organisation, which this Bank is described as by the Prime Minister, by delegated legislation to have power to make laws which will be of full legal force and effect in Barbados. I would like to know whether this is part and parcel of a general agreement reached with all of the territories in which the Bank will be operating, and for whose benefit the Bank was formed. For instance, I would like to know whether in Trinidad & Tobago, Jamaica and the Associated States the Regulations made will have the same force and effect in their territories.

The second point is that a certain amount of diplomatic immunity has been granted to the Bank as a result of the arrangement, and I would hope that provisions have been made whereby in the event of our citizens and members of the Bank who enjoy this immunity having any claims upon them, machinery is established similar to the machinery which is established in relation to Embassies and High Commissions in Barbados for the settlement of claims.

Thirdly, the necessity to grant tax exemption to the officers of this quasi-international organisation

illustrates quite clearly what a difficult position the Caribbean is in by virtue of the fact that, had this been a genuine Federal institution the staff, members of the Federal Service would have to have paid income tax to the Federal Government. This is a very interesting development, because it means that like people in the Diplomatic Service, a whole category of people who are providing an inter-Caribbean service will now be in a special category responsible to the taxation laws of no one. I warn the other side that, just as you have had to concede it to the Development Bank, it is not going to take five years before the staff of the University is going to demand reciprocal treatment upon the basis that they are providing a similar service for the Inter-Caribbean area; mark my words. It is not going to take five years for other inter-Caribbean institutions; so at the Heads of Government conference you had better get around the table and decide once and for all what special machinery you are going to devise to deal with this privileged position into which you are forced, because of the lack of a central political body in the Caribbean area, or because of the lack of an alternative body similar to the East Africa Community. This is a very important point; this Caribbean Development Bank illustrates a difficulty, and you have other inter-Caribbean institutions which will be established by way of a Treaty arrangement too, and they are going to ask for exactly the same perquisites and privileges.

I would like to know also whether in Guyana where the Caribbean Secretariat is set up, similar privileges are granted to the Caribbean Secretariat and the members of staff there. These are important points, because I cannot see how you can single out one for special treatment and have other similar institutions which are subject to different treatment. This is a very important point, and the full implications of this method of setting up inter-Caribbean institutions must be realised by all. We realise on this side that the level of privileges and perquisites that you would have to give to people working in such an institution would be greater than you would get at your domestic level, but this is all part and parcel of the price you will have to pay, and I know that the Minister of Finance recognises that there is one certain way of committing political suicide for his Government. Do not mind what the ex Minister of Housing, the roll-over Minister, has done; the big question that is before the minds of every Barbadian is the burdensome system of income tax which every one has to bear today, so that a full explanation of all the provisions relating to the taxation, the exemption from taxation, whether similar inter-Caribbean institutions have enjoyed it or do enjoy it, in the territories where such institutions operate would be at this stage very politic.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Before I reply to the points about the Agreement and the Bank raised by the hon. member for Christ Church, I should like to clarify one point. He spoke about the burdensome income tax with which this country is faced; I have been Minister of Finance for five years and progressively I have eased the burden. No new income tax has been imposed on anybody in Barbados,

Mr. St. JOHN:

If the Prime Minister would give way, I know the Prime Minister has eased it, but inflation has tripled the burden.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The income tax law, as I know it, has been relaxed considerably, both as to the quantum that is paid and the incidence of the taxation. There are more people paying taxes in Barbados because three times as many people are working for the kind of money whereby to pay taxation. If you call that inflation, go ahead and call that inflation; but we are collecting more taxes because there is more money in circulation. When there was \$26 million Government revenue in 1960-61, there is \$83 million today; so the money has to be coming from somewhere because it is being operated in the community by the economy of the country, and a lot of people who did not pay anything at all and evaded tax now find themselves paying tax because they have money. People are eating Rice Crispies today that did not eat Torpedoes when I was going to school, including myself; there was a time when we could buy a whole barrel of what they used to call broken biscuits for \$1.50 and you cannot even get a package of sweet Marie biscuits now for \$1.50.

I want to make it clear on the record that I have not put on any additional tax on anybody in this country. I have relieved them of a lot of tax as far as we can go to meet our services; so when you get up and talk about the burden of taxation just because a few middle class wives said they wanted to pay separate income tax from their husbands - but they should know that there is a very easy way to go about it; get separated from their husbands and let the husbands pay them an allowance through the Court and then they pay separate income tax. 4.45 p.m.

I should like to deal with the Bill. I heard this expression about the burden of taxation. I have been trying to ease the burden on: the backs of everybody ever since; but it will be done when we can do it, and not before. I will never go in for cheap politics with the finances of this country and say that I am going to give everybody a dispensation from income tax and then find that we have no money to pay the Civil Servants or to run the Hospital. That is nonsense.

I would like to point out that these strictures (Asides Not strictures, observations.) Not strictures, observations. They are on our side, I would like to point out that this is part of the Agreement that wherever the Headquarters was located the people should not be subject to taxation, and it is nothing that we have concocted in the Ministry of Finance with the President of the Bank. This is something that we have negotiated for two years.

We are not the first original Development Bank. There is the African Development Bank; there is the Asian Development Bank; there is the World Bank and there is the Inter-American Development Bank. All these international banks, wherever their country of temporary residence maybe, have similar types of Agreements, and therefore if you are going to recruit staff for the Development Bank of the nature

and quality of the staff which they recruit for these international Banks, we have to fall in line with the concessions, dispensations and privileges which are conferred on the officers and personnel working for these institutions. We have to do this if we are to attract persons of similar calibre. These are the simple facts of life.

None of us who has to pay what the hon. member refers to as burdensome personal taxation in this country can view with equanimity and resignation people junior to ourselves and, maybe, less qualified than ourselves working for \$40,000 a year and not paying any taxes on it at all. Perhaps I should say \$20,000 because most of the people junior are in that bracket.

As a matter of fact, Sir, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago at a lunch meeting we had - I always think that lunch is not a good place to transact business - but at the lunch meeting we had on the day after Guyana Republic Day he strongly protested not only over the fact that the salaries were tax free, but at the actual level of the salaries because he said that all the Central Banks in the region would find themselves deprived of staff because of the escalation of salaries which they had fixed for themselves.

Dr. Williams, as you would say, with his mouth wide open did not conceal that he was very perturbed about it. We pointed out to him that although we were as much concerned as he was, there was nothing we could do about it. This is the price we have to pay for these institutions. We have the Bank in Barbados now. Although to the general public it appeared that the whole matter was a foregone conclusion, we had to do a lot of in-fighun to keep the Bank here in Barbados. (Asides. -I thought you said that you did not lobby.) That is for public consumption. That is what I said, not what I did. When the interests of Barbados are at stake, I do not get up and make statements and advertise what I am doing. I told them one thing to throw them off the scent and did the other thing to make sure that we had the Bank here. What is wrong with that? You should fight for your country.

What I say is that people did not realise that Jamaica was so keen to get the Headquarters of the Bank because the Bank does increase the level of deposits in the country, not merely the salaries which are paid to the officers of the Bank, but the total deposits in the country must rise from the presence of the Bank because the money that is paid into the Bank is not being drawn out as fast as it is paid in. That is the first thing.

Another thing, Sir, is a certain amount of prestige. I do not go much for prestige, but there is a considerable psychological advantage to the Government of this country to have an institution like that located here. If you aggregate the total amount of personal taxation that may have inured to the

Consolidated Fund of this Island if the personnel of the Bank actually paid tax to the Government of Barbados it does not really mean a lot of money when compared with the inestimable benefits which are conferred by the presence of the Bank.

Let me put it another way. If the Bank were located in Jamaica, they would not be paying taxation in Jamaica nor in Barbados and by the Bank being here we are not deprived of any money which we would have got in other circumstances. All that has happened is that some additional money that we might have got in other circumstances if the Bank did not have this dispensation given to it, we are not getting.

Let me come a little closer home. Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited taken over from the old Panama Telegraph Company was in Barbados from about 1890. They have set up an all-time record. I pointed this out in the House before. Cable and Wireless, or, as it was, the Panama Telegraph Company and their successors enjoyed the longest pioneer period in the history of mankind, and if I knew what went on in outer space, I would say in the history of the Universe or the Solar system because according to that Act that I repealed just two years ago Cable and Wireless paid no form of taxation whatsoever. The Manager, his wife and children, his ox and his ass, his man servant and maid servant and all his strangers within his gates paid no form of taxation whatever. The result was that Cable and Wireless for over 60 years enjoyed a period of tax freedom to the extent that not even to the local Government of Christ Church or St. Michael did they pay bicycle licence, motor car licence, property tax, trade tax; personal income tax or whatever form of tax or surtax or whatever kind of tax you could think of. I would just like to paraphrase what the Leader of the House said on a previous occasion criticising a statement made by some members of the Opposition. They said they wanted St. John for Prime Minister, and he said that what they wanted was not St. John but Syntax. I do not think that Cable and Wireless was even liable for syntax because they used the King's English.

This particular enactment gave them every kind of dispensation and this was in the Statute Law of Barbados. I think it was in my Budget speech 5 years ago that I said that they would have to start paying some kind of taxation, and I think that the amount that I am collecting now from Cable and Wireless is a minimum of \$100,000. 4.55 p.m.

Now it is going to go up because the tax base is being broadened in a way in which we will come to the House and explain a little later when they build their new premises. It is not that we are losing something; we are not getting something that we could have got if we got the Bank to agree to come here and not give them these concessions. That is the highest we can say. As far as the Secretariat of the Caribbean Free Trade Association in Georgetown is concerned, they do not pay any tax to the Government of Guyana. As far as the United Nations personnel are concerned, they do not pay any tax to the Government of the United States, but the United Nations Organisation itself imposes a staff levy

on its employees which is not as onerous as the tax which they would pay either in their own foundries or the tax which they would pay the federally and state-wise on the Continental mass. That is the position. The closest thing to a rational body that we have is the Caribbean Secretariat, and they do not pay any income tax. The Government of " Barbados is, moreover, under an obligation to provide suitable premises for the Bank. I do not have any estimate of what the final resting place of the Bank will be in Barbados, but the Bank is temporarily occupying a floor of the Treasury Building free of rent, and that is also part of the Headquarters Agreement.

The lion, member also asked some question about whether these Regulations which the Bank is making or has authority to make -aider this Act will apply. I would expect a question like that to come, maybe, from the hon. junior member for St. James or the hon. junior member for Bridgetown because he is still inexperienced at the Bar. For the hon.

member to ask whether a law in Barbados will imposible fine or imprisonment on somebody in St.

Lucia or St. Vincent is really inept, coming from somebody like him.

Mr. St. JOHN:

On a point of explanation, I never asked that. I never suggested that a law in Barbados could impose a fine in St. Lucia. I asked whether the Regulations parsed by the Bank would be applicable as the domestic law in all the other territories; in other words, whether they had passed a similar Act in the Legislature, (Asides.) It is not that I have now understood; I always understood. You have now understood what I meant and that is "he difference. This has arisen because the Prime Minister would not lay the Agreement before us in full.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Is the hon. member suggesting that I did not bring the Agreement in here? The Agreement was laid and you are supposed to read it; I am not supposed to come and translate it for you. I am sure that the hon. member asked whether these Regulations would apply in the other Islands, and he even repeated it when he got up, but he is now saying that he asked whether they passing similar Regulations. I should like to make it clear that this is the Headquarters Agreement. There is no individual Agreement between the Bank and any other contributing or subscribing territory. All the obligations of the member Governments are set out in the Charter of the Bank, how many Governors they should have and so on, but in so far as the Agreement between an individual territory is concerned outside of the Charter of the Bank, this is the only one because this is the Headquarters Agreement of the Bank. I think the hon. member will at least be able to get that point. I do not think there is anything else that he asked.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Tell us about the implication in Guyana and their University. Do they gat that?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I answered that point already. I said that the people in the Secretariat in Guyana do not pay any tax to the Government of Guyana.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed. The Schedule was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Chairman, I beg to move thai:
this be the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Just for the information of hon. members so that they will understand the implication of this, Article XI11 Section 49 of the Schedule is very interesting, It says "Governors, other representatives of Members, and Directors shall have the right in connection with their official duties with the Bank, to

(a) Immunity from personal arrest or detention and from seizure of the; personal and official baggage;

(b) Immunity from legal process of every kind in respect of words spoken or written and - 11 acts done by them in their official capacity."

I presume that includes libel action. That seems to me to be a similar privilege that is enjoyed by certain other bodies.

The question that this be the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 5:
00 p.m.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think the House might now wish to do the Budget Bills; I move that the next Order be the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1970.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one which arises out of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals which was made on the 12th May this year. Very briefly, the purpose of the Bill is to make it possible to collect a 15% tax on management and other fees paid by resident firms to foreign parent companies or to other firms outside. This is not merely a fiscal measure; it is made in a genuine effort to discourage the splitting of income between Barbados and other countries abroad in respect of fees and services rendered in Barbados, and I propose to watch very carefully the working of this tax. If I am satisfied that it is not having the desired effect, I may have to come back to even increase the rate of tax which is payable in respect of such services. We are undergoing a rapid period of expansion in this country and there are large numbers of foreign firms - firms which are not Barbadian firms - who have parent companies in the United States, in the United Kingdom and in Canada particularly, and in respect of which quite a large volume of fees which I consider as income which should have been taxed in this country are often paid abroad. I beg to move that this Bill, which only has five short sections, be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I am very glad to see that the Prime Minister says that he is going to watch the working of this, because due to the fact that the amount of tax here is 15% as opposed to the local rate of 40%, it may encourage some to form Cayman Island companies and otherwise. I hope the Prime Minister soon comes down here with a Bill saying that Cayman Island Companies and any Trust Agreement have to be disclosed in the Registrar's Office; we do not want Royal Bank Trust or Barclays Bank 'Trust or any international Trust; we want to know who the beneficiaries are because there are large numbers of Barbadians who own property under the shelter of Cayman Island Trust Companies in which all you see on the Register is a company reregistered under section 223, shareholders, directors, this Trust Company or that Trust Company. They execute a little nominee agreement in there and they are the front men. I have to pay my tax, lots of it, Sir - and I feel badly when I see others who are carrying on activities that I know should attract tax but who get away because of the fact that they can use the aeroplane and run up to the Cayman Islands, and because of the fact that some Trust Companies' sense of ethics is so low that they will allow themselves, for a 2 1/2% fee, to indulge in every kind of operation. They are lucky that this Government is in power because, when this one gets into power, holding of land by any Trust Company at all can take place. 5.15 p.m.

The Prime Minister can tell them that he passed a law just as he has told these people that he was forced by the Opposition to do this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I would like to assure the hon. member that the Minister of Home Affairs is looking at the whole question of ownership and Trust Companies and everything like that. I do not have to go and apologise either to him or anybody for the implementation of proposals to bring more revenue to this country. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about.

I have said that the Attorney General and the Minister of Home Affairs have been constituted a joint committee to look at this whole question of foreign ownership of subsidiary companies and so on. We will bring our proposals to the House. We will not jump up and shout these things and scare people until we are ready to implement them. The Hon. Mr. Edward Seaga, the Minister of Finance in Jamaica, imposed the property transfer tax. He said that he was imposing it in January last year. I have collected over a million and a quarter dollars and he has not collected 25 because he spoke too quickly. He was not ready to act when he spoke.

When I introduced my taxation I was ready to act next morning. So the hon. member can be assured that when I bring in my legislation it will be implemented from 4 o'clock or 4.30 on the day that I bring it in. If the hon. member would like to give any evidence to the Minister of Home Affairs or the Attorney General which will assist them in any way, we will be glad for his assistance.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that,

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that the next Order of the Day be the second reading of a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

RUM DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The instant Order of the Day is the second reading of a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906, and it stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill also arises out of my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. It is a very short Bill. It merely increases the licence fee payable from \$100 to \$200 and repeals the Rum Duty (Amendment) Act, 1968. This Act comes into effect from the 13th May, 1970, the day after the Budgetary Proposals were made.

I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time. Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in committee,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

**A BILL TO AMEND PART IV A OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC ACT,
1937**

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next Order be a Bill to amend Part IV A of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The instant Order of the Day is a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, and it stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, although it does not appear to be so, this Bill is based on a Budgetary Proposal as well. The remarkable thing about this Bill is that no money is mentioned in it. That is because in Clause 2, subsection 1 Section 43 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 was amended to provide for the payment in respect of the documents mentioned in paragraph (a) of subsection (1) and in respect of such other matters for the purposes of this Part, of such fees as the Minister considers appropriate having regard to any services performed in pursuance of the Order. 5.25 p.m.

Now, the particular section that we are referring to gives the Commissioner of Police power to issue licences on the production of driving licences of certain countries or to issue a certificate or to grant permission to drive for a limited period in Barbados. We could do this in two ways since the fee is the same for visitors as will be charged for residents; we could give a driving licence to every visitor, but we do not normally intend to give them a licence to drive about for the whole period of a year in Barbados. We only give them that permission to drive on the production of satisfactory proof that they are holders

of a valid subsisting licence in an approved country, and we give them permission to drive for the period of their stay in Barbados or for three months, whichever is less. So although the fee that will be payable is \$5.00, it does not entitle the visitor to a Barbados Driving Licence, and that is why we have had to bring in this amendment which has also arisen out of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, and in that Statement which I made on 12th May, Your Honour will remember that I said that the revenue which was anticipated from this source when the money is collected from visitors, who do not pay anything now, is in the region of \$50,000 per annum.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952, be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day is the second reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952, and it stands in the name of the Rt. Hon and Learned Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, immigration into Barbados is regulated at the moment by a Bill of model colonial legislation as sent down here and enacted in the various territories of the Caribbean, and enacted in Barbados in 1952. The right to grant work permits or to withhold permission to reside and work is vested in the Chief Immigration Officer which is under the control of the Minister of Home Affairs by virtue of the provision which says that the Immigration Officer may allow a person to enter the Island on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit. This is a very vague and general section of the Act, and we feel that it is much too wide. We think that the Act should be a little more specific, and furthermore we propose to levy a fee for the application for a work permit. I think that fee is \$10.00 and this is being dealt with in section 3 of the Act. So the Act really is to regularise something which is being done in a general section now which is ample authority, but is not specific enough, and also to give authority for the levying of fees on the filing of an application for permission to reside or to reside and work or both.

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, for some time I believe the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has been drawing to the attention of the House the existing Immigration Act and the manner in which the Minister of Home Affairs through the Chief Immigration Officer has been exercising powers in relation to work permits

and matters of that kind, and expressed the view that the Act needed amending to make it more specific. I see that, now that Government has decided to amend that Act, they have decided to empower the Ministry to make certain regulations dealing with this matter.

Now there are certain aspects of this matter on which I would like to hear members of the House express their views, particularly in relation to what I regard as the most flagrant form of discrimination against women that could be conceivable. On many occasions I have found that a Barbadian woman who marries someone other than a Barbadian finds herself in a very discriminatory position vis-a-vis her counterpart, a Barbadian man, because his wife is automatically allowed to come in; but her husband has to walk to the door of the Ministry of Home Affairs and beg for a work permit.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I should like to correct the hon. member. Application is made in writing on a prescribed form called an Immigration Report by anyone wishing a permit to reside and work. No one has to come up to the Ministry of Home Affairs. They only come up to the Ministry of Home Affairs when they have been turned down and they are trying to importune the Permanent Secretary, the Assistant Secretary or the Minister himself, if they will allow themselves to be seen; but no one wishing to get permission to reside and work in Barbados has to do any more than fill out a form and file it at the Central Police Station. If they elect to go up interfering with the work of the Ministry of Home Affairs, that is a matter for them. We do not like to see people up there saying they want to see the Minister or the Permanent Secretary, because there is a form. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I always like to give way to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister knows as a fact that work permits are dealt with in nine cases out of ten at the Ministry of Home Affairs in Bay Street. I am not accusing anybody of anything; the Prime Minister seems to know something that we do not know over here. I am dealing with a case where I feel that Barbadian girls who go abroad.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The point that I took was that the member has said that they had to go to the Ministry of Home Affairs if they wanted to get permission. I want to make it clear because this is bad information. We do not like to see anybody up there, whether it is K. R. Hunte or somebody for a work permit, but we have to deal with the public and we just cannot slam the door in their faces. We try to filter them through the lower ranks and eschelons of the Civil Service, but their proper place is at the Police Station and not at the Ministry of Home Affairs. They do not have to go up there. I wish that Businessmen and other people would stay away from Government Headquarters in Bay Street.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I would like to ask the Prime Minister what about the East Indians with money.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That cannot arise; the hon. senior member for Christ Church is addressing the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I do not know what has happened, but the point I was dealing with is the position of a Barbadian woman who marries someone abroad. I say it is discrimination that her husband has to go to the Immigration Department at all; that is the whole point. Just as a wife of a Barbadian man can come in here and live, why can the husband of a Barbadian woman not come in here and live too? The basic point is that very often it is the husbands of people who are coming back home to contribute the skill which they have learnt abroad - in teaching, in nursing and in other fields. I say it is discrimination and I would like to hear members express their views on it because I feel that in the Regulations a permit should be given automatically to them on certain conditions and they should not have to go and apply at all.

The way to prevent people from going up to Headquarters is to have a system of Regulations where it is set out clearly, as it is set out in the United States of America, in Canada and in other places, where the category of people whom you are going to allow in is well known and well-defined, where you have a hierarchy established in the Regulations. You put in the application there; after he gives his decision, you have a Board to review, and the final appeal is to the Minister. When you have those Regulations, they cannot go up to Headquarters; but they go up there now because the feeling is that if you go up there you can get better treatment than you get down there. The Prime Minister knows this, too; that the feeling in Barbados in relation to work permits is that if you go up to Bay Street - I am not saying how you must go up there; I know you cannot go up there in shirt and pants and empty hands. I believe you would have at least to carry your books to argue your case, and it is better still if you go up there with somebody - a specialist in immigration law. There are a few specialists in immigration law. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I remind hon. members not addressing the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN:

I am not calling any names because as a lawyer - there is no doubt about it - we perform good service to our clients, and sometimes when a case comes to us we have to bow to the superior ability, superior experience and the superior contact of others; so your best service is to tell your client to see those particular lawyers. The position is that it is clear that we want to see this thing administered on a basis of some degree of rationality; but I really feel -and I believe that all hon. members in this House would feel the same way - that you cannot have Barbadian girls discriminated against in this way. It is really a bad thing, because some of them have to come back home. The position is that some girls go abroad and they marry and they intend to live with their husbands; but for some reason, as they grow older the climate does not agree with them and they have to come back home. Of course, the Prime Minister will say that all they have to do is to get divorced from their husbands before they come back; but I do not believe in the breaking up of homes in this way. I believe that if you are a citizen you have a claim here; and if your husband comes here, so long as he behaves himself, does not commit any criminal offence, so long as he is not a charge on the Treasury, he should have a right to live here in Barbados, and I hope that it will be the unanimous decision of this House that all members on both sides feel that this discrimination should stop.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I have come up against this discrimination on several occasions. As it stands now, a Barbadian man who marries a foreign woman is entitled to bring his wife in, but a Barbadian woman - and they are several Barbadian women abroad who are married, even in Jamaica, to foreigners - who has a foreign husband is not allowed to bring him in. In my opinion, the suggestion made by the hon. member for Christ Church that Regulations should be made setting out the category of persons who would be permitted in, like Canada and the United States, is absolutely correct, and to avoid all the rumours we hear, this should be straightened out. A person came to me saying that he was charged \$5,000 - and I will say this. The Minister's hands were perfectly clean as far as this matter was concerned, but another person charged him \$5,000 to guarantee him to get a work permit. I have said that the Minister's hands were perfectly clean; so there is no need for the Prime Minister to get up. 5. 45 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not concerned about a Minister. I am concerned with anybody connected with the Government, whether a Minister or Civil Servant. If the hon. member has that information, I would be glad if he would give it to the Commissioner of Police or the Director of Public Prosecutions. I would be very indebted to the hon. member. I do not like allegations like that being laid unless they can be substantiated. Hearsay is not enough to indict a Civil Servant or anyone else.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Did I indict any Civil Servant? I said that someone came to me at my home and said they were charged \$5,000. Did I indict a Civil Servant? Oh, legal advice, that is the correct terminology. I thank you for putting it in my mouth. Is that parliamentary, Sir?

He said he was charged \$5,000. The lady was married to a Barbadian Jew, and the person the lady was working with said she could only help with \$1,000. When I speak I speak ex cathedra. I am not going to

condemn anybody in this matter. The person was not a Civil Servant, either. I told the person that the Minister's hands were clean of this. I told them that the Minister did not know anything about this and not to do it.

It is all rank dishonesty, and I would suggest to be Prime Minister that when the Regulations are made, do what the hon. member for Christ Church suggested. It would solve things better. You should not have people going around and saying that "Mr. So-and-So charged me this money", that "if I can pay him something, he has an entree to the Minister" etc. You get all this going around.

There are Barbadian women, nurses in America, married to professional men who, I know, would want to come here and practise and they are prohibited right now because they do not want to pay up. This is an absolute fact; but if you would make Regulations, as the member for Christ Church has said, this would solve the entire matter. There would not be these rumours going around about people being charged this kind of money.

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

From the Order Paper when it was sent to me, I did not think that there was enough to keep the attention of the House for a great deal of time. I was a little surprised when the hon. senior member for Christ Church, on my attending late in the House handed me a copy of this measure and said that this was proposed to be done, I gather in all of its stages, today.

I am not one of those lawyers who find favour with intending immigrants. As far as I know, the highest fee I have ever drawn was \$30, and that was for a great deal of work. This happened to be a Barbadian woman on whose behalf I had to make representations for her over a period of four or five weeks; but eventually my friend, the senior member for Christ Church, during my absence from the

Island was able to finalise the arrangements after a lot of what I think is silly twaddle.

Although I have not done that kind of work, I have done a careful study of the Immigration Act and have made a careful study of the officials appointed to administer the Immigration Act. I do not believe, and it has never been alleged to me in such a form in which I could believe it that either the Minister or a Civil Servant - except in one isolated instance which I reported to the Director of Public Prosecutions that anyone has ever done anything corruptly or dishonestly under the Act. I do not accuse them of anything like that.

I accuse lawyers who make poor members of the Indian Community and the Pakistani Community here believe that they have influence with Ministers and influence at Court and charge \$2,500 for making out an Immigration Form. In my view, the Bar Council should deal with them, from whatever Party they are. When I hear lawyers say they want us to get in power so that they can get money from the Indians too, as far as I am concerned if I ever know anything like that, and we happen to be in power, I would hope that the Bar Council would deal with them.

As far as I know, the senior member for the City was not referring to a Civil Servant or a Minister when he talked about the \$5,000, but to a lawyer who is not a member of this particular Parliament. I think that it is as dishonest, as unethical, to do that because they are holding themselves out as able to procure an advantage unknown to the law by legal means. I think that it is as unethical to do that as any of the practices set out in the little Red Book that you are given when you are called to the Bar. The Prime Minister well knows who some of them are.

When the Regulations come to be drawn, I very much hope that the Prime Minister will see to it that there is included in them what appears on certain United States Immigration Forms, that if a lawyer helps you make it out, his name has to be entered on the form at the bottom, because that at least will give those who investigate in the future some assistance in knowing exactly where their investigations should be directed.

I want to talk about the Act, and I am going to say, Sir, that although it is perfectly true, as the senior member for Christ Church has said, that I can regard these amendments as being the result of things that I have said in this House and to Police Officers and to Permanent Secretaries, the amendments are not satisfactory.

Now, Sir, I am accusing a lot of these officials. I do not know anything about the Minister's administration. I just know that he is guilty of silliness sometimes in his administration of Immigration Act; but I cannot say any more than that.

I can give you an example. I was once negotiating for someone from abroad who was a school teacher here. In other words, he was in the service of the Crown. He was not working in one of the Secondary Schools, but was a school teacher in a Primary School as a servant of the Crown. He was therefore under Section 5(c) of the Act and was entitled to reside here without let or hindrance. He is not a prohibited immigrant, and under Section 11 of the Act he was entitled to apply to the Chief Immigration Officer for a certificate that he was not a prohibited immigrant. Unless the Cabinet has made a ruling under Section 6 of the Act barring him from the Island, he would be free henceforth from restrictions.

Sir, you can imagine how I felt when, on pointing this out to the Permanent Secretary, he said that he was not aware of the provisions of Section 5(c) or Section 11, and he is the Permanent Secretary responsible for doing that work. The Police were a little better. The Chief Superintendent who was in charge of Immigration a number of years before remembered this being issued. I think he told me that it was issued for a Colonial Secretary. Those were the old Colonial days. The Commissioner of Police was very familiar with it himself. It was then that I said to myself that the old Immigration hands know something about this Act - the people who dealt with it a long time ago - but the people who administer it now know very little about it, as evidenced by these amendments because there has never been any Section 12 which is sought to be amended.

I am addressing my remarks principally to the Prime Minister because I think that he is the only person on the Government side capable of appreciating some of the niceties of this Act. The Bill seeks to amend Section 12, but there is nothing in the Immigration Act which tells you about a residence permit or a work permit. 5.55 p.m.

Another point that I made to the Permanent Secretary that went right up and down through everybody concerned with the Immigration Department is that the stamp in use at Seawell Airport allowing people to enter for purposes of employment means that they can enter and work at anything they like. The Prime Minister is shaking his head; he is wrong, and his own Department recognises he is wrong by changing the stamp. I always advise people never to contradict from ignorance.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member would give way, I am just pointing out that no one at Seawell International Airport is authorised to give anybody permission to enter this country to work unless he bears a letter

from the Chief Immigration Officer or the Ministry of Home Affairs, which he may acquire in advance of actually landing in this country; but no Immigration Officer has an authority to issue work permits at Seawell or to stamp anybody's passport or any bit of paper or any document that he is admitted here for employment purposes unless that person bears the necessary authorisation.

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

The point is well taken and, to my knowledge, totally accurate. When I say 'totally accurate', I am not trying to be patronizing. The point is well taken and I appreciate it has been made. In fact, on this particular occasion I should correct myself because the Police Inspector who placed the stamp in a particular passport that I am thinking of in connection with the general statement I am making had by then moved from Seawell to Bridgetown. Anyhow, the stamp is placed in Bridgetown. It used to say that you are admitted to Barbados for purposes of employment. You then used to get a letter, usually signed by a clerk in the Ministry of Home Affairs - who is not an Immigration Officer and therefore has no power under the Act to say you are permitted to work at such-and-such a place. But the point is this once the Immigration Officer has allowed you to enter Barbados for the purpose of employment and it is unqualified - or it was then unqualified - you could work anywhere, and a whole apparatus has been built up in Bay Street of sending out letters from clerks saying that if you wish to change your job you have to apply. The whole apparatus is nonsense, and the only sanction by which it could be enforced was the sanction of revoking the permits altogether, which is a very arbitrary act and one that is still subject to question in the Courts. Anyhow, Sir, as a result of a particular case in which both the hon. senior member for Christ Church and I were interested, that was changed and I believe they now use a different stamp after I had pointed out to them that they were writing letters to a particular immigrant asking him why he had changed his job. As I had said that - he was legally entitled to change his job, the Permanent Secretary rang me one day and said he agreed with me; the Crown Law Officers had said he was legally entitled to change his job; so he was going to revoke his permission to be in Barbados at all, and they took back the man's passport; so he had to get a new passport from his Embassy here. Eventually the Minister insisted that he had to go to Montserrat and make a fresh application from there - as silly a piece of behaviour as you could ever want - and all along he was married to a Barbadian girl. These are the depths of silliness to which the Department can descend.

Now we deal with ignorance. The Prime Minister has shown by his intervention that he perhaps really does, as I suggested, know a lot more about this Act than anybody on that side. Section 12 which we are seeking to amend is the least among the apostles of the permissive sections in this Act. Section 12 distinctly says that without deciding whether or not an immigrant is a prohibited immigrant, an Immigration Officer may, at the request of the immigrant grant him a permit, and permits are only granted for six months. The true section under which - and I really would ask the Prime Minister to check the Act and see if he agrees with me - power is given for long-term residence permission is Section 17, and not Clause 12 at all, and there must be a mistake in omitting Section 17 from Section 3 of the Act now being considered. Before I read out Section 17, I am just going to say that I was astonished when an experienced Police Superintendent who had been on an immigration course told me that he does not know anything about Section 17, and that all his permits are issued under Section 12. If they are issued under Section 12, he is wrong because Section 12 is the Section that deals with the

situation before you decide whether a man is entitled as of right to be in Barbados or not. A man may have a stamp in his passport under Section 12, but he may have a right to be in Barbados whether or not his passport is stamped.

Section 17 reads as follows: -

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor or an Immigration Officer may grant a permit, subject to such conditions as may be deemed expedient, to prohibited immigrant to enter and remain in the Island."

That is the Section which you should be amending and not Section 12 at all. I am going to send the 1952 Laws of Barbados over to the Prime Minister, and I am sure that if the Prime Minister reads that, he will realise that a ghastly and terrible error has been made in this amending Act when the permissive section is Section 17, and the Act does not bear upon Section 17 at all. What is needed is a course to teach the Police and the Permanent Secretary so that they can advise the Minister properly on the terms of the Immigration Act. If the Prime Minister has glanced at it, I would be glad if he would perhaps give us his comments, but we must surely go to Select Committee on this Bill - I am sorry to say, it - before you have to amend the Bill over again. If the Prime Minister looks at Section 17, it is obvious that the permission for long-term residence of more than three years can only be granted under Section 17. There is not another section in the Act. Section 18 is mentioned, and yet Section 18 is a section qualifying and referring to Section 17 though not in terms. It is a section subsidiary to Section 17. Section 14 is mentioned in this Act. They do not have the importance of Section 17 and I would not fulminate so much about it if I did not know of the ignorance that prevails in the Departments. I have suggested to a policeman - I must say, not to the Permanent Secretary or to Major Headley - that any stamp should bear upon its face the section of the Act under which it is issued, because it would be a source of fruitful confusion in the Courts when these cases come up, and it should not be doubted that these cases do come into Court. I believe they never get reported to the Minister of Home Affairs. They do get reported to the Court in these circumstances: somebody is charged with a crime and he is not a native of Barbados, and the Police tack on to it an application for deportation or a Deportation Order, and Deportation Orders are quite often fought successfully on technical legal grounds because the Police are not operating within a sufficiently precise framework of statute to enable them to tie up every loophole that appears before the Magistrate. I would repeat that Section 12 is only a temporary section. What is the point of amending Section 12 alone to talk about a residence for a period of more than six months? Are you going to say that without deciding whether a man is a prohibited immigrant, you are going to allow him to reside here permanently or for a year? You must amend Section 17. In fact it might be argued that you do not have to amend Section 12 at all, that you merely need to amend Section 17.

The Act, I really and seriously and deeply suggest, is misconceived. If it is going to relate back to 13th

May - and I really would like to know why it is to be retroactive to such a remarkable date let the Government have a little time in which the Permanent Secretary, a draftsman, the Minister and interested parties of this House and perhaps Senator Phillips could be invite⁴ to attend - he might learn some immigration law - and let us have a session when we will go over the Act section by section. I am glad to hear the Prime Minister echoing the words that I have spoken more than once in here that Colonial Office' draft legislation used to come out to these Colonies. It used to go from colony to colony, and the Attorney General, as he found the energy and time, would just have it passed, and nobody would understand it because no local draftsman had gone over it section by section. At least the local draftsmen here have this great virtue now. They have written out each section in their own hands, and therefore they understand it. They are not passing-things blindly into the law. At least they should understand it, as I hear an hon. member say. They are not passing things blindly be cause they come out from the Colonial Office, and I hope in the future, when hon. members on this side make reference to the Colonial Office draft legislation that has bedevilled our Statute Books and has placed unnecessary fetters on the liberties of Barbadians, that hon. members will have a little more respect for the statement because we have it now from the voice of the Prime Minister that these Acts just come out as Colonial Acts designed for Colonial days. 6.05 p.m.

I do not see anything in the amending Act that brings us more up-to-date. I believe that the real section already in effect is adequate, and the Immigration Rules are themselves what need amending -the Immigration Rules of 1955 or whenever they are I do not want to tire the House, but it seems that you have to make a point sometime sin as many different ways as when you are dealing with a jury.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

While the hon. member is looking up his point, I would just like to say that this is not an attempt to revise the immigration law which, I have already said, needs an abundant revision or that it needs repealing. I do not want to answer the other points now; I will do that when I reply. The point I would like to make about the hon. member saying that he could do it under Section 17 is that in the first place Section 12 is the correct section because we are dealing with permits to reside and we never give permits to reside and work for a longer period than three years. Section 17 is not a section which can be used, and it is not done by Civil Servants or Policemen; it is done by the Minister of Home Affairs, the Attorney General, myself and the legal draftsmen principally; we appreciate the niceties.

Section 17 deals with giving permission to a prohibited immigrant; it does not deal with ordinary, decent, law-abiding, self-respecting citizens of other countries coming into Barbados to work. Section 17 deals specifically with giving permission to a prohibited immigrant to file security under the same section, or such other terms and conditions as the Chief Immigration Officer would ordain, to temporarily reside or enter the Island; so, in my humble opinion, section 17 will not be the proper section for amendment. But the most important one I should like to illustrate is that this is really a fiscal and not a legislative amending Bill, as it were. It is very short fiscal measure because we want to have specific authority, after the expiration of the statutory period which is allowed for the temporary

collection of duties, and legislation to make sure that we have authority to collect the \$10 that people will have to file when they apply for a permit.

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

Sir, now we have come up with the definitional difficulty of what is a prohibited immigrant. The definitional difficulty has always been this; it is obvious that the original English draftsman defines the term "prohibited immigrant" in a negative way. Certain persons are ex-officio prohibited immigrants under section 4, but anybody has a right to enter Barbados. In general the immigration of all persons into Barbados is prohibited unless they have a permit. The Prime Minister is saying that, and I submit that this is because the legal officers he re years ago we re led into a confusion upon the reading of section 4 by assuming that because a list of prohibited immigrants is set out in section 4 no other immigrants can be prohibited, but with respect to their opinion that is not a fact.

I hear what the Prime Minister is saying, and I hear that he is saying that in general the Immigration Act needs revision, but I want him to look at this, and this is the next main burden of what I was going to say.

Another aspect I want him to look at is this. Permission cannot be granted for more than three years at a time for anybody to come to Barbados, but yet it is within the knowledge of all of us that people live here for very much longer. I particularly want the Prime Minister to look at the status of persons who are not Commonwealth Citizens, but who seek to reside here and do reside here. They are, in fact, in a very weak position, and I have observed, in dealing with the Police Department, that the Police often do not know how to deal with them. People live here for a great number of years; the Police do not think they have power under section 12 to allow them to stay for longer than three years; yet they have allowed them to stay here for longer. There are American citizens who have been living here for 13 years, but on what basis? They technically cannot be prohibited immigrants; but equally, unless they cannot avail themselves of the temporary provisions even though they may be domiciled in Barbados, because they are not Commonwealth citizens, these people very often come to lawyers to find out exactly what they can do. They say that every time they go out of Barbados and return, the Immigration Officers scamp in their American passports that they can stay here for three years, when they have been living here for 10, 15 or 20 years. I will suggest to the Prime Minister, that amelioration of their lot is desirable. I would suggest that, in fact, a serious look should be taken at section 2 and an examination as to whether it is still necessary to confine the advantages of domicile to parents who at the time of his birth were domiciled in the Island - whether it is necessary to confine the advantages of the subsection to Commonwealth citizens. I cannot see that Americans who live here and have lived here for many years should really be subject to legal disabilities and Commonwealth citizens are not subject. Barbadian citizens are in very little better positions in the United Kingdom than they are in the United States, and they can emigrate to the United States much more freely; why should we show greater favour to English people who live here than to Americans? There is no campaign, so far as I know, in the United States against Barbadians on the grounds of their colour; there is no member of the House of Representatives

who is heard to attack West Indians because they are black; why should we show more favour to English people who wish to reside here than to Americans? This is not merely an empty point because it causes trouble; the Immigration Officers do not know what to do, and no sensible advice can be given. Suppose Americans live here all these years; what can you tell them when the Police stamp their passports valid for 30 days. 6.15 p.m.

But we can never give them the surety of it because, no matter how domiciled they are in Barbados, they can never have the security of residence that a British subject can acquire - even the dependants - I mean the children - of Americans who live here.

I know one case of children of American nationality who qualified when they were 21. They had been in Barbados since they were 2 or 3 years old, and when they got to 21 they opted for American citizenship and got American passports and they had trouble at the Airport. They never knew any home but Barbados, but they did not want to give up American citizenship. They did not want to surrender it, and travelling with American passports they have these difficulties. That is something I would ask the Prime Minister to look at and see whether some amelioration of their positions cannot be introduced by way of even a temporary amendment before there is a major reform of the Act.

Sir, I am going to support this Bill as it stands. I could hardly do otherwise since so much rests on points that I must have made on several occasions in the House. I agree with the Prime Minister, but it does not go far enough. It is a clever point to say that 'it is a fiscal measure; so bear with it for now'. That explains the retroactivity.

I hope, Sir, that it will not be long before a comprehensive analysis of the Immigration Act which we have been promised is undertaken, and an altogether new Immigration Act is introduced to the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; As I explained, Mr. Speaker, this is a mainly fiscal measure to ensure that we do have authority to collect money for work permits. I have said several times in this House before that the present Immigration Act in Barbados is unsatisfactory. From the time that I came into office I have been exploring the possibility of having a Department of Immigration which is completely divorced from the Police Force because I think that Immigration Officers should be like Customs Officers with their own uniform and discipline and that kind of thing; but every time that I investigated it from the Establishment point of view, I found that it would be a very costly exercise as it involves training and so on.

It is true that it would release members of the Police Force for duties which are appropriate to them. I am not entirely happy that the first confrontation that you should have with Barbados is a Police uniform. I had the uneasy experience of landing in Caracas, Venezuela, and having to run the gauntlet of some trigger-happy adolescent Venezuelan soldiers with tommy guns pointed at my abdomen. They did not single me out. All the other passengers had the same experience. I can tell you that I had very uneasy moments because I did not know when one of these tommy guns would go off.

We are not quite as bad as that here. Our policemen are not armed, but I am not satisfied that the first confrontation you should have in Barbados on Barbadian soil apart from the Air Hostess who may be at the foot of the stairs, should be an array of four policemen. I think that we ought to have a Department of Immigration.

I should also like to make the point that the status of husbands who are married to women of Barbadian nationality has been set out abundantly in the Constitution of Barbados which regulates who is and who is not a citizen of Barbados. We also have a Citizenship Act. Now both of the members who have spoken on this motion should appreciate that it is a legal provision according to the law of the most civilised countries, amongst which we must for this purpose number ourselves, that a husband is responsible for his wife and not that the wife is responsible for the husband, It is the duty of the husband to find a matrimonial home for the wife, and it is not the duty of the wife to find a matrimonial home for the husband.

Now, whether we agree with this Law or not, it is the law in most countries, and therefore the concomitant of this dependency of a wife upon her husband raises points both in private international law and Domestic Law with the conflict of, laws. So you have a situation in which our legal situation which is derived from the Graeco-Roman Juridical set-up -you get this dependency of the wife upon the husbands both in private International Law and Domestic Law, and like Ruth and Naomi, it is a question of wheresoever thou goest I have to go, and wheresoever thou stayest I have to say; That is what the wife has to tell her husband. There is no correlative obligation on the part of the wife to support her husband or to provide a matrimonial home for the husband.

Now, we are confronted with this situation in Barbados of which members will be well aware. You have in this country a community of about 500 persons whose original homeland was the sub-continent of India. Some of them are Muslims and some are Hindus and they have relatives back home, most of them in Surat in Bombay and places like that.

Children are born here. According to our Constitution anyone born in Barbados, provided you are not the child of a Diplomat, is automatically a citizen of Barbados. That child grows up as a girl, goes to one of our schools and is entitled to our free secondary-education and everything that this Government has introduced, as we do not discriminate against Barbadian citizens living in Barbados when it comes to educational matters.

She becomes 14, 15 or 16 years of age, and the next thing you know is that the child wakes up some morning and they put some goat's blood on her head, tie a ribbon and put some flags outside the house and the girl hears that she is married to somebody back in India. She has never seen her husband, but according to the rites of their religion that girl is now lawfully married to somebody she has never seen. Now, he may be spending time in a penitentiary in India, for all you know; but he is legally married to her.

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

On a point of order. Surely he is not legally married to her. There is no personal law in Barbados and the Lex Loci Celebrationis governs marriages of that kind. I do not know that marriage by proxy is allowed by the law of Barbados. In the example which the Prime Minister has given, that would not be a legal husband.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Is it illegal because he is in a penitentiary or because he was married by proxy? If the hon. member would go into his Conflict of Laws a little more deeply, he will discover that we have to recognise marriages as long as the marriages are not repugnant to the Laws of this country, and the Marriage Act does not preclude the possibility of marriage by proxy. I am saying that as a point of fact; but I would not like to pontificate on a matter like this. These people are legally married as long as it is not repugnant to our Marriage Act. I enjoin the hon. member to check up on this. I say this is only a hypothetical case.

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

If it is a man, and the ceremony is in India, it is a legal matter. 6.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Let us withdraw the point that he may be in a penitentiary. We know what a penitentiary is. I am only elaborating that it does not matter who the man is. Not only do we not know him, but the wife does not even know him. Then the father-in-law who has arranged all this or the girl's father applies for permission for this husband to come here, if we carry their contention to its logical conclusion simply on

the basis that the man is married to his daughter. We have had cases in which people have applied for permission to come here to work in a business in Swan Street. He did not get permission because he is the cousin or something of a merchant in Swan Street, and we say that there are Barbadians who can do this work. The next thing we know is that they bring in a marriage certificate signed by the Mullah and say that this marriage took place last night in Kensington New Road, and when you ask where is the husband, you hear he is in Surat in the province of Bombay in India, and then they say he can enter. This is a problem you have. The Constitution says that a woman married to a Barbadian can make application to be registered as a citizen of Barbados. Citizenship confers all the rights that the Immigration Act can confer on you, but the antithesis is not the case. The Immigration Act does not confer citizenship only, but there is a provision, I think, in Section 2 of the Act which says that if you have been residing in Barbados for a period of seven years you cannot be deemed a prohibited immigrant, and therefore you have a right to remain; and if you have a right to remain, you have a right to work. We have had cases in which persons have come in on temporary permit and got extensions and extensions, and then you wake up one morning and find that they have been here for seven years.

Now the Citizenship Act says that if you have been here continuously for five years you can be registered; as a citizen of Barbados; so it is harder in some respects to come under the Immigration Act than to come under the citizenship law, because in the Immigration Act after seven years you are actually deemed to be a native of Barbados, but after five years you can become a citizen. That is why I say that the whole question of immigration wants closer examination, but not at this stage. This is a Bill to collect money, and I would like that money during the time the House will be in recess, and we can come back and look at all the conflicts of laws, the Private International Law, the constitutional implications and all these. But I want the money in the Treasury now, and that is why I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed. On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the pausing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

third time and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day. Hon. C. E.

TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO STORE PETROLEUM AT POWDER MAGAZINE, POWDER ROAD, ST. MICHAEL

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 6 is to resume debate on a Resolution to authorise the use for the storage of petroleum in the building known as the Powder Magazine situated at Powder Road, St. Michael.

When this matter was last discussed, the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister spoke, and a motion was made that further consideration be postponed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that last week I gave an undertaking to have a look more closely at the proposal to remove the Petroleum Warehouse from Princess Alice Highway to the Powder Magazine at Powder Road in the parish of St. Michael, because Section 3 of the Petroleum Act, 1882, requires that Parliament should authorise the use of any building for the storage of petroleum, and we felt we should come to Parliament and let them know what was happening. Hon. members expressed concern at the time- and so did I, for that matter - that having removed the contents of the Powder Magazine at Powder Road we should now be storing petroleum products in the same area because it is a fairly densely populated area. The reason why I have asked the House to resume consideration of this is that it is my understanding from the Leader of the House that the House will be going into recess later this week for a period of at least ten weeks while certain alterations, we piously hope, will be done to this Chamber. In the meantime the situation is rather desperate. I myself have paid a visit to the Petroleum Warehouse up to this morning, and the roof there is in a very bad state of disrepair and actual dilapidation, and I think we may have to pay out substantial damages as bailees to the property of the people who store these petroleum products. The Petroleum products which are stored, I should like to assure hon. members, are

things like methylated spirits, butane fuel and matters of that kind which are normally stored in drug stores; but when they have reserves, they are kept down there, and there is not a very large quantity. 6.35 p.m.

To be quite honest I did not see any at all down there this morning in the Petroleum Warehouse, but as a temporary measure I am inviting the House to agree to this Resolution, and my undertaking still stands that we shall investigate, by the time the House resumes, the possibility of other arrangements being made altogether where petroleum products are stored either at the Oil Refinery or somewhere like that where they have fire-fighting equipment, and not in Powder Road or anywhere in Bridge town other than a place where you already have bulk installations. This investigation is already under way as, it is for that reason only that I brought it back here today because of the urgency of the situation so that we can approve this, with an undertaking being given personally by me that we will on resumption have concrete proposals for the proper storage of petroleum products. In the meantime I have been assured that there is no danger to life or property whatsoever by the storage of these things except through malicious acts. Of course we can never account for them: but it has iron gates, and there is a Keeper there, and I think they are safer there than down on Princess Alice Highway. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this will conclude Government Business for today's sitting. I have had a word behind Your Honour's chair with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and he agrees with me that Friday afternoon at half past three might be the best time for us to come back. (Asides.) There is one Bill which we have not yet done - the second reading of a Bill to re-organise the offices of Parliament, and we have also not concluded Private Members' Business, at least the item which is still under discussion; so I am suggesting that the House leave over one bit of Government Business and the unfinished bit of Private Members' Business for us on Friday. But I also want to tell the House this, that in any case there is something else to which it will have to turn its attention.

When the Bill which provides for the reorganisation of the offices of the House is passed, the House will itself have to immediately set about appointing a Debates Committee and possibly amending the

Standing Order which now governs this, so that we have to do this before the House rises; or else, when the Bill is assented to, there will be no authority for the proposed Debates Committee to invite applications for new posts.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I remind the hon. member that there is a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee fixed for tomorrow afternoon?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I was not proposing, Mr. Speaker, that we should meet tomorrow afternoon, but the Standing Orders Committee may have their attention directed to this problem so as to be able to tell us on Friday, to put some recommendation before us, because it has to be done before we rise. I am suggesting that we come at half past three on Friday; this is the understanding which I have reached with the Leader of the Opposition. I cannot entrust the secret formula to subordinates, and therefore I have to deal with the person constitutionally competent to discuss these matters with this side of the House.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what was the object of suspending the Standing Orders today? It is very material.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

When I came into the House today, the hon. member was suggesting to come back tomorrow, and I spoke to the Leader of the House and he said it would have been better to finish off today. I suggested that if you go on to 11 o'clock tonight you could finish; can the Leader of the House deny this?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, but I have to affirm that when the Leader of the Opposition and I have reached an agreement, I cannot go behind his back to consult other people.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

There is no consulting in this; the suggestion was for us to come back some time this week. When I spoke to him he seemed rather inclined to work right through today and finish the Order Paper. I said I would speak to the Leader of the Opposition, and when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition came in I spoke to both of them and I suggested to them to suspend the Standing Orders and do it this evening. He

told you that he would go on with them tonight.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

He had now agreed to Friday. Mr. Speaker, the first words I said when I rose was that the Leader of the Opposition and I reached an agreement behind Your Honour's Chair. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY Is that a responsible statement?) I cannot say if he is responsible or not; I can only deal with him because he is the constitutional person with whom I must deal.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Why can you not finish it tonight?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If hon. members consider this, Friday is the best time to come back. We will do the Bill, we will finish the Private Members matter we are on, and we will then proceed to amend the Standing Order, if need be, on a re commendation which the Standing Orders Committee will prepare and send to us, and then we shall be able to rise. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Friday next at 3.30 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that. 6. 45 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I am not on a point of order at all, Mr. Speaker. I am addressing you right now. A motion has been made and I am addressing you on the motion. Am I entitled, Sir?

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m. o'clock on Friday of this week, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as fallows: -

AYES:

Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. HOPPIN; and Mr. SPRINGER. - (11)

NOES:

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS, Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; and Mr. HOLDER -6. 50 p.m.

On resumption

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, before we begin, I am asking leave to lay some documents and to give notice of Bills.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Airport Regulations, 1970.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay The Fourteenth Annual Report of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1969.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay The Thirteenth Annual Report of the Housing Authority for the year 1st April, 1968 to 31st March 1969.

NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Child Care Board Act, 1969 (1969-46).

Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950 (Act 1950-56).

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, copies of these Bills have been circulated. I would like to give notice of my intention to deal with them in all their stages today. They are short and are noncontroversial.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend The Child Care Board Act, 1969 (1969-46) be now read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend The Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950 (Act 1950-56) be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

As regards the questions which I promised the hon. junior member for St. Peter that he would be allowed to give notice of today due to the fact through certain matters over which he had no control they were not ready on Tuesday, the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

To what extent, if any, have reports made to the Acting Chief Technical Director (Mr. H. L. V. Griffith) and action taken thereon, served to bring an end to the misdeeds of one Leon Harris a Section Leader employed at the Asphalt Plant Workshop at Seawell Airport?

2. Is the said Leon Harris given the freedom of reporting for duty on Sundays and disappearing in less than one hour afterward and receiving a rate of pay, far in excess of a normal day's pay, for may be one hour's work?

3. At whose instigation did Jackman, a mechanic attached to the said workshop, spend five hours working on a motor vehicle X-1386 on Tuesday 14th July, 1970?

4. Did the said Leon Harris transport the driver of X-1386 from the workshop compound in a motor vehicle MC-473 leaving the said mechanic Jackman to execute repairs to car X-1386?

5. Was either Jackman or Leon Harris paid from Government funds for work done by them on 14/7/70? If not, why not?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The same hon. member's Question re Branches of the Housecraft Centre.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

1. How many rural branches of (a) the Housecraft Centre;

(b) the Evening Institute; were in operation regularly during the academic year 1969-70?

2. Where is each branch as mentioned at No.1 above is located?

3. What are the enrollment and attendance figures at each branch?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The same hon. member. His Questionnaire the standpipe at Pleasant Hall Road, St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

Would Government consider the possibility of removing the standpipe at Pleasant Hall Road, St. Peter - opposite Ebworth Plantation Gap - to a point at Benn Hill, St. Peter so as to ease the difficulties of those persons who live at Benn Hill Crest, but have to walk a long distance to this standpipe to fetch water to their homes?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The same hon. member. His query re the official List of candidates for entry to Queen's College.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

1. How many of the names appearing in the official List of candidates for entry to Queen's College at the beginning of the academic year 1970-71 are names of persons who did not (a) sit Part II or (b) secure a Pass in Part II of this year's Common Entrance Exam?

2. What are the names of those persons who did not sit the Exam at all, but are still listed for entry to the College; and what are the circumstances in each case?

3. What are the names of those persons who failed Part II but are still listed for entry to the College; and what are the circumstances in each case?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The same hon. member. His Question re Comprehensive Schools.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the appropriate Minister - 1. How many pupils attending (a) Senior Department Schools or (b) Comprehensive Schools were awarded

(1) the School-leaving Certificate referred to in Circular 71/59 at Sec. vii? or

(2) the new Barbados School-leaving Certificate, at the end of the 1969-70 School year?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The same hon. member. His Question re the number of children who will be transferred from the Primary to Secondary stage.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

1 What is the number of children who will be transferred from the Primary to the Secondary stage in education at the beginning of the academic school-year 1970-71, to: -

- (a) Senior Department or Schools;
- (b) Comprehensive Schools
- (c) Government-maintained Grammar Schools; or
- (d) Government-aided Private or Independent Schools?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that in respect of the incident which occurred in the House of Commons a few days ago I sent a cable to the Speaker, Dr. Horace King. The cable reads -

"Profoundly deplore wanton and dastardly incident in Commons on Wednesday. Barbados gratified no serious injury to personnel of Commons to whom pray convey best wishes.

The reply which has been received from Mr. Speaker Dr. Horace King was as follows: -

"My grateful thanks for your kind message of sympathy over the incident in the House last week which was much appreciated by all members. "

HORACE MAYBRAY KING 3.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I should like to say that I was very surprised to read the contents

of the message which Your Honour has now informed the House of in the local Press. I take it that this was purely a personal message sent by Your Honour, and not one coming from the House. I have no recollection of any such Resolution being moved, and at the same time I have never heard the House of Commons who were the subject of a smoke bomb attack sympathise with the members of this House for the wanton and dastardly attacks which are made against the characters of private citizens and members of the House of this Island. I just want to dissociate myself from any such telegram. If it had been a more serious matter, then I would have to consider my position.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I note the hon. member's observation.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Member's Business be now resumed for one hour and a quarter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION re JUDICIAL COMMISSION INTO ADMINISTRATION OF HOUSING
AUTHORITY

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior 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 last under discussion, the Rt. Hon. and Learned Prime Minister was addressing the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, when we had reached the end of Private Members' Business on the occasion of the last suspended sitting, I was replying to a statement made by the mover of this Resolution, who, for the record, I should like to point out is not now in his place; neither is a single member of the alleged or so-called Opposition in his place. Somewhat like the Assassins, they do their dirty work and slink away under cover of night.

This sitting was suspended to the broad light of day where the light of inspection which the mover of the Resolution was so vociferously calling for certainly could be brought to bear on the discussion which has ranged far and wide over the past four weeks in this Chamber over the alleged mismanagement and misconduct of a Statutory Board set up by Act of this Parliament some years ago to look after the needs of the underprivileged masses of this country. I would be the last person to contend that any attack on the Housing Authority is an attack on the poor of this Island; this would be nonsensical; but as the Hon. Leader of the House has done in so effective a manner, before one gets down to examining the actual words spoken during the course of the debate and the actual arguments that have been advanced, it is absolutely necessary to examine the motivation and the underlying reasons behind a Resolution like this.

The mover of the Resolution suggested, as has the misguided, misquoting, misapprehending and mismanaged local daily Press of Barbados, that the Government wanted to stifle debate in introducing a motion relating to the repeal of certain provisions in the Parliamentary Privileges Act which we as a Government brought down here and put on the Statute Book, and which we as a Government in our wisdom and in the circumstances of politics and parliamentary irresponsibility in Barbados have decide to remove from the Statute Book in order to put members of this House, apart from the salaries that they claim we have voted for ourselves - something which I have never in my nineteen years had anything to do with - I do not want to go into that now - in exactly the same position as what the Greeks used to call the "idiotes." This does not mean idiots; it means private citizens; so we would be all "idiotes" as far as the law is concerned, and as upholders of the law, we must believe in equality before the law. All that the Government is doing is to put back the members of the House in a position where they would not be able to assassinate the characters of private citizens or of people who are trying to do a public service in this Island.

Now I want to get the record straight. It is a dastardly and damnable lie to suggest that the Government has brought in the repeal to the Parliamentary Privileges Act in order to stifle debate. All I can say is that

if the purpose of that was to stifle debate in this Chamber, I hate to think what would have been said in here if the Bill had not been brought in; but this, of course, becomes utterly irrelevant for some of the people who made these allegations. Some of them know better; but certainly members of the Press owe a duty to the public to tell the public first on enquiry that the decision to repeal what I described as those offensive sections of the Parliamentary Privileges Bill was made way back on 17th March, 1979, after some two years of discussion in the higher echelons of the Government Party, when on that day the Cabinet instructed that the Bill should be laid before the Legislature and that the Bill should take effect as from the day on which it was laid.

Now it is absolutely untrue and it is a lie to say that the Bill is retroactive. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the Bill was not actually printed to take effect on the day on which it was laid, because when this Resolution was brought by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, when he was made the mouth-piece for the machinations of the one.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I object to that remark.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member has now entered the House on a Resolution of which he was the mover.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to those remarks, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is objecting to what particular words?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Being called the 'mouth-piece for the machinations'. 3.50p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I will continue; the word "mouth-piece" could never be offensive.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to the word, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

You are objecting to being called a mouthpiece.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to 'those words, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is nothing wrong with "mouthpiece"; I am having a check on "machinations".

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am objecting to the word, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That phrase, as it stands, I am not ruling out of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Do you mean to to say that to say that a person is a 'mouthpiece of the machinations' is not unparliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not ruling that phrase out of order; let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Is it unparliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not rule that phrase to be so.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would be grateful to Your Honour if you would get the words for me.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member does not want me to reply to the debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would like to know the exact words, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not ruling the phrase "mouthpiece of the machinations" out of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

With all due respect to you, Sir, is it not unparliamentary to say that a person is being used as the 'mouthpiece of the machinations?'

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not ruling that phrase out of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Do you say it is not unparliamentary ?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not deeming it unparliamentary; I have so ruled.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I was dealing with the point made by the junior member for the City, and now that he has taken up some of the valuable time, which, apparently, he does not want me to employ to reply seriatim i to all the statements he has made, I will have to speak a little more quickly, I will ask the Reporters to bear with me, but I am not going to allow my time to be taken up by these interruptions. I am saying that the member has said that we introduced a Bill here to repeal certain provisions of the Parliamentary

Privileges Act in order to stifle debate on this Resolution. I have already said what I think about the Resolution and I do not want to take any more of your time or my time on that because Your Honour has ruled on the Resolution, and there has been debate on it, and it will be a waste of my time to go back and illustrate why something like this is completely and utterly wrong and should never have been brought; but I will deal with it as a Resolution.

I stated that in the first place the recorded decision to repeal the provisions of the Parliamentary Privilege Act - I call that as a short title - was made way back in February or March 1970, and the recorded instructions given then by the Cabinet were that the Bill should take effect on the day on which it was actually laid. When the Bill was introduced, the Bill did not stipulate that it would take effect from that date, but on a date subsequent to that - and the reason why that was changed without going to the Cabinet was that as soon as this Resolution was introduced, I instructed the Cabinet Secretary to change the date to a date subsequent to which the hon. member would speak on the Resolution, it having been introduced a week before: If any member examines the Bill, he will see that the Bill does not take effect on the date on which all of the members, bar one, of the Opposition spoke on this Resolution, but the Bill only effects the people who are speaking on this side in anything that we say; so I speak with a full sense of responsibility.

These are incontrovertible facts - the hon. member says it is nonsense. When the hon. member spoke, on 30th June, the Bill was to take effect on the 7th July, and I instructed the Cabinet Secretary just five minutes before the Bill was brought down here not to put the date, and I have not even been back to the Cabinet to inform the Cabinet that the date was changed. How in the light of that - a decision made way back in March after two years of discussion and careful examination of the whole history of the so-called privileges behind which they want to shelter anyone could say that we brought in a Bill which could only affect the members on this side and go out in the highways and byways and tell the general public that we brought in a Bill to stifle the Opposition, as if the Opposition were only the members of this House and the Other Place? Between this Place and the Other Place, the Government Party has no less than 27 out of 42 total members of Parliament, leaving 15 people, some of whom are Opposition people and some of whom are independent members of the Other Place. How anyone can say that a Privilege Bill which affect 27 of us and 15 of them could be something brought against them is as factious as the Resolution that we are discussing here and the arguments which have been adduced in its support; but there are other very disturbing features about this. The disturbing features about this Resolution, like so many other Resolutions and Parliamentary Questions, are firstly, that the local Daily Press gives full publicity, on instructions from the other side, to every single word of every Resolution, no matter how ridiculous, unproved and undiscussed it may be. When the Leader of the House rose to put the Government's case, when the hon. senior member for St. Andrew rose to explain certain points, there was hardly any reference to the fact that they had spoken; there was some kind of reference. When Questions are asked in this House which may be derogatory of public officers or private citizens - let us leave aside Government Ministers now, because this is the first Resolution or Question which is directly derogatory of a Government Minister, but only by innuendo they attack Government Ministers - let us take the case of the private citizens or the Clerk of the House or the Marshal of the House or someone who works across the way in a Department of Government, the Replies are given, but the Replies are

never published. The Questions are published; so everybody has the currency of a Question which contains tendentious and sententious accusations, and no Reply is published in the Press when it is laid here on the Table of this House and that is the kind of democratic situation that we are supposed to have in Barbados today. (Mr. HINDS: Get Hansard on the road, I pray you.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I will not waste any more time, Mr. Speaker, discussing this; but I do not want to get it on the record that the decision to bring in a Parliamentary Privileges Bill to repeal certain clauses of that Bill was made way back in February or March - I gave the date last week and I cannot remember the precise date now; my recollection is that it was on either the 17th February or the 17th March, 1970 - and that was done after two years of discussion, and it was an examination of all the similar provisions all over the Commonwealth; secondly, I want it on record that the Cabinet instructed that the Bill should take effect on the date it was laid, and thirdly, that that date was changed by me to a subsequent date which would be after the members of the Opposition had spoken on this Resolution. 4.00 p.m.

So they need have no apprehension that for anything they may have said, however false, they will be prosecuted. I am positive that they all knew or they would not have given their tongues such great rein. All that they had to do was to read the date, and certainly on the 30th June when most of them spoke, that Bill did not say that it was coming into effect on that date or on the day that it was actually laid, but a date subsequent to that date.

Throughout the debate, the Press Table was always crowded with the cohorts of the Opposition when the senior member for St. Thomas and the junior member for the City were speaking. There was not a single representative of the Press when this side spoke: so that probably explains the inefficiency of the reporting of the answer they gave to the specific accusations made here.

I should like to get the constitutional position clear. This Resolution calls on me to set up a Judicial Commission of Inquiry. Plainly that is wrong and that is the first point I want to make. It is a wrong Resolution brought by the wrong people in the wrong place at the wrong time and for the wrong reasons. (Asides.) You still condoning thieving, though.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask hon. members not addressing the Chair to please observe the relevant Standing Order. Will the hon. member for the City please desist?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I never thought that I would live to see the day when two people rejoicing in the same name would sit side by side bringing a Resolution of this kind in this Place.

In the first place, they are asking the Prime Minister to set up a Commission of Enquiry into the Housing Authority. As I have said, this Resolution was brought for the wrong purpose by the wrong people at the wrong time and in the wrong place. Some members of the House, as some of them confessed last week, have beaten paths to Government Headquarters in Bay Street seeking redress for clients of theirs. Sometimes they come direct to me.

Mr. Speaker, anyone of them could have come to me and even presented me with documents and asked me to be sure to investigate certain matters; and if I failed they could have brought the same affidavits and asked for a Commission of Enquiry to be set up. But the person to ask to have a Commission of Enquiry set up is the officer administering the Government of this country. You cannot come here and ask me to set up a Commission of Enquiry.

You can come to my office and say I am a citizen and you are a citizen. We profess that we like good government and you like to tell the people so and ask me to investigate this. They could then say....

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

On a point of elucidation. The Prime Minister has said that if we would present him with certain information, he would take certain steps. Would the Prime Minister guarantee that if I gave him a piece of paper with certain dates noting deliveries of certain pieces of equipment.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

That is not a point of order. I have a limited time to reply to the three weeks of harangue and I will enjoin Your Honour not to allow people to trifle with the time of this House. I am not going to give way. I have a limited time to reply and I am not going to give way at all.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet.

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

I am asking if he will investigate it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The answer is "No; because you were not decent about it. " You are not decent enough to come to me first You cannot come in here and behave as you did in Queen's Park. You cannot say what you did and then come and talk about deliveries of equipment. I am saying that the Governor-General is the person who has to set up a Commission of Enquiry.

Deal with me in my office; and if I do not deal with you in a proper way, you can come to the House and say that you approached me. This Resolution was moved by a lawyer and seconded by a lawyer, and neither one of them knew that it was the Governor-General who had to set up a Commission of Enquiry;

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

On a point of order. In what Assembly can you call on the Governor-General and ask him to set up anything? He does not sit in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member should go and read the Commission of Enquiry Act. He should have done that before he started this nonsense. The Resolution is out of order; but I will deal with it specifically and constitutionally.

I am serving hon. members with notice now I am not afraid. I owe no Minister around this Table or no member of the House any money that I know of. Three Ministers have been relieved of their duties during the time that I have been Prime Minister of this country. One of them is right here on my right - the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. (Asides. That is not true. They resigned.) We observed certain constitutional proprieties. We gave people an option.

The only crime the Minister has committed is to associate with the wrong people. Evil communications corrupt good manners. I have warned him since 1966. None of the members of this side have broken bread with members of that side because of the way in which they carried on a scurrilous campaign against Independence for this country, and the way in which a campaign was carried on against the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union by the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

I am inviting him not to invite me into this debate at all.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am saying that the crime which the Minister has committed is that he has tried to keep friends with everybody. 4.10 p.m.

All I am saying is that I realise that from the time I decided to serve the people of this Island it is like total war as far as I am concerned. There was nobody in Germany who had done me personally anything; it was a question of principle; and certainly what Ministers on this side have had to endure, the scurrility they have had to endure from trying to serve the masses of this country by people who are hungry and lusting purely for power, and who will laugh with you outside and tell you they don't mean anything like that, they are trying to get the Government, I am not in that. I only knew Mr. Goering by sitting in on opposite side of the court room from him. I am no Adolph Hitler. As far as I am concerned, Hermann Goering, Rudolph Hess, are just-names and faces that I saw; but none of them ever attacked my character or my family, or tried to prevent me from discharging my duties to the masses of this Island, and if anyone doubts I said it, I say again that the war being over, I would much sooner sit down with Hermann Goering than to sit down with any of the other people I have had to deal with in politics. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. senior member of St. Andrew has got to learn that you cannot fraternize or compromise with

the enemy. This is the first thing, because there are people who are out to destroy you, and if there are people out to destroy you, you have no right in their camp, playing cards with them, drinking with them or talking to them, because if you tell people 'good-morning, ' they get on a public platform and say that you said something about somebody else, or that you made some profound admission of guilt about something that you yourself allegedly had done, and they have been abusing their positions in public life.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the shorthand writer on my left is having some difficulty in distinguishing between the voice of the hon. member on the floor and the voices of hon. members seated to his left.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

All I am saying is that the Minister was warned three years ago that he should not associate in any shape or form with certain people. If you are dealing with people who play the game according to the rules, that is one thing; but when you are dealing with people who improvise the rules as they go along, and people who would think nothing of distorting facts and actually inventing charges against people. I think that the crime that the Minister has committed is disobeying the rules and fraternizing with people that he should not fraternize with. When people talk about Black Power, there are black people in this country and there are black people in the Opposition Party that I would not like to be seen in the same cemetery with dead, and there are white people that I would defend, and I do not care how many are Black Power advocates, because I have never been subjected to the slander and abuse from any white man in any country in any part of the world that I and my Ministers have had to suffer at the hands of the people and the supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. Those are the facts of life, and so when I speak now, I speak from a position in which I am *Athenaeus, contra, mundum* on this point as on so many other matters. If you have to be lonely and stand alone in order to fight for your principles, it is better not to be down there with the crowd in the arena and getting their plaudits for the time. It is better to be alone and isolated as we were for so many years when we were in an Opposition Party in this House.

Mr. Speaker, in the Resolution, I now want to outline the constitutional position first with the Resolution, and I said quite clearly that any member of the House or the public who wants a Minister to do 'something for him has a right to approach a Minister because he is there to serve the general public, and anything that should be brought to light can be brought to light. But I do not see how you can get in here and harangue and abuse and make statements and withdraw them, statements that you yourself two days after admit to be untrue - I will give chapter and verse in a moment - and then ask any self-respecting judicial officer - let us get around the constitutional difficulty of it being addressed to the wrong person in the wrong place - to go on top or alongside of you and endorse or otherwise support the kind of scurrility in which you have indulged; I certainly could not ask any self-respecting judicial officer either in Barbados or outside of Barbados to do so; so you put me in a position of great disadvantage. I do not know any judicial officer, retired or working, who with any sense of decency

could be asked to support the kind of scurrility that went on in this Chamber and in Queen's Park. And then on the back of it, you are asking for a Judicial Enquiry; In the middle of a debate in the Legislature you call a public meeting, and the things which you thought you did not have licence to say within the Chamber, you then propagate to a lot of middle-class people, a lot of Civil Servants who do not want to work and who have been pitch-forked into positions sometimes of trust. I went around and I counted their cars, I not only went to the meeting. This is the voice of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. (Tape recording played)

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, what is all this going on inside here?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member wanted to know if I went to the meeting, and I reproduced the voice of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. It is the first time in my life that I have been to any meeting of theirs because I am not normally interested, but I was astonished that anyone could bring in a Resolution talking about corruption and letting the light shine upon the dark corners and so on, and then, in middle of the Resolution calling for a Judicial Enquiry, have the effrontery, the gall and the nerve to hold a public meeting in Queen's Park. The hon. member knows I was there. The brother of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, like some traffic cop, stuck a pamphlet which I have here in my car, and I was not the only person who recorded this. It has been recorded on several different instruments. (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY It has been recorded; so what happens?) It is the only time I hope that I will ever have the misfortune to attend a meeting of theirs; but in view of the fact that I intended to speak on this Resolution, I had to go there and hear for myself to believe that anyone would come in here sanctimoniously asking for a Judicial Enquiry, and then in the middle of the debate, when they had exhausted all their spleen on the Legislative Chamber, go and further compound the offence by going into a narrow shed at Queen's Park to make it look as if they had three thousand people; it holds 800. I do not know what the hon. member is sneaking around here for. He has been a sneak from the day he was born. 4.15 p.m.

The Hon. Leader of the House, Mr. Speaker, has dealt in my opinion very adequately with the motivation behind this motion. I have illustrated that you cannot ask for a Judicial Enquiry of the Prime Minister - it is constitutionally improper - that there are ways and means in which you can request any Minister, if he thinks something is wrong and he really has the public interest at heart, and any Minister who in those circumstances ceases to carry out some kind of investigation would be laying himself open justifiably to an attack on the floor of this House, if you have gone about it in the proper way.

Thirdly, it is wrong, during the course of a discussion in this House, even if the discussion has a legitimate foundation, to hold a public meeting on matters which are being discussed before the House,

matters of this nature. We will hold our public meeting, but we will hold our public meeting after the debate has run its full course in this Chamber and has been disposed of in the way in which it is going to be disposed of, and after that, when there is no question of trying to tamper with the debate or bring pressure upon any member of this House to vote one way or the other, we will then hold a public meeting.

Now I go on to the other constitutional points. The Housing Authority is a Statutory Board for which we vote funds in here from year to year. It was set up by the authority of an Act of Parliament. The members of the Housing Authority are persons who are selected by the Cabinet to serve for a fixed period of time. The Housing Authority has technical officers, administrative officers and clerical staff, and then in the lower echelons of the Authority's employment list there are people who carry out work for the Authority of a skilled or semi-skilled nature. The policy of the Housing Authority is directed by the Board of the Housing Authority; that is the Authority. In other words, within the framework of the funds which they have at their disposal, and the purposes for which those funds have been allocated, the Housing Authority has a right to carry out the programme which is the programme which has been approved by the Cabinet, by the Minister, and in the final analysis by the Legislature. The Report of the Housing Authority for last year is right up-to-date, it is not being concealed, it was laid in the House today. I think it may even be before its time; but in view of the fact that the House was going into recess for ten weeks, or it is so intended, the Cabinet instructed that the Report which we received, I think, yesterday should be laid in the House today; so if the House votes \$2 million for the Housing Authority during the financial year, the Housing Authority has \$2 million to spend on Housing.

This is the constitutional position, and how that money is spent is ordained by the decisions in the Minutes of the Housing Authority, recorded in the Minutes of the Housing Authority, and subject to the policy directions of the Minister. For years the Housing Authority was using funds from one item of expenditure and transferring them to another item of expenditure without the approval of the Minister of Parliament, and I stopped them. I said if they wanted to exercise the power of virement, even the Bridgetown City Council - it is true they used to do it *ex post facto* - but even the Bridge town City Council used to apply to me as Minister of Finance. If they wanted to use funds allocated for, say, street cleaning to purchase equipment for the Infirmary, they had to apply to the Minister of Finance, and so they were subject to the financial control of the Ministry of Finance. The Housing Authority is not subject to that control, but it is subject to the Minister, if they want to change funds from one thing to another.

What is clearly wrong is for the Housing Authority to pick up money allocated for Housing and spend that money for buying aeroplanes or something like that, or sending money to South Africa to support the Verwoerd regime, or sending money even to St. Lucia for a political Party in St. Lucia. If the Housing Authority spends this money on Housing, the only thing you can question is the administration; nowhere in this Resolution has it been suggested that money has not been spent on Housing which should have been spent on Housing. No one has suggested that the \$2,400 houses - I am still surprised to

learn that in Barbados you can get a \$2,400 house today - that they were only worth \$3.79 which is the weekly rent, or even \$379, and that somebody had sold the public short and taken houses which were only worth \$379 and put the other \$2,021 in their pockets or something like that. The Resolution that they want this Judicial Enquiry for is that an offer to build houses to be distributed by the Welfare Committee of the Barbados Housing Authority at a price of \$2,400 has been made by Mr. Bryan, the father of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

If you had heard the intonation, the rhetoric in Queen's Park, the dropping of the voice for dramatic effect, the chorus of psychopathic yardfowls who were arrayed over the first nine or ten rows of Queen's Park benches, benches which traditionally have only been used for loafers, you would have thought that this was the greatest indictment, and it was the impeachment of Warren Hastings for raping the whole sub-continent of India and despoiling not only the Rajahs and Emirs and all the panoply of aristocratic wealth, but their wives, their children, their ox, their ass and the stranger within the gates, as they say in the Ten Commandments. This is what you would have believed, and that is the reason why I went to this display of buffoonery which took place in Queen's Park; about what? "ASK THE MINISTER if his father did not offer the Housing Authority to sell them houses; ASK THE MINISTER if his father was not a carpenter; ASK THE MINISTER if the Housing Authority did not pay him two days late," and all you heard was "Yeah," "Yeah," and you heard them screaming and hollering at this exhibition of unadulterated buffoonery, unequalled in the annals of public life in Barbados. The same kind of atmosphere was translated into these Chambers, although the audience was more limited; but there all the dramatic effects were pulled out - the darkened lights, the drolling psychopaths, the loafers, the idle Civil Servants, the 119 motor cars, which would be lost in Independence Square but looked like 7,000 motor cars in Queen's Park, and if you measure Queen's Park from the Governor's Gate to the Constitution Gate you will see that my figure of 119 was an exaggeration, but I also counted the cars on the pasture; the 120th was mine. So all of this for what effect? For what purpose? What has gone wrong? What has befallen the State, the Nation? 4.30 p.m.

What has befallen the nation is that this is a nation of good-willed people and ill-willed people, and people of good-will have no right to associate with people of ill-will. The Jews should have no dealings with the Samaritans. If you do good and suffer for it, that is acceptable to God. If you do good and associate with people who do evil, everyone will think that you are evil too. If you do good, stay on one side by yourself.

The Resolution goes on: "The Housing Authority agreed to purchase houses -- I have dealt with that before. The Minister himself dealt with it. For years the Housing Authority has been lending money to persons to buy houses, and the same Mr. Craig referred to in this Resolution has been one of those people, those small, independent contractors and carpenters in this island - including a member of the Other Place and a deceased member of this party for St. Joseph - who have been building houses for people.

These houses are inspected, and then a loan not exceeding 90 per cent of the assessed value of the house is made to these persons who then receive the houses, and the money is paid to the contractor who has built it.

The houses are valued by the Housing Authority.

Now, if the Resolution was one saying that the Housing Authority over-valued or under-valued the houses, one way or the other, of course that would be something that you should try to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister. You do not ask for a Commission of Enquiry into the Housing Authority to prove what you yourself have stated, that the Minister's father is Mr. Bryan.

The Resolution states that "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 Departments."

Now, as far as I am concerned, Sir, I have access to the Minutes of all these statutory authorities, and in the Minutes of the Housing Authority I see that houses are included in the programme for rehabilitation, houses which have been neglected for a long time and I wish to explain that and perhaps take the responsibility for the delay. We had four contractors - Mr. Sydney Watson, Mr. George Rogers, Mr. Preston Holder and Mr. William Jordan. This was an award made by the Housing Authority, not the Minister, for the renovation of houses and over 2,000 houses were renovated.

Their talk of a million dollars sounded like a lot of money. When I came into the Government,

\$26 million was the total revenue and expenditure of this island. Today it is \$83 million. They talk about a million dollars as if it is something.

The Housing Authority has 3,983 houses and the Cabinet decided, before the Estimates were brought in last year, that the houses were getting into a very dilapidated condition because we had been concentrating on the building of new units and we said that the maintenance of these houses could wait a bit. The houses were getting to the stage where they would have been in need of a much more serious and heavy financial outlay.

The Legislature voted this money, and the Board of the Housing Authority gave instructions for the work to be done, not the Minister. If the Housing Authority gives it to Mr. Watson and he works with the Waterworks Department the Housing Authority must know what they are doing. The name "Watson" meant nothing to me. The fact is that if Mr. Watson works with the Waterworks Department, if he has a right to do private work is a matter for the Public Service Commission. It is not a matter for the House of Assembly. The Public Service Commission would have to tell him whether he has to resign or if, as a member of the unestablished staff, he has a right to do a job on his own.

When you consider that Parliament voted this money and the Housing Authority awarded contracts to four contractors for doing this work, \$500 a house is not too much to spend when you consider the condition of these houses. The hon. senior member for the City would tell you that if he only claimed \$500 on each property, he would be paying 75 percent more income tax than he pays now.

I have given the total number of houses owned by the Housing Authority. No work of any magnitude has been done on any of these houses since 1965 and it is now 1970. Over 2,000 were repaired at an average cost of \$500 per house, and the work was done by four contractors.

As the Hon. member for St. Lucy has said, if the Housing Authority had called in Ash and Watson, Mitchell Construction Company, International Construction and Clarke and Tucker - it is a quarter of a million dollars in work, and 694 Barbadian workmen were employed by the four contractors during the period that the contract subsisted, a contract awarded not by the Minister; but they shout "a million dollars." They are four contractors, 694 workmen, all Barbadian. The work done includes painting of houses, putting in window sills, stopping holes in roofs etc. There are 694 workmen and four contractors. Did the Opposition want them to have 2,000 contractors, one for each house?

This is money that has to be spent in 12 months. There are over 2,000 houses. 4. 40 p.m.

The Housing Authority awarded contracts to four people and they have done 2,000 houses; so that is

"Whereas No. 4, " This is what they want a Commission of Enquiry for: that one of the contractors who had to do these 2,000 houses scraping off paint, puttying, doing windows and that kind of thing, was the Minister's father. What kind of crime is that now for a judge to investigate? He will get- a Stenotypist, a Palantypis, a Secretary, an airconditioned room for six weeks or six months to bring out a report that he finds as a fact that the Minister's father is a gentleman called Mr. Bryan, and that Mr. Bryan worked for a gentleman called Mr. Watson. What kind of charge are you going to lay in Court

now? When you bring accusations in here, they must be things which (a) are incapable of being dealt with by the normal judicial process and (b) must transcend and be of a greater magnitude than passes the question of compensation between subject and subject. That is how we put it in law. It must not merely be a question of compensation between subject and subject or the Crown asserting its rights for law and order; it must be something which is greater than that; so what is greater than that? That Mr. Bryan is his father? All that you have proved is that his name is not Bryan; everybody knows his name is Edwards. Do you want a Judge to tell you that his name is not Bryan? I am going through all the WHEREAS's. So Mr. Bryan is his father and his father works for a Mr. Watson, and Mr. Watson was one of the people awarded a contract. Where is the illegality?

You go on then, not satisfied with that in your ignorance and say "WHEREAS the said contracts awarded to Mr. Sydney Watson worth over one million dollars were awarded without any invitation for Tenders...." I have investigated that. The contracts were awarded like all the Housing Authority contracts of this nature for maintenance and so on, without tender. For six years, regularly every quarter I would write to the Local Government Authorities and invite them that when they are spending public money they should go out to tender. I could only invite them to go out to tender. I am not making any accusations against anyone, because I was the Minister of Finance and if they wanted virement, they would have to come to me as Minister of Finance. Nobody ever resented it, any Local Government member here on any Finance Committee can tell you that I only surcharged one officer in St. James, and up to now I do not know if he has paid the \$739. You all know that case in the Northern District Council. I surcharged him. I told him to pay the Government back this money because I was not satisfied that this money was spent in the right way; but there are former members of Local Government Councils here and I used to write to them every three months, and they used to tell me that they would like to do that, but the nature of the operations which they have to conduct - I am not saying I accepted it in toto - would make it difficult. Another thing they used to tell me - and I am not betraying any confidences - is that if they went out for tender it would take three months and they only had one financial year of twelve months, and all the big fellows would come and undercut the small man after the work is distributed. You can ask any of the Local Government members around here. They said that if they went out to tender, the big fellows would come and lose money on the first year's contract, undercut the small fellows and all the little shopkeepers and people like that would be cut clean out of the picture by the small merchants because they are the same people as the provision merchants and commission merchants, due to the vicious system of distribution of foodstuffs and merchandise in this Island. The only time any of them, including the Bridgetown City Council, including the Northern District Council and including the Southern District Council - two of them controlled by the Government to which I have the honour to belong and one controlled by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown - went out to tender was when they were purchasing vehicles like scavenging trucks and so on.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I do not think that is strictly correct. Under the Act you had to go out to tender for anything over \$500, and therefore besides trucks, things like meat and bread had to be tendered for.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member knows that I know the interior parts of that. I am not quarrelling with the hon. member; I am just telling it like it is. The position like it is and how I know it is is that you could not buy a truck day by day; but what the Local Government Councils did if they had \$4,000 to spend for the St. Michael's Infirmary or for the St. Philip's Infirmary on bread and provisions and so on, instead of going out to tender to supply the whole year, they would buy bread every day, because the Financial Rules said that if you have a contract for more than \$500, you should go out for tender. You could not buy a truck for \$500.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Bread and meat went out to tender and contract every year.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Wait a minute. Don't worry about 'point made.'

Mr. SPEAKER:

Well, when a point is made, I say the point is made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

He could have told you that the point was not made or that it was no point. The hon. member said that bread and meat, and I added lorries, went out to tender. This accusation here is that the contract to renovate these houses, which as I have now illustrated went to four contractors, did not go to contract. Once the Authority satisfied itself that their staff was incapable of carrying out these extensive renovations - extensive in the number of dwellings that had to be done - it is debatable whether they should have waited to go out to contract. I cannot hold a Judicial Commission of Enquiry on that because it is a fact that they did not go out to tender; but I do not see how this in anyway re -fleets on the Minister because Housing was under his portfolio.

Then we go on, Mr. Speaker, to the next charge on the indictment that equipment belonging to the Housing Authority has been used at the residence of the said Minister of Housing at Melbourne, Belmont, and at a building site belonging to the said Minister of Housing at Stanmore Crescent, Black Rock. I do not know if that is anything to hold a Commission of Enquiry on. I have investigated that and

I have a statement signed by the contractor, a gentleman by the name of Mr. C. Mayers, in a letter dated 13th July, stating that he spoke to Mr. Hoyos, the Executive Officer, as to whether he could rent the compressor from the Authority, and that he finished in one day. He did not tell him the purposes for which it was wanted, but he said that he did this because he knows that Mr. Hoyos himself was in the habit of using or renting the said compressor or equipment, that he had done work for Mr. Hoyos, and that he notified him that he had finished with the compressor on the same day on which he had borrowed it. 4.50 p.m.

What is the point of my saying that a compressor was not used on the Minister's property? Let us examine the circumstances under which it was used. The Minister might be young, but do you think he is foolish? What does the Minister have to gain by using a compressor he can rent for \$15 or \$20? Any member of this Government has to give away more than that before he gets to work on a morning; is that something for a Commission of Enquiry? Mr. Mayers in his letter to me stated that, knowing that Mr. Hoyos was in the habit of renting and/or borrowing or using this, he asked Mr. Hoyos whether he could use the compressor, but they kept the compressor so long after he was finished - and now you can draw your own deductions. Having been notified that Mr. Mayers was finished with the compressor, the tractor driver should have returned for it. I am telling you quite honestly my position. Ask the hon. senior member for the City if this is true or not. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Why do you not leave me out?) Because you are the best witness I have and you can teach him some sense.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am just drawing this to your attention; I sat in here and listened to all the debate and said nothing; leave me out.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am going to ask the hon. member two questions now. The first question is, when I wanted my yard done, what did the hon. member suggest to me? Rent the steam roller from St. George.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Did I tell you something about St. George? What the hell do I know about St. George? When was this? Can you look in my face and lie like this? (Shouts of ORDER, ORDER from the Government benches.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member told me, and I rented a steam roller from St. George at \$8. 00 an hour or something like that. It was the hon. member who pointed this out to me, and anybody passing there and seeing the

St. George roller would then call a big meeting in Queen's Park and then say "is it a fact that a St. George steam roller was in the Prime Minister's yard at 10 o'clock a Tuesday morning?" (Mr. HINDS Give us some tape.) (A tape was heard) (Mr. HINDS Bring in a steel band next week.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Next week will be quite in order, we will be in recess next week; steel band, by all means.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

"Ladies and gentlemen, ask the Prime Minister if the St. George steam roller was not in his yard at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning, and Blenman, ladies and gentlemen - you all know Blenman - Blenman was driving it. " Ask the senior member for Bridgetown if the St. Michael Vestry, the St. George Vestry did not rent rollers to all the people. Ask him about Mr. Yarde, a mason, and Mr. Yarde came in his time and did some work for me, but Mr. Yarde was working for the Bridgetown City Council and he came in his time and did some work for me.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You are a liar, and I am not going to stand for that. You are a God-damned liar.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

This is no accusation. Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY But you are lying.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. senior member for Bridgetown sit?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You are a liar; you are trying to besmirch me in this.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown sit? The hon. member was on his feet when you said "you are a liar".

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I appologise and I withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is the atmosphere; let us proceed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not understand the hon. member, because he assisted me. He knew mo re about what went on in Barbados, where you could get a good mason or a good carpenter.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You said I had a man at the City Council who came and did work for you. The Leader of the House got in he re and said that you are all trying to besmirch me, leave me out.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I did not say that. Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY What did you say? Mr. SPEAKER Will the two hon. members sit?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member would not get excited, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief the gentleman to whom I referred was a highly qualified mason; when I needed a mason - I am only drawing a reference to show how people can distort things - as far as I know he worked either with the Cemeteries Board or the City Council.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Neither one.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Well, whom did he work for? He contracted work from time to time for those bodies, and he was recommended by the hon. member in a normal decent way, and he came in his own time and did work for me; but anybody passing there and seeing Mr. Yarde swinging in to my yard on his bicycle or coming out in his own time, and they were out to denigrate the hon. member or me, politically, would call a meeting in Queen's Park and say "Ladies and gentlemen, ask Mr. So-and-So if Yarde who lives down in Richmond does not do work for the Bridgetown City Council - and where was he coming out from Saturday morning or Saturday afternoon? From the Prime Minister's residence. " This is the kind of behaviour they went on with; foolishness. I am only drawing an illustration.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, it seems to me the Prime Minister is losing sight of one fact; even when Mr. Yarde was working for the Bridgetown City Council.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is no point of order. (A tape was heard).

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Are you satisfied with that, Brancker?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Can he have respect for you, Sir? How can I have respect for you in the face of that? Mr. Speaker, I was saying.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The Prime Minister seems to be losing sight of one thing, that even if Mr. Yarde did work for the Bridgetown City Council.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am making it; I would be grateful if you would allow me to make it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member would make it, he is allowed to make it, but not to make another speech.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I cannot make it being interrupted all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Chair cannot interrupt, the Chair can intervene; what is the point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The Prime Minister seems to be losing sight of the fact... ..

Mr. SPEAKER:

A point of order cannot be so referred to. The time for Private Members' Business has now expired, and we now proceed to Government Business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members time be extended for another half hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Before you put that question, that cannot be done like this; it has to be done early in the day before the business starts.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Standing Orders have been suspended since last Tuesday. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

If the Standing Orders are suspended.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Suspended, but this meeting was resumed at 3.30.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You continue the meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There was then a motion that Private Members' Business proceed for one hour and 15 minutes. That motion was made at 3.45 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

You cannot make another motion now. If you rule, I am going to bow, but I still think that I am right.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is my ruling. The question is that Private Members' Business be extended until 5.30 o'clock p.m. Hon. member in favour will please say Aye and those against will please say No. He thinks the Ayes have it, and Private Members' Business is accordingly extended until 5.30 o'clock p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before, the hon. member has spoken twice on this motion. I have a

limited time in which to reply and I do not intend to have my time taken up by unnecessary interruptions. I am asking Your Honour to bear in mind that this time has been extended for a limited period and I will not be interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister may continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, there are two hon. members on their feet. I am asking you to ask the hon. junior member for the City to sit.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

My point of order is that the Prime Minister is infringing Standing Order 26 (7). He seems to be losing sight of that when he talked about Mr. Yarde who worked for the Bridgetown City Council. The money paid to Mr. Yarde did not go into anybody's pocket. The money paid to Mr. Watson went into somebody else's pocket - a Minister's pocket.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have to call on the hon. junior member for Bridgetown to withdraw the statement that the money paid to Mr. Yarde went into a Minister's pocket. I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I did not quite hear you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understood the hon. member to say that the money went into a Minister's pocket. I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

With all due respect, Sir, what is wrong with that? I never said that it was paid as a bribe. If you really insist, I will withdraw it, but I did not say a Minister of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member withdraw the remark?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

If you find that the remark is offensive.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You do not intend to allow me to speak at all.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

If you find that the words are unparliamentary and that they offend any Minister, in the circumstances I withdraw the words.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is bringing in qualifications.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I said that if you find it unparliamentary I withdraw it.

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

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am saying that the Prime Minister is imputing improper motives when he accuses us of saying that because a truck is seen in somebody's yard, that means that something shady was going on. The point is that here is a question of taking the Housing Authority's compressor to your building site when the Housing Authority has to hire another one to use. If the Prime Minister says that we are making false allegations he is imputing improper motives to all of us and I submit that he should not be allowed to do that.

I specifically said that the Minister had the compressor while the Housing Authority had to hire one. If the Prime Minister said that I said something improper he is clearly imputing improper motives to me, and I object to that. I can give the Prime Minister details.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Rt. hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I want to get it for the record. I am not going to give way to silly interruptions. Members cannot criticise my speech under the guise of points of order. They may not like my speech because they never liked the truth; but they will have to sit down and listen because we sat here and listened patiently to a lot of scurrilous abuse on the Government.

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

On a point of order. He cannot make scurrilous abuse on anyone.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I said that we listened to scurrilous abuse here, and in Queen's Park we listened to scurrilous abuse.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Like the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, I take objection to the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What are the remarks?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

That people who spoke on the Resolution used scurrilous remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the Clerk to get the words from the Reporter. 5.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is my ruling that the words as they stand in this context "we sat here and listened to a lot of scurrilous abuse on the Government", are not unparliamentary.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Exactly thirteen minutes of the precious time in which I have to reply have been wasted, and then they talk about democracy; I will go on, and I intend to deal seriatim with this. I am not going to leave out any single bit, although I do not agree that the Resolution should have been here at all. What one of the hon. members said is this.

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

On a point of order...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order before I have said anything at all?

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

Your Honour has not yet ruled on the point I made that the Minister has accused me of misrepresenting certain facts. It is a reflection on my motives. He has accused me of misrepresenting the terms under which the compressor went to Stanmore.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I never said anything about you and misrepresenting anything. I am dealing

with it now. I do not think the hon. member was in his place when I said that I have a statement signed by a Mr. C. Mayers, supervisor, who was working at Black Rock, and he said he knows that the Chief Executive Officer was in the habit of borrowing or renting the compressor, and he approached Mr. Hoyos, who is in some way related to the hon. member and whom he claimed in Queens Park was the source of his information or who has been accused.

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

On a point of order, quite false.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I would like to play back the hon. member on this. I am not quite positive (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS Play it back.) I should like to assure the hon. member, because my time is limited, that what he said in Queen's Park, I believe, was to the effect that he asked somebody how he could say that Mr. Hoyos had him these things.

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

On a point of order Senator Brathwaite went to Mr. Hoyos and told him that the Prime Minister said that I had told the Prime Minister that Mr. Hoyos was the source of information. Could anybody believe that I would tell the Prime Minister that?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

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

The point I was making was that Mr. Hoyos was not the source of information, and Senator Brathwaite should not have been trying to find out who gave us the information by these oblique means.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

That is exactly what the hon. member said in Queen's Park. I accept that. I do not have to waste anytime on that because I have it here.

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

On a point of order, why does the Prime Minister say that I said mr. Hoyos was the source of information and now he admits I said that he was not the main source?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senioir member for St. Thomas has made his point.

Rt. Hon. e. W. BARROW:

I will play the tap the hon. member outside, but I wan tot get of the debate. For the purpose of argument I accept that everything he said is true. This was making at the time when I was inteyers that I have here a statement signed my Mr. Was - I do not know what the "C" stands forward was on accumstomed to working for Mr. Hoyos, saying that basis that he approached Mr. Hoyve to be that when you are in certain positions position very careful and if I were in the M than use I would have waited fifteen week the kind of any Government equipment, kr ut I do not people you have to deal with in Bommission of see that that is any occasion ent equipment Enquiry. Public officers use nent houses. As and Government workmen at.far as Mr. Williams is concerned, I have discovered that they rented rquipment, but I am satisfied hat they knew that the quipment was available and that Mr. Mayers had finished with it, and I am saying that I can make a logical deduction that they did not send back for their equipment because the Minister was not even aware of the progress of the work or that the thing had been finished in an hour and a half or something like it. What the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said..... (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has withdrawn the remarks.

Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow:

Not for two minutes and I to be allowed to talk about democracy? The Prime Minister is not going to be allowed to reply to the charges made against a Statutory Body and at Minister of Government? What are you afraid of ? I am afraid of nothing.

I am saying, mr. Speaker, that I have also discovered that they rented Mr. C. O. William equipment at this time. It was not necessary for them to do so, and I shall pursue the person who was responsible for it and make him pay for it. I will surcharge him, and if the person to be surcharged is the Minister and I find out that he is responsible for the House has my undertaking that I am going to surcharge the Minister, and if I found it is Mr. Hoyoves I am sorry we cannot have a rule that you can trip surcharge an Executive Officer, because I wovtrpte surcharge him; but I will apply the ordinary . You do not need any Judge; you need me, Minister of Finance.

The next charge on the so-called indictment.

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

On a point of order am glad the Prime Minister has returned to go humour, but just for the record I had better de that Mr. Hoyos I s any family to me. We are no relations whatsoever.

Mr. SPEKER:

Point made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Hoyos' sister is married to the uncle of the hon. member. Is Mr. Hoyos' sister not married to your uncle?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not to my uncle.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If you want to deny the family relationship it is all right with me, but I do not see it is anything to be ashamed of.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Shall we proceed with this debate?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I also understand that Mr. Connell at the Housing Authority is a cousin of your. All I can say is that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is well connected at the Housing Authority lineally and otherwise. There is no accusation there or anything to be ashamed of. I have never heard that either of them went to gaol or anything so. I am making statements of fact.

We come down to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas stating: " I never said that the Minister had stolen anything, because I have not the slightest evidence that the Minister put his hand in the taxpayers' pockets for money. He used the compressor and the traxcavator and so on, but I have no evidence of money." I wish he would consult more closely with the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, because they do not appear to be ad idem or to have any consensus on this matter. They seem to be, like their orebears, fighting from opposite corners, a sort of atural primaeval instinct coming to the fore even then tehey are supporting one another in a Resolution. 20 p.m.

Even when they are supporting one another in a solution it is so deeply ingrained that they appear to be fighting one another. Here is the hon. member Sr. Thomas saying here that " I never said the minister has stolen anything because I do not have slightest evidence" but he wants us to get a lge, when he does not have any evidence, to explaine something that he knows he will not be able to ng evidence on. I

could go on, Mr. Speaker; I spend days on my feet in situations with are more embarrassing - I find nothing embarrassing about this at all - but I do not like the process of the Legislature or any judicial pocess abused for political reasons. I am not raking accusations; but when you say one thing on a form and then you get in here and say you have evidence, you have already done the damage. You ruined a person's character and reputation side; but when you are challenged here, as the member for St. Thomas was challenged on two three occasions when the Minister categorically tied certain things, it was a different picture altogether, an entirely different picture. The danger of is kind of thig is the feneral public, especially then the reports are slanted, the replies are not published, the very illuminating speeches made by like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and hon. senior member for St. Andrew are made in this use - these are not published at all - when a member withdraws and says things like " I have not the gtest evidence", and htat is not published, you have already besmirched and sullied the reputation responsible citizens and people who are trying to the best according to their likes.

No two people are like peas in a pod, even when they are twins. People who are trained as lawyers react in different way to given situations from people who are not lawyers or people who believe that they are like lawyers. A priest reacts in a different way from a doctor and a doctor from a lawyer and a lawyer from a carpenter in the same given situation, and that is why we have differences in personalities of persons. I anybody wants to set up a Commission of Enquiry, let them set up one on me, because I am the Minister of Finance and I have the authority to say to one "Come" and he cometh, and to the other: "Go" and he goeth. If you are criticsing the Minister you are criticizing me, because you are saying that you, the minister of Finance, are harbouring in your bosom somebody - and a whole Board of an Authority - that is not only dishonest, but words like "corrupt" and so on are used; so if I do this knowing it to be so - this is what they are insinuating - then I am the person that is wrong. All I can say is this. I invite the hon. members to bring the right kind of Resolution to have any Enquiry into my conduct or my finances, and I will nominate the Chief Justices of all the West Indian territories to sit on that Enquiry and absolute privilege would prevail and they can bring all the evidence. But let me assure hon. members that there is no Minister in my Government who is, (I) afraid of me, and certainly there is no Minister in my Government whom I am afraid of. If the hon. member for St. Andrew tells you that I am afraid of him, as was insinuated and I heard insinuated, just give me that statement in a sworn affidavit by three persons, and the Minister will be relieved of his post tomorrow. I give you that solemn undertaking just to demonstrate that I am not afraid of any Minster; as long as I am Minister of Finance - the hon. senior member for the City has had to be under me and my financial control, and he knows that I do not make fun - I am saying that the unfortunate thing about this whole Resolution is that the newspapers have been prejudiced, they have been one-sided, they have distorted the debates and they have misrepresented the proceedings of this Chamber.

That is the first charge I am making, so that the general public has a distorted idea about the statements which were made in here, the importance of them and the relevance and all of that. I am saying that you cannot ask the Prime Minster to set up a Judicial Enquiry because I have no control over the Judges. According to the Statute law of Barbados this clearly resides in the Officer administering Government of the country who happens to be the or-General of Barbados. Thirdly, I am saying that the Leader of the House has demonstrated, solution has been brought wrongly; in other saying that despite all the sound of

alarm on the of cannons and everything, the members they side have been fighting the wrong battle; place' fighting the wrong battle in the wrong been fighting the wrong battle in the fighting the wrong weapons; they have been wrong weg battle in the wrong place with the fighting the wrong time; they have been wrong weapon battle in the wrong place with the been fought wrong time, and the battle has people.

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

NOES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, K. N. R. HUSBANDS, N. W. BOXILL Messrs. W. R. LOWE, J. B. YEARWOOD, G. E. SARGEANT, R. StC. WEEKES, C. A. E. HOPPIN and J. B. SPRINGER - 13.

AYES:

Messrs. ERNEST MOTTLEY, W. C. B. HINDS, ELLIOTT MOTTLEY and J. M. G. M. ADAMS - 4.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that one of the Bills of which I gave notice earlier, and of which copies have been circulated, the Bill to amend the Child Care Act, be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 5.30 p.m.

CHILD CARE BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL 1970

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons of this Bill set out, this Bill would amend the Child Care Board Act, 1969 (1969-46) by deleting the definition of "Minister" so that the wider definition appearing in the Interpretation Act, 1966 (1966-10) should apply.

The position is that when the Act was passed the terminology used was that it would apply to the appropriate Minister.

I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 2 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION ACT, 1950

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the next Order of the Day be the second reading of a Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Natural Gas Corporation is currently giving consideration to the use of liquid petroleum to replace the present supply of natural gas because the reserves of this supply are now running out.

The Corporation is not only satisfied with supplying gas to the Metropolitan area, but the intention is to extend even wider afield. Therefore, they will have to use liquid petroleum, whether or not mixed with natural gas. In order to proceed with plans for this type of gas it is necessary to have the Act amended.

This is a simple amendment, and I therefore beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. A. DaC, EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

**A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REPORTING AND PUBLISHING OF THE DEBATES AND
PROCEEDINGS AND FOR THE STAFF OF THE PARLIAMENT OF BARBADOS**

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the final Order of the Day be Order No. 9 of this Meeting's Order Paper.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is that Order No. 9 be the next Order of the Day. Honourable members in favour will please say Aye and those against will please say No. I think the Ayes have it, and accordingly order No. 9 is the next Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is a result of a Report made to this House by a joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, which Report was adopted and accepted by the House with recommendations to the Government that these provisions should be enacted into law.

Chief among the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee was that the post of Clerk of the House of Assembly should be abolished and that there should be appointed a Clerk of Parliament, along with two Deputy Clerks.

Other recommendations concern the salary and emoluments of these Officers and what the requirements and qualifications of the posts should be. 5.40 p.m.

The Select Committee also recommended that; there should be a new Joint Debates Committee made up of nine members, five from this House of whom Mr. Speaker should be, ex officio, the Chairman of the Joint Committee, and four from the Other Place, and that a quorum of the new Debates Committee should be made up of five members, two of whom should be members of the Senate.

The Bill therefore embodies the recommendations of the Select Committee and also makes provision to constitute the offices of Clerk, Deputy Clerk and Librarian of Parliament; it puts in the Chaplain and other staff of the House of Assembly, deals with the security of tenure of the Staff, the employment of Reporters and Typists, the publication of debates and the termination of contracts; it makes provision that all expenses arising out of the implementation of the Bill should be chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, and it repeals four Acts of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, certain things will arise and will need to be done after we have passed this Bill and sent it to the Other Place, and, indeed, after they have passed it too.

The Bill provides that the new Debates Committee should be the employing authority for the offices to be constituted under it. Hon. members must, therefore, take note that after we have passed this Bill, we have got to proceed to the equally important task of choosing our five of the new Joint Debates Committee. We should do this before we rise because if we do not constitute that Committee as quickly as possible, there will be no authority to act under the Bill, and the Bill expressly enjoins the new Debates Committee to be the appointing authority for the new offices which the Bill will create. I just draw this to hon. members' attention. We may therefore have to pass a short Resolution before we leave abolishing the present Debates Committee, and constituting the new one so that they can get together with the other members from the Senate and do what work has to be done while the House is in recess.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, before I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part, I just want to suggest an amendment. The interpretation of Debates Committee here says "Debates Committee means the joint committee appointed by the Senate and House of Assembly to superintend the printing executed by order of either House. " Since of course this Committee will be a Select Committee of both House, I am suggesting that the word "Select"- should be put in after "Joint". I have consulted the Hon. Attorney General and the Crown Law Officers about this and they think it is quite in order. So it will read "Debates Committee means the joint Select Committee appointed....."

I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed. Clause 4 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, in abolishing the offices of Clerk, Deputy Clerk and Librarian/Secretary of the House of Assembly, I wonder to what extent the Debates Committee is responsible to such officers in view of the fact that their posts are being abolished. What commitment do you hold out to them?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I think there is a Clause which we shall get to which answers that point. Clause 21 says " Any expenditure incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act is hereby charged on and shall be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. " This means, of course, that if you abolish a post and the House, as I believe it will, makes recommendations about compensation for pensions and gratuity, a simple Resolution of the House directing that that should be done makes it chargeable under this Bill. I do not know if that answers the hon. members point.

Mr. HINDS:

That does not answer my point at all. The Hon. Minister is telling me where commitments will be made in the event of the Debates Committee having any financial commitments to the present holders of posts that are being abolished. What I want to know is whether in abolishing the posts you have found out yet whether we would be obligated to any of the holders of office whose posts will be abolished, and if so, to what extent. In other words, if you bring a Bill before this House to abolish certain posts, you should take into consideration to what extent you hold yourself obligated to a person whose post you are abolishing. Have you done so? If so, to what extent are we committed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Section 8 (1) says "The persons appointed to the officers mentioned in sections 6 and 7....

Mr. HINDS:

That only speaks in respect of the Chaplain, Debates and the like.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member is talking about the present Clerk, Deputy Clerk and Librarian, their offices are going to be abolished, and the new offices constituted under this Bill; but it will be for the House or the Senate, if the Senate has anybody like that, to make appropriate recommendations in respect of any officers who retire when this Act comes into force.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, my argument is that this should have been gone into before you abolish the posts, and if you have three posts that you are going to abolish, you should go into details to know to what extent you are going to be committed financially or morally before you set out to abolish these posts. 5.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

For two reasons you could not do it that way; (a) because the present incumbents may apply and could possibly succeed, and (b) the House itself always makes provision for retiring servants, has always done this.

Mr. HINDS:

A servant whose post is abolished is not a servant who is retiring.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

And the more so is the House in duty bound to make provision for such person if that contingency arises. There is no problem at all -a simple Resolution. If the House had a servant who ceased to be a servant of the House, it is open to the House to pass an appropriate Resolution awarding such compensation as the House thinks fit, and that is the end of it. But there is a much more fundamental point; incumbents, if they wish, may apply for the new posts and could conceivably succeed, I do not know.

The question that clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 and 6 were called and passed. Clause 7 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 7 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we have here what I choose to refer to as a Technical Operator. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR He is not employed by the Debates Committee.) Why has provision not been made in view of the fact..... (Hon. J. C. TUDOR He is not an officer of the House.) What I am saying is that the officer under reference is now part of our reporting staff (Hon. J. C. TUDOR I cannot accept that.) I agree with you in Grenada he would not be, because what he is doing, in Grenada Reporters would have to do there. Who is going to continue to pay him, not the Debates Committee?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I think the hon. member knows - as a matter of fact, I think the hon. member knows his Estimates even better than I do, and I have perforce to know them. His money is voted separately under "Amplifying equipment1' and he is paid as a casual employee; he is not an officer of the House and could not therefore come into this Bill.

Mr. HINDS:

My argument is that in view of the fact that the officer is now required to attend as often as the House sits, we are now satisfied that he is not to be regarded as a casual employee any longer. What we are saying is that the officer has got to be here each time the House sits. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR But he is paid per sitting.) I am saying it is not enough to pay him per sitting, and this is an opportunity where provision ought to have been made to remove him from the casual list.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I could not accept that. First of all, the hon. member knows the basis upon which this worker is employed and remunerated. Secondly, that he gets paid per sitting, and as often as the House meets he gets paid for just so many sittings he attends and for which he works. The Joint Select Committee presumably took all of this into account and did not feel able to submit a recommendation in respect of this particular bit of work, and we cannot now go outside this Bill to rake in everything and

push in to it, because the Bill has been drafted within the terms of the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee.

Mr. HINDS:

But I envisage, Mr. Chairman, that sooner than the Hon. Leader of the House can see we will have to employ perhaps two more servants like this one and do away with some of the Reporters.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I cannot accept that. Last Week the hon. member made, I believe, an unjustified criticism against the Reporters, and we let that pass because the hon. member obviously has a right to speak his mind in this House; but in repeating it now in a context in which it is even worse - because we are not dealing with Reporters now; we are asking questions about a casual employee of the House, and the hon. member is taking the opportunity to denigrate the Reporters of this House.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Leader of the House, I do not leave home and come in here looking for friends; I come to do the people's business and I am not looking for the friendship of any Reporter of this Hon. House. What I am saying is that sooner or later we will have to increase the number of tape recorders that are now in use, whether you keep the service of the present Reporters or else; that is how I see it. Unjustified criticism? You are making sport.

You will see, Mr. Chairman, there was a time when I think that the Messenger of this House was considered a casual employee; it is now certain that with the progress of time we have had to appoint a Messenger, and not only have him as a Messenger but he is also Library Attendant, and my view is that we are not doing justice to this Hon. Chamber by having a servant in the capacity of the Technical Operator there doing the type of work that he is expected to do to be remaining on the casual list. The Leader of the House might not see my point of view, today, but I am sure, whether he is inside this Hon. House or outside, he will come around to seeing it some day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I do not want to prolong this argument, but I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think that there are 24 members of this House, including Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if I can speak for everybody else - I can certainly speak for myself without fear of contradiction - I do not accept the hon. member's point of view that there is anything wrong or inefficient in the work of the Reporters employed by this House. The hon. member has his point of view; I have mine. 6.00 p.m. I think that hon. members other than myself will speak, if they wish, in the same tone; but I certainly think that this House is served and serve

dwelt by its Reports, and certainly from the point of view of their knowledge and techniques and efficiency, the standard of their work would be hard to beat in this area or in any other part of the West Indies.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am sorry that I gave that latitude to deal with Reporters under Clause 7.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with what you say. It is I who introduced the question of reporting because I was suggesting.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am saying that Clause 7 deals with the Marshal and Deputy Marshal etc., Under Clause 8 you can properly deal with the Reporters.

Mr. HINDS:

But it was under Clause 7 that I suggested that we should include the Technical Operator and that is where I went on to point out that he was assisting in reporting the debates of this House. I am not challenging your ruling. If you say I will have that down I will sit down, but that is how the question of reporting came in.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 8 and 9 were called and passed. Clause 10 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 10 stands part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I want just to get this one point into the records. With reference to the Reporters, the Clerk of this honourable House has told us in the Debates Committee that we have Reporters on the staff that he could not dare send inside this House to do its reporting. That implies that there is inefficiency among these people. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR No, no.)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give way. Suppose you have a panel of four Reporters doing the work of this House, and suppose further that one extra Reporter does it occasionally. Would you expect the extra one to be as good on the ball as the four who are doing the work all the time? It was in this context that he said that he would not recommend Mr. X to do the work because, not doing it often, he obviously would not be as au fait as those who are doing it often.

Mr. HINDS:

It is a good thing that this is not 1955 or the last storm that we had. We are not talking about storm carpenters, but about Reporters. The Clerk of this honourable House tells us that he has on the staff a Reporter whom he dare not send here. If he says that, it means that the Reporter is so inefficient that he cannot send him here.

Now, the Leader of the House is saying that he does not do it often enough. He has to be a Reporter in here or in the Other Place or not working at all. He cannot be sent in here. Do you mean that reporting does not go on in the Other Place now? What am I hearing?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The hon. member cannot know everything. I have been in this House for sixteen years, and the hon. member only four. Let me tell the hon. member something. We have had experienced Reporters in this House - some of them are not working with us now and one is still with us - who would tell the hon. member that in sessions before it was extremely difficult to take Mr. Frank Walcott when he was a member of this House when he was in one of his heated speeches, or to take the hon. senior member for

the City.

No matter how efficient he is, he cannot come here and take a debate that is going great guns. He would lose a lot of what was said, if he is not doing it regularly. It is in this kind of sense that the Clerk disclosed to us in another place that there was one whom he did not think he would risk in here. It is not that the man was inefficient, but if you are accustomed to something you have a certain atmosphere, and the person who knows that atmosphere is bound to be better than a person who is working occasionally.

Mr. HINDS:

You employ a Reporter whom you cannot send inside here. All well and good; but you place a tape recorder at his disposal. Do you mean that a tape recorder plus a Reporter is not equal to a Reporter? Do you tell me that this is efficiency in this Reporter? If a Reporter is not fast enough, then you place a tape recorder at his disposal so that he has the tape recorder to play back and fill in things that he may have missed. That is what I take is the object of the tape recorder. Do you think that you are doing service to the Reporter by keeping him away from this House altogether? 6.10 p.m.

You should expose him to the glare of it occasionally, because he has the tape recorder to back him up and what I am suggesting is that you could do with less Reportorial staff and get Hansard on the road at a much earlier hour.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

We do not accept that. I still say that the hon. member's criticism of the Reporters is unjustified. The hon. member is one member, of this House. Perhaps the other twenty-three of us do not share his view.

The question that Clause 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 11 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I spoke on Clause 9.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Clause 10 was called and the hon. junior member spoke on that Clause. The Clause has already been passed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to have a recommittal, but I would like to hear the tape played back.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

When the hon. member rose to speak, it was on the motion that Clause 10 stand part.

Mr. HINDS:

I do not accept that. It is certainly not so, but it is the way that the business of the House must go on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

We are now discussing Clause 11.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the truth will out. We are now doing Clause 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

We are now doing Clause 11. I have said so repeatedly. Clause 10 has already been passed.

Mr. HINDS:

If Clause 10 has been passed, I am asking that Clause 10 be recommitted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is already a motion before the House that Clause 11 stand part. I will proceed with Clause 11 and if the Committee wants Clause 10 recommitted, that will then be done.

The question that Clause 11 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 10 be recommitted.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

I am going to support that for the simple reason that it is never the practice of the Government if the Opposition wants a section recommitted to oppose it, because there might be something very valuable that the member wants to contribute.

The question that Clause 10 be recommitted was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as foil OILS:

AYES:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR Hon. C. E. TALMA Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. LOWE, Mr. HOPPIN Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. SMITH; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY -11.

NOES:

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS - 1.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not cast any vote. How do you get 11 members voting "AYES". The count is wrong. This is something that affects the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to have this clearly in my mind, and therefore I am now seeking to find out if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is willing to vote now.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is that not placing the reputation of the Clerk at stake? 6. 20 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Clerk was under the impression that the hon. member voted AYE; I would like now to know whether the hon. member would record his vote as AYE or if he wants to vote NO. Would the Clerk call the hon. member's name and ask him to vote?

Mr. CLERK:

Mr. Boxill,

Hon. N. W. BOXILL (sitting):

You hear I am not voting?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will have to ask the Clerk to record the hon. member as voting AYE.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if an hon. member refuses to vote.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This sitting has not yet been suspended; the vote is being taken.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if an hon. member refuses to vote you cannot record a vote of

AYE:

you ask him to leave.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I really would like to see the Leader of the House in his place because I would very much like to hear him explain Clause 10 to the House as he understands it, and- I am serious when I say so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I can hardly hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, there has been a continuous cry about the early publication of debates of this House. As far as I can remember, a Resolution came before this House for a token sum to acquire equipment, and the reason for that was with a view to expediting the publication of Hansard. In other words, it was then the feeling of this Hon. house that what is said and done here ought to be in the hands of the public within a period of three, or possibly four, and at the most, five days after it has taken place here. In other words, if a debate takes place in this Hon. House on Tuesday, by Saturday it ought to be available to the public for reading; but what we find is that at clause 10 all of this is being swept aside because this Bill is giving the Printer of Debates a period of up to 12 days to have printed - I would rather say to have published - in the Official Gazette the copy of the reports of this Hon. House as handed to him by the Clerk of this House.

It is not that the Government Printer or the Printer of Debates, although I must admit that the Debates Committee can contract out for the printing of debates, (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It gives us a free hand.) Yes, but it gives you a hand that you are giving the Printer of Debates a period of 12 days within which to act.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give way, do you not see that you have to make allowances for the longest debates as well as for the shortest? The debate on the Public Order Bill took from Tuesday to Friday; the

last Estimates took from Tuesday to Saturday; the Independence Resolution took from 10 o'clock Tuesday morning to half past six on Saturday morning - would you expect then to give the same three or four days for getting out a debate of that length as you would for one which would last, perhaps, for three or four hours? The 12 days represents an outside limit for a long debate; but because you say lie must do it within 12 days does not mean he must take 12 days in each instance; we had the Estimates in mind, where we would be sitting perhaps for four full days, but even for that 12 days at the outside would be most reasonable. Of course, the inference is that if we have a shorter debate it would be much less than that; this seems to be reasonable to me.

Mr. HINDS:

It would appear reasonable, Mr. Chairman, if we did not have experience in printing ourselves. We have had considerable experience with the Government printers, and the question that still must arise is whether or not they are equipped to do the work in two days, ten days or twelve days; that is the point at issue, Mr. Chairman. And what I am going to say here and now is that you know too,

Mr. Chairman, that even some of you who are Chairman of Boards know to what extent your very Boards are presently suffering to get some of the printing work done. Some of the Ministers ought to know this, but it is not a question - you cannot decide to give out this debate and do not give out that debate on contract; you have to have some fixed policy in handling this debate, because - bear in mind - no private printer is going to set aside his regular customs' work when the Government finds itself in a jam to rush down here to get its work out; the thing to do is to take a decision to relieve the Government Printery of this work. That is what we want you to do.

The question that clause 10 stand part teas put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.30 p.m.

Clauses 12 to 16 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour to now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with amendments.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

APPOINTMENT OF NEW DEBATES COMMITTEE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think that at this stage we are in duty bound, owing to the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee, to come to the appointment of a new Debates Committee. I therefore beg to move that a joint Select Committee of nine persons, five of whom shall be members of this honourable

House and four of whom shall be members of the other place under the Chairmanship of His Hon. the Speaker be now appointed to superintend the printing executed by order of either House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The motion that I am making is that a Joint Select Committee of nine persons under the Chairmanship of His Hon. the Speaker ex officio be appointed to superintend the printing executed by order of either House. The recommendation of the Select Committee was that the Committee should be comprised of five members of the House of Assembly and four members of the Senate. That would mean that His Hon. the Speaker has to be one of the five.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

That is the recommendation of the Committee, but it seems tome that if the Lower House is the holder of the purse strings and has five members, I do not see why the other House with no responsibility should have four. (Mr. J. C. TUDOR The House has agreed on this.) The House is entitled to change its mind. It sounds to me that there should be six members from here and I move that as an amendment.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there should be six members from here and three from the Other Place with the Speaker as Chairman. I hope hon. members will see my point. You cannot have five from here and Tour from the Other Place. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is a recommendation which the House has accepted.)

Mr. Speaker, I beg to amend the Resolution. At least you must realise chat we have twenty-four members and there are twenty-one in the Senate, and therefore it should be five members from here plus the Speaker.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we cannot change their numbers because we have no power to dictate to them. I think perhaps, however, the House could take Mr. Speaker, so to speak, out of the five, appoint five members and have Mr. Speaker still as Chairman. You would not be taking away their four. We would only be taking Mr. Speaker out of the five, making him Chairman, with five members from this place. (Asides.) If the hon. member is saying that this is what it says, this is not so. If it were so, the House would not need now to make it so. The House accepted it as it was. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this would involve sending a Message to the Other Place. Therefore I beg to amend the Resolution to

read "a Joint Select Committee of ten persons under the Chairmanship of Mr. Speaker, six of whom shall be members of this House and four of whom shall be members of the Other Place to be appointed to superintend the printing executed by order of either House."

I beg to move that this Resolution as amended do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that I should withdraw the original motion about nine members and substitute therefor the one I have just made about Mr. Speaker and five other hon. members of this House together with four members of the Other Place.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that this Resolution as amended do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

No, no, Mr. Speaker. I have' asked leave to withdraw the original motion and to substitute the second one.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution of which he earlier gave notice, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw the Resolution of which. he gave notice.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that the Resolution as substituted do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, could I have the Resolution read?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

You should know it because you were sitting there.

Mr. CLERK:

"Resolved that a Joint Select Committee comprised of ten persons under the Chairmanship of Mr. Speaker and five other hon. members of this House and four members from the Other Place be appointed to superintend the printing executed by order of either House."

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

MESSAGE SENT TO SENATE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Message be sent to the Other Place conveying to them this House's decision and amendment in respect of the Joint Select Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I would suggest that the proper proportion would be two, two, one 6.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I think I will nominate from our side the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House has nominated the members of the Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to nominate the senior member for St. Thomas and the junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

I beg to nominate the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Five hon. members have been duly nominated for the five vacancies.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The formula which I proposed would have given us two from each Party and one Independent.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I cannot hear the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. HINDS:

Let the junior member for St. Lucy sit. On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The senior member for Bridgetown caught my eye.

Mr. HINDS:

Let the junior member for St. Lucy sit.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

If you have two members from the Government Party, two members from the Labour Party, I represent a Party inhere. I can not understand what formula you are speaking about. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR I know.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Members are entitled to speak on any motion; I am not going to deprive any member of his right to speak.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, since we are nominating, I beg to nominate the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that you had already announced that five hon. members had already been nominated.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no limit to the number of members to be nominated; I did not close nominations. There are two hon. members on their feet; the hon. junior member for St. Peter is addressing the Chair.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to you not to let us clash. It is not a question of voting in a matter of this sort; if one thought for a single moment that you had made a promise to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph..... (Hon. J. C. TUDOR I have not made any promise; I have nominated him.)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I think we are witnessing an extremely dangerous principle that the Government, through the Leader of the House, is trying to put over on this Chamber tonight. When the Leader of the House got up and said that he would suggest that you have two for the Government, two for the Opposition and one other, nobody could seriously expect or could ever imagine that the Leader of the House would now reach the stage where he would prefer to give an Independent member or guarantee an Independent member a seat on any Committee here. The Government is now saying that an Independent member must be guaranteed a seat on a Select Committee in preference to a member who has been elected here representing a political Party.

When one analyses this sort of principle, it shows private promises that have been made by the Leader of the House to certain members in this Chamber. All principles of elected representatives and representatives of a political Party., ...

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am not giving way, Sir; if he gets up on a point of order, I will also get up on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I will not press the point of order; he is at liberty to ask the hon. senior member for St. Joseph if I have ever spoken to him on this matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would like to find out one thing. When the former Debates Committee was appointed there was no talk about appointing any Independent member; when Mr. Frank Walcott was in this House of Assembly, the Government never got up and said they would give Mr. Frank Walcott as an Independent member a guaranteed seat on any Committee. 7.00 p.m.

This is the same principle that we had to fight against earlier this year. I cannot talk when the Leader of the House is interrupting me all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown is speaking as he is entitled to speak.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Can I go on? Mr. SPEAKER If the hon. member will.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY; On condition that I am not interrupted. The Leader of the House is interrupting me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not hear him interrupt now.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am saying that this is the same principle that we had to fight against earlier this year—this principle of according Independent members certain rights that ought to be reserved for members of a particular Party. I think we must decide whether we are going to adopt Party Politics and guarantee members of Parties these rights or whether you are going to guarantee Independent members rights that should be reserved for members of political Parties.

I know that the Opposition will suffer because you are not going to find that the Government is going to give away any of their nominees. They will try to give away the nominees of the Opposition. If you vote on this as it stands, you are making nonsense of the whole principle as set out by the Leader of the House.

You cannot say that you are voting for the members of the Opposition or the Barbados National Party

or the Independent member. Once you vote, you are voting for the entire Committee, which means, and it is quite possible for the member of the Barbados National Party to be voted out of existence and therefore the whole principle as laid down by the Leader of the House is made nonsense of. The mere fact that we have a situation where an Independent member has been nominated by the Government is clearly indicative that he will be supporting the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair will please observe the appropriate Standing Orders.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

When it comes to the vote you will find that it is quite possible that the Official Opposition is now being represented, which would mean that the Government is represented by two people. It will mean that the Independent member on my right - it may mean that the Barbados National Party may be represented while the Official Opposition is represented by only one person, and for that matter if further nominations are made, it may mean that the Official Opposition may not be represented on this Select Committee.

I am not trying to guarantee anyone, but we have a certain principle. If you are going to guarantee an Independent member it means simply, if we analyse the principle as set out by the Leader of the House, that the principle to be adopted was 2-2-1, where will we be? There are three political Parties represented in this House. If the Leader of the House

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. Would the hon. junior member for Bridgetown take notice that when the Leader of the House said 2-2-1 he pointed most distinctly to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

I will now come to the point of order. If the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is labouring under the impression that the formula presented by the Leader of the House is being complied with, that is not so. What the hon. member seems not to know is that the Leader of the House has made preparation long in advance.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown may resume. 7.10 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, when one heard the Hon. Leader of the House.... (Asides.).

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I would like to, Sir; but when you get that sort of conduct from the Leader of the House, what do you expect from other people? If he can sit down and shout across at people, what do you expect from other members in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown is a more senior member of the House than the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I am nothing to do with that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You seem only to pick on certain people.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not pick on anyone. Will the hon. member please withdraw that?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw those remarks, but I want to make it absolutely plain at this stage that so long as I am a member of this House, do not shout at me. If you shout at me, I will shout at you too. You know I do not get on with any nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member to desist at once. Sit down; (The hon. member sat)

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

If you feel that certain remarks I made may be insulting to you, call upon me to withdraw them; but do not try to treat me like a yard boy and shout at me like one of your employees.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I want advice neither from the most junior nor the most senior member of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You treat certain people that way. You do not shout at certain people in here. You would not shout at the Prime Minister like that; so do not shout at me either.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member understand that he must conduct himself, if I may say so, as his father does.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I will conduct myself in accordance with the treatment I receive from you. If you respect me and treat me properly, then I will respect you and treat you properly.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I respect any member who behaves himself as does the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

And, you would appreciate, during that period of time that you respect him and behave that way, I

behave in a similar fashion to you.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member behaves in a manner contrary to Standing Orders, he will be dealt with under Standing Orders.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You too, Sir, with all due respect. (Asides.)

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. John came in here today and did what he did.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

The hon. senior member for St. John came in here and played a tape recording.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

What is that to do with it?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

It is nastiness. You asked the Speaker how he could stand for this. Why did he stand for what the hon. senior member for St. John did?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest to the hon. junior member for Bridge town that as far as I am concerned, I am one of the senior members in here and I am not fighting for anything. I have served on the Debates Committee, and if this is the sort of thing they want to do, it is all right. They say that I am a member of the Barbados Labour Party. I supported my son as he was running with the Barbados Labour Party, and I would do it again. I am not one of those worthless fathers who get children and do not

support them, banish them from the Is land and never look at them. I supported my son when he was running with the Barbados Labour Party and I will do it again. I am not a member of the Barbados Labour Party; I represent a point of view.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understood the hon. member for Bridgetown rose on a point of order. He has, if he so did, transcended it.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Chair and I would like the Chair to hear me without any sort of interruption. I, Sir, am in a bit of a quandary. Mr. Speaker, I am being interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us get this straight. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown was addressing the Chair, and as I understand it, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown rose on a point of order.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Well, Sir, as soon as that point of order is disposed of, I hope to catch your eye.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to analyse the principle which the Leader of the House said would be adopted in appointing members to this Debates Committee. The Leader of the House indicated he would have two members from the Government, two from the Opposition and one other member. The problem which we have got to recognise is this are we prepared to accept and accommodate Independent members in preference to members of elected political Parties? If at this stage the Government is really seriously suggesting that they cannot guarantee a member of a minority Party any rights such as the right to sit on a Select Committee such as this, but at the same time they are going to guarantee an Independent member that right, it is indeed creating a very dangerous precedent because so long as you decide to ignore the existence of political Parties, whether they are represented by one, four or fifteen members, then you are beginning to sound the death-knell of parliamentary democracy.

As regards this rubbish talk by a lot of backbenchers who do not understand what they are saying about somebody representing one Party, it does not depend on the size of the political Party; it is the principle of the whole situation. Are you prepared to recognise the- existence of political Parties and to

accord to them certain rights? Do you mean to tell me that if one of the members of the P. P.M. was elected to this House, purely because he is one member you are going to say he should not have certain rights in this Chamber, and that Independent members should have more rights than he? Is this seriously what the Government is trying to say now? It is a very important principle because if you can extend it to say that a political Party is only represented by one person, what would happen to any political Party if there is a General Election and that Party happens to lose votes? What would happen if the Government won twenty-three seats, as the Prime Minister wanted at one stage? Would you come in the House of Assembly and say that that particular man, because he forms the Opposition Party, has no rights? Look at the situation and see. that is not how many people are elected to this Chamber What about the number of votes? From time to time you hear the Government talk about having so many popular votes. It could very well be that a political Party in this country - and this may be so in the next election which will be fought under single member constituency - may well receive about 20,000 votes and yet has only two or three members elected to this Chamber. Do you mean that the Government will say that because two or three members are elected from that one Party, the persons elected have absolutely no say? This talk about a one-man Party shows a lack of understanding of the workings of parliamentary democracy in this country. I am not surprised that the only contribution some people make is to sit down and mumble and shout across the floor.

Now, Sir, when the last Debates Committee was appointed, the Government did not go out of their way to appoint an Independent, The hon. senior member for St. Joseph who was on that Committee at the time happened to be a member of the Barbados Labour Party. 7.20 p.m.

Nobody talked then about giving anybody special representation at that stage, and we cannot accept that purely because somebody has left a political Party and is now an Independent member that he is going to have better rights than if he were a member of this political Party. If he were still a member of this political Party, nobody could guarantee that that particular individual would be elected to any Select Committee; but once you bring the principle that purely because a man has left a political Party and has now become an Independent he has a right to sit on any Select Committee or has special rights to be represented on that Committee, it means that you are putting him in a very privileged position, because you are giving to that particular individual rights which are not guaranteed to any other individual but merely guaranteed to political Parties.

Let us go a step further. You get a principle of 2: 2 1 and you come back now and you hear that six people are nominated; how are you going to vote? You cannot vote on the two Government members and then come to the two Opposition members and then decide between the Independent member and the member for the Barbados National Party, it cannot be done that way. Whenever you vote it means that you must vote for the five members and any five can be elected, and it may very well mean that when the vote is taken, you may find that the Independent member and the member of the Barbados National Party, if the Government so wills it, would have their two members nominated and only one member from the Official Opposition is nominated; so what is the whole purpose of asking the

Opposition to nominate two members? You ask us to nominate two members, but then at the same time you come and say we have to vote to get those two members on this Committee; so this makes absolute nonsense of this whole principle. How can you operate on a principle of 2 2 1 and then have to come back and vote, when the likely outcome, knowing the mentality of certain Government members, will be that they will not vote for one of the members nominated to represent the Official Opposition. It may verywell be, when the vote is taken, that the Official Opposition will only be represented by one person; if that happens, what principle are you operating on? You cannot be operating on the principle that the Opposition will have two members, because at the same time what you are purporting to give the Opposition Party with one hand, you are taking back in a very underhanded way. I was even surprised to see the Leader of the House get up and talk about a principle; that was indeed a shock coming from the Leader of the House. But it was not a shock, having got up and calked about principle at one stage, that he should come back and deliberately do everything to remove the basic principle on which the members should be elected. I think this is very important, because today you may say it is only the Independent member; what happens if somebody else leaves a political Party? Are you going to say that that individual is going to have the same rights as the senior member for St. Joseph to be nominated on Select Committees? It is clear what has happened here, that the Leader of the House obviously promised the senior member for St. Joseph that he would put him on the Committee.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, no Leader nor anybody in this House has promised me anything; that is totally untrue.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, let me say this. Sitting here and looking at the shocked expression on the face of the Leader of the House when he realised that it was the senior member for the City, representing the Barbados National Party, that was nominated in place of the senior member for St. Joseph, the look of shock and bewilderment could only lead one to the conclusion that it was some prior arrangement to have the senior member for St. Joseph on and not him, so that you find that the whole principle of this is being taken away. How can we in the Opposition take part in this sort of thing? How can we be guaranteed that two members will be elected from the Official Opposition?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, there are two Opposition Parties as such - one is the Official Opposition and the other one is an Opposition party. Then there is an Independent member. I want to bring it to the attention of the House that this is a democratic Assembly and it is hardly likely that the Government could have the majority and would have a right to nominate less on this Committee than the Opposition Party or Parties combined. Face that; so you see how much principle and how much sense you are talking.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

I believe he just woke up, but he can go back to sleep. For the junior member for Christ Church to tell me I am talking nonsense is like an insult from a fool being a compliment. How can the junior member for Christ Church get up and talk about the Government having the majority? This really shows - so unwittingly he shows the true feeling and thinking of the Government in this matter. He gets up and he says "How do you expect the Opposition to have more than the Government?" But look whom the Government nominated; they nominated the junior member for St. Lucy, the junior member for Christ Church, and then nominated the senior member for St. Joseph; then they get up and tell the House that the Opposition cannot have more than the Government, We are now facing a situation that the Government has now nominated the senior member for St. Joseph and telling us we cannot have more than the Government this is the whole thing I am talking about. It should be interesting to watch how the vote is recorded, because it should be very interesting to see if the Government will deliberately vote against the two representatives of the Official Opposition, because if that happens I think it is nonsense for the Opposition ever to take part or to accept any word from the Government when it comes to Select Committees, or ever take part in any Select Committee, so long as those members are sitting on the Government benches. 7.30 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, now that the last speaker has sat, I am going to express my sentiments provided that I get your ear, Sir. I am interested in how we are going to proceed. I am interested in the procedure that we are going to adopt at this particular stage when it comes to disposing of two Motions at the same time, which I know is impracticable in Parliament.

It seems to me, Sir, that there are two motions before the House, if my memory is right.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If I may intervene, as I understand it there are only two motions as such. One is that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown be a member and the other is that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph be a member. There are technically only two motions before the Chamber and there are no other motions recorded by the Clerks at the Table.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I thank you, Your Honour.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. Do I understand that you only have two motions before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not know how the hon. member understands me.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Did you say that there are only two motions before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are at the moment two motions, and two only, before the House. Will the hon. member sit while the Speaker is speaking and will all hon. members listen? There are only two motions. (Aside. What are they?) Will the hon. member let me speak with clarity so that all hon. members can understand? There is a motion that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown be a member of this Committee and that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph be also a member. In respect of other hon. members who have been named, there has been no formal motion made. There were nominations of the hon. Leader of the House and the hon. junior member for Christ Church. There is a nomination of the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. There is a nomination in respect of two on each side of the House.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, Sir....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I will never get to hear you.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. junior member for Bridgetown state what his point of order is?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You have said that there are only two motions before the House and that there were nominations made by me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not say so. I said that there were nominations in respect of the senior member for Bridgetown which had been seconded and in respect of the senior member for St. Joseph which had been seconded and I said that there were nominations, as distinct from motions, in respect of the junior member for St. Peter and the senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

With all due respect, I would like to ascertain the difference.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will explain.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Wait a minute.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I muse not be told - the Speaker must not be told to wait a minute. Even junior members do not as a rule make that mistake.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, if you want me to sit, I will sit.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is the only thing to do when the Speaker is speaking.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am speaking. In respect of the nominations they can very easily be regularised by a motion that the two hon. members - what I am saying is that there have been two formal motions and it is a simple matter to regularise the nominations by saying "I beg to move."

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. I would like to find out the difference between the nomination that I made of the senior member for St. Thomas and the junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The difference is that the hon. Leader of the House merely did not state "I beg to move." It is purely a technicality, but it is a very important technicality. He did not say "I beg to move."

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

What did the Leader of the House say?

Mr. SPEAKER:

He said "I beg to nominate" two members. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown said "I beg to move. " All that is necessary is to say "I beg to move. " It is so simple just to regularise it.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

So that I understand that what the Leader of the House said is not a motion?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No. He did not make a motion as far as the two hon. members that he nominated are concerned. I would suggest that to avoid undue delay - I am not in any hurry at all - that a regular motion in respect of these two members be made and there will be no problem.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to get the procedure clear. That is my point in rising. Will I lose my right to

Speak?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has not started to speak yet.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the following six members constitute this House's part of the representation on the Joint Select Committee -

His Honour the Speaker as Chairman ex officio;

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas

The hon. junior member for St. Peter and

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. If that happens.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has already been duly nominated.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

What about the hon. senior member for the City?

Mr. SPEAKER:

With regard to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown it has already been duly moved that he be one of the members of the Committee.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order. The Leader of the House has already made a motion. He has not sought leave of the House to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

He did not make a Motion. I have ruled that he rose and stated that he nominated two hon. members.

Mr. HINDS:

What did he do in respect of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That was a motion.

Mr. HINDS:

But he has not withdrawn that motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg leave to withdraw the motion. 7.40 p.m.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There cannot be three hon. members on their feet.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Bad behaviour is an easy thing for anybody. It is not a matter of brains to behave badly. You can behave badly; I can't.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Drunkenness is worse than bad behaviour.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, three hon. members were on their feet. Two of us set and that nuisance remained standing.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet. Will both please sit?

Now the Hon. Leader of the House withdrew the motion in which he had proposed one member and he has made a new motion, proposing six hon. members including the Speaker. That is the present position. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown has already been duly proposed and seconded.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order...

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order when all the hon. member has said that he is seconding the motion, because that hon. member has not yet spoken.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, he has done much more than that.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I will continue to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are three hon. members on their feet. Will all three please sit? (Hon. member sat.)

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

Seeing that all three have sat, it seems to me that there will have to be an amendment to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member suggest what amendment he has in mind?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, he has got no more rights in here than I have. You cannot say that I cannot talk and then allow him to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown rose.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On what? He cannot talk if I cannot talk.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Continuing my seconding of the motion...

Mr. HINDS:

I rose on a point of order when the hon. member was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But the hon. member has to say something.

Mr. HINDS:

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown, you said, was out of order because the hon. member had only said he was seconding the motion, but he had gone much further than that when I rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

He has not yet said anything further than that which I have heard. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I thank Your Honour.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, would you refer to the Reporter's notes to see whether he said anything more?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am satisfied that he has said nothing more than that he is seconding the motion.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

I think the procedure is very clear to me. Now that a motion has been moved and seconded...

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has spoken on the question of procedure, and that is the very point I rose on, because my suggestion is this.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I see three hon. members on their feet. All must sit. Now let us get this quite straight. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is as entitled as any other hon. member to speak. He rose and said that he rose to second the motion. He is as entitled to be heard as any hon. member on either side of the House. Hon. members must not try to make use of the expression "point of order" to prevent, however unwittingly, another hon. member from making his address when they have either spoken or have their right to speak.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order because the hon. member talked about procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point of procedure?

Mr. HINDS:

I am on a point of order. Make the hon. member sit if you are going to hear me. The procedure to be followed is exactly as operated when on the last Debates Committee all three parties were represented - the Barbados Labour Party, the Government Party and the then Barbados National Party. That is how the Committee was constituted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. HINDS:

On the question of procedure, that is what I feel should be brought into play.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point is made, but it is not a point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, you see, I am trying to make a point of order and you do not want to hear met.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am going to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, are you going to hear me on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member has no point of order to make...

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The hon. member is standing.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member make his point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

The point I want to make is simply that the hon. member was speaking and the Leader of the House got up and made a motion. Is that motion in order at this stage?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point is made.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Wait a minute; Just let me finish my point. Am I the only person who cannot talk on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member not mad? his point?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point?

Mr. HINDS:

If you are hearing the hon. member, have the other hon. member sit.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter proceed.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:

Now that a complete motion has been made and seconded, one motion must be completely disposed of before another can be acted upon. As I see it, Sir, members can continue to speak on the motion now before the House, but no other motion can be entertained before this motion is disposed of, and that is as I said at the outset. I wanted the position regularised whereby we would know how we would be proceeding. It is crystal clear to me that there is a motion to be acted upon before another motion can be entertained and subsequently disposed of.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

All I have to do for the hon. member's benefit - he has been in the Chair for a long time - is to move an amendment to his motion and get that amendment put first. Tell him if I am right or wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member moving an amendment?

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY:

In moving that amendment, I would like to say this. In the House of Commons you have 600 - odd members and maybe five members are just Liberals, but they represent a point of view. In this House I represent the point of a Party just as the Barbados Labour Party member represents the point of view of the Barbados Labour Party. The hon. member who has been nominated together with myself are, with the exception of Your Honour, the most senior members of this House. I have served on the Debates Committee for a long time. I am not rushing to serve, on the Debates Committee, but I have always felt that the Government should have a majority on any Committee, no matter what it is. 7.50 p.m.

On a Debates Committee with Your Honour as a member of the Party, you are Speaker then when you have got to maintain the status quo or be impartial; you are on a Committee. You are only just a member of a Committee and therefore with the Government having Your Honour as a member of the Committee, and two other members of the Government Party on the Committee, you have a casting vote, not an original and a casting vote, unless they provide for it in the Minutes, but in my opinion the Government should have a majority. If the Government has a majority the Opposition would have a minority, and I represent a minority Opposition. It would not seem fair to have three of an Opposition, because I am not ashamed to say, and I have never been ashamed to say what my views were in politics, and I have succeeded for 24 years, and therefore if the Government has a majority, I cannot see how you can argue that a member who all his life has been a Labour Party member but has seen fit to resign from the Labour Party, does it mean that he has changed his views? He has made that quite clear in this House and therefore as far as I am concerned nothing in the world could prevent me from nominating myself, as an amendment to the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the House, and that amendment will have to be put first.

I am going to move, therefore, that the hon. senior member for the City, representing a point of view, be nominated on this Committee. The Government has numbers; let them vote. As far as I am concerned, you have a Socialist point of view; you have a Socialist point of view over here; the hon. senior member for St. Joseph saw fit to resign from a Socialist Party; does that make him not a Socialist? Does it seem democratic in any way to exclude, because you have the numbers, one who has a different point of view? It does not prevent you from having the majority. If you do not want to have 3:3 in Opposition, it would be a matter for you how you nominate them. I beg to move that the senior member for the City be nominated. This is now actually regularising as an amendment to add the name of the

senior member for the City as an amendment to those name, moved by the Leader of the House, With the permission of the junior member for St. Peter who actually nominated me, I ask him to withdraw his motion. You have to put my name first; if you do not want to vote for it, it does not worry me.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, if I have to withdraw my motion, I withdraw it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member just cannot get up.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Thomas caught my eye first. If there is no objection to the withdrawal by the hon. junior member for St. Peter of his motion, I declare that his motion is duly withdrawn, and therefore there is an amendment to the original motion by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown be a member of this Committee. Is there any seconder to that motion?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to you, just now you told me that the senior member for St. Peter had not said anything on which a point of order could arise; is he in order on a point of order at this stage? If you rule he is in order, I will sit.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is nothing which arises now for a point of order to be made.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, do not tell me that there is nothing which arises now for a point of order to be made, because a mistake has been made in here and you sat in the Chair and allowed a mistake to be made. The hon. member got up and did not ask for permission to withdraw a motion he had made.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Anyhow, permission has been given him to withdraw it; I deem it to have been withdrawn.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to permission being given for him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have heard the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

You should not have heard him at all.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. junior member for Bridgetown addressing the Chair?

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the amendment made by the senior member for the City.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the junior member for St. Thomas wants to object to my being given leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That point of order I deem to be no point of order. There are now two motions before the House; the amendment I will put first, that the hon. senior member for the City be a member of this Committee.

The question was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows; NOES: Hon'bles J.

C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, K. N. R. HUSBANDS and N. W. BOXILL; Messers. J. B. YEARWOOD, W. R. LOWE, R. St. C. WEEKES, C. A. E. HOPPIN AND L. E. SMITH - 10

AYES:

MESSERS. ERNEST MOTTLEY, W. C. B. HINDS and ELLIOTT MOTTLEY - 3. 8. 00 p.m.

The question that the 6 hon. members proposed by the Leader of the House be appointed members of the Debates Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows: -

AYES:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WEEKES, Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. BOXILL; Mr. SMITH; Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY and Mr. HINDS - 12

NOES:

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question has resolved itself in the affirmative 12 hon. members voting "Aye" and 1 hon. member voting "No. " I now declare the "Ayes" have it.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that the House adjourn until Tuesday, 13th October this year, at 2.30 p.m.

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.

8.05 p.m.