

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13 th February, 1973

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W.C.B. HINDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon.

P. G.MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A. (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance) and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of Friday, 23rd July, 1971, Tuesday, 3rd August, 1971 and Tuesday, 30th January, 1973 are before you for confirmation.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is at this point I should draw to Your Honour's attention that until this very hour no copy of the Order Paper for today's meeting, which would include the Minutes to which Your Honour has referred, has reached my home. I must say that yesterday after making enquiries at my

office and at my home I made contact with the Clerk at his office here to learn that the Order Papers had been deposited with the Post Office since Friday afternoon. However, the Clerk advised me yesterday that he would get me a set, but I think I should draw to Your Honour's attention that I have not received an official copy of the Order Paper.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, if I may join my colleague, although I received mine by the evening post yesterday, this state of affairs is deteriorating. We are receiving the Order Papers very late on Monday afternoons and this is not satisfactory in as much as on this side of the House we do not see the Resolutions prior to the Order Paper being received by us, and it is a state of affairs we would like to see remedied. We are not blaming the Government for this defect, perhaps whoever is responsible for it should ensure that at least by Saturday the members of the House should receive their papers.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I think the complaint is a very valid one. I have been making a check with the Clerk and I intend to make a further check with the Government Printer. I have been informed that these papers were posted on Friday, so it would seem as if the post is at fault this time. Even in my own case I only received mine yesterday, so it is a valid complaint and something has to be done about it. I promise to do whatever I can about the matter. I will have a word if necessary with the Postmaster General, but this is a matter which needs very prompt attention. I regret the incident.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I share the apprehension of the hon. members over there, and as the Minister responsible for the Post Office I would like to say now that if the Clerk gets in touch with me personally when the papers come late I will make transportation available to him in order to get these papers to the members' homes. I am responsible for the Post Office and am Minister of Communications and Works, and naturally any errors or delays in the Post Office, even although technically I am not to blame for them, but parliamentarily I am responsible, and if he would just get in touch with me from now on I will place at his disposal a van - although I think he should be able to get police outriders to do it - but if he finds himself in difficulty I will make transportation available to take the papers to the members' homes. I would like to pledge that oath to you, Sir, as the Speaker who protects the rights of the minority and who is responsible ultimately for the general administration of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Confirmation of these sets of Minutes is therefore postponed.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Cabinet to lay a report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Housing Authority for the year ended 31st March, 1970.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1973.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1973.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land, at Reed Street, Bridgetown, for the purpose of improving the environs of the School Meals Centre.

I would also like to give notice of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964 be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 be now read a first time.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.15 p.m.

RESOLUTION RE DEATH OF MR. JAMES TARTON COLLYMORE RAMSAY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, before the Business of the House is commenced, I should like to pay tribute to the

passing of a very outstanding representative of this House of Assembly and a very able and constructive representative of the people of this country. I refer to the passing of the late James Tarton Collymore Ramsay of St. Barnabas. The late Mr. Ramsay has been associated with my family for some time. I have been informed that he actually worked with one of my relatives years ago, and he always made reference to that. I refer to Mrs. Rosa Cox-Earle, who was a teacher, social worker, and organist at St. Barnabas Church.

The late Mr. Ramsay was associated with members of my family and I have just quoted one, for example, but I, personally, have had a lot to do with him when I served as the first General Secretary of the Barbados Progressive League and the Barbados Labour Party in 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941 and 1942, and when I was a member of the Royal Commission in 1939. I do not know when he first ran for the House, but in 1942 when he secured a seat I was a candidate also. I appeared to be one of the good candidates, because I was put in the hardest constituency, St. James. In those days the franchise had not been lowered; there was no woman suffrage; for many other reasons we had no adult suffrage, and we were not as successful in St. James as we were where Mr. Ramsay ran and secured a seat in 1942.

He served with distinction as a member of the House of Assembly. He was a fearless and dynamic fighter. He was one of the best Labour representatives I have ever seen in this House. He was a fearless fighter and a good man who could be trusted. He was a man to his word. He made a very valuable contribution in this Chamber and did his part as far as the advancement and progress of the workers of this country are concerned at the time when the constitution was made. Everything is easy now. We are being paid for our services, but in those days nobody was paid. Everybody can jump into politics today. Tilings are easy now, because the foundation has been laid. In those days when Mr. Ramsay served, he served at a time when victimisation was the order of the day. He was an outstanding contractor in those days, and in a short space of time he lost a lot of work by attempting to represent the working class. In those days victimisation was the order of the day, but it is not so now. Apart from losing work and jobs, you would probably be locked up and incarcerated in 1937, 1938, 1939 - 1942. Those were the days when Sir Grantley Adams was President of the Barbados League and the Barbados Labour Party. It is very touching for me, because I am speaking of an old colleague of mine and of the labour movement in this country who has given very valuable service to this cause and whose passing should be regretted on all sides. I know it will be not only in Barbados, but throughout the Caribbean where Mr. Ramsay was well known among the working-class organisations.

I should like the House to join with me in the passing of the following Resolutions:

"RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy concerning the death of Mr. James Tarton Collymore Ramsay, a former Member of the House of Assembly for the parish of St. Peter.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives."

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have known Mr. Ramsay from the time I was a , small boy. He was a very dear friend of my father, and he has always remained a friend of , my family. One thing that impressed me

about Mr. Ramsay from early childhood was the sincerity of purpose and the honesty of his convictions. He was definitely a friend of the working classes and his appearance at the opening of Parliament not in a frock coat and a top hat as was the custom, but in overalls to exemplify and emphasise that he was a representative of the working classes and that he had come to Parliament elected by the working classes to represent the working classes.

Like myself, apart from our sincere convictions together and our desire to represent

the working classes together, he is one Member of Parliament who has resigned from Parliament on two occasions. If you will check the records of Parliament you will recognise that he did not, at any time, stay in Parliament for the full term of his office. I know that the Opposition will join, but I could not allow an occasion like this to go by, because I have been associated with the working-class movement since 1948, 24 years ago, with the Trade Union, as well as with the working classes.

In terms of politics, apart from the Hon. Leader of the House, there is nobody in this House of Assembly who has been in Parliament longer than I have been. I was first elected in 1956, so that when I rise to pay tribute to this great patriarch and this sincere friend of the working classes, I could not allow this occasion to pass without adding my tribute to a man whom I hope more people would emulate and endeavour to follow. May he rest in peace.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, before I rise to speak to the Resolution, just let me express my regrets that I was not, as is usual upon occasions such as these, able to catch your eye immediately after the Leader of the House has spoken, because I am sure that hon. members will understand that I mean no disrespect to Mr. Ramsay, whom I knew at least as well as the member who has just sat down, when I did not immediately rise to second the motion. It was purely an accident, because I did not anticipate that any member of this House would have got up quite so quickly to break the usual and normal practice of permitting the Leader of the Opposition to second the Resolutions of sympathy, especially in respect of hon. members who held their seats as members of the Party which I have the honour to lead.

If it pleases you, Sir, I can remember, I suppose, for all of my life Mr. James Tarton Collymore Ramsay. I am proud to think that my late father and Mr. Ramsay enjoyed a friendship which dated from the very days of the entry of both of them ; into politics, and I remember Mr. Ramsay as a frequent visitor to our house when I was a little boy so long ago that I cannot even recall my age. 12.25 p.m.

I remember the pleasure which it gave my father in particular and those of his household when Mr. Ramsay in the difficult days of the early 1940s was first elected to the House of Assembly as a member for St. Peter. Even in those early days I can remember his fearlessness, the quality of his speeches and the sincerity which he brought to the difficult task of being a representative of the workers in a Barbados which was still and yet ruled by plantocrats, especially in St. Peter which was one of the areas particularly in ferment in 1940, 1941 and 1942, an area to which perhaps first in the country side political emancipation came spreading outwards from Bridgetown. I remember Mr. Ramsay's struggles to preserve his seat against assaults from all sides. When he gave up his work further to serve the people of Barbados as a liaison officer with those Barbadians who were pioneers in being able to seek their fortunes in agricultural work in the United States of America, it was a matter of regret to his colleagues in the Barbados Labour Party, but it was realised that Mr. Ramsay was continuing to fight for the

conditions of the sugar worker whose cause he had espoused when he first came into politics.

Mr. Ramsay's departure upon the occasion of his resignation in 1945 brought another young man who was at that time an outstanding supporter of the workers of this Island. I refer to the hon. member for St. Michael West. I wish I was in a position still to call him by his name, and I regret that he is not in his seat, and the two of them together fought in the 1946 election once more under the banner of the Barbados Labour Party, and together established such a sway of the Barbados Labour Party in the parish of St. Peter that I think hon. members of the House will realise has persisted to this day.

Mr. Ramsay served the people and the Party faithfully for another couple of years, and I have much pleasure in reporting to the House that to his dying day he remained a member of the Barbados Labour Party, remained on our books and as far as he was able and as far as my recollection affords, remained a subscriber of the appropriate subscriptions. He wished the Party well at all times. He fought a great fight for the Barbados Labour Party, he fought a great fight for the people of Barbados and for the dignity of the working man of Barbados in and out of this Assembly, and it gives me the greatest pleasure on this occasion to be able to support on behalf of the Opposition the Resolution now before the Assembly.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of the fact that I now represent the constituency which was formerly represented by the late J. T. C. Ramsay, I should rise to pay tribute to such an honourable man. I want to say that I followed Mr. J. T. C. Ramsay as closely as I could from my boyhood days. I should say of him that I know Mr. Ramsay was a man who said exactly what he meant and meant exactly what he said. He had the art of interpreting the aspiration of the working class people of this country, and if it is that we can today pay tribute to success in and out of Parliament, I believe that much of it hinges on his ability to so interpret the aspirations of the people with whom he associated throughout his entire life. It is indeed a sad loss to many of us whom, even in his ailing years, he was able to counsel on very many matters of public interest, and I am sure that his many friends and admirers in the parish of St. Peter extend their sympathy to his relatives, and I pay tribute in that respect.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, it would not be befitting of me if I had allowed this Resolution to pass in connection with the death of the late J. T. C. Ramsay without paying my due respect and regards to an outstanding, straightforward, honest-minded Barbadian. In public life he was the same as in private life. If he had to tell you about a spade, it meant a spade, and his conviction was so becoming of the working class man in this Island that I remember that in 1942 when he first came to the Assembly and everyone was in his tails, Mr. J. T. C. Ramsay saw fit to prove to each and every one of us that Parliament was not made only for the elite group or any particular individual, but Parliament was made for the ones who had the potential to represent the unfortunate masses. I can remember vividly when he came up the steps in his blue overalls with his rule, hammer and square and sat in Parliament, and it was from that day onward that I made the decision to become a member of Parliament.

In his declining years I visited him on several occasions, and I always remembered his words "go forward; if you are honest you must achieve your goal!"

With those few remarks, I hope he will rest in peace and leave his fitting passwords for every Barbadian to realise that the day of reckoning will come, and if you fail to do the right thing for the

people of this Island, at that time you will pay.

Mr. SPEAKER:

To show our unanimous approval of this Resolution, and as a mark of respect to our late departed colleague, let all hon. members be upstanding.

Hon. members stood in silence one minute.

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

Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took their seats. 12.35 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 59 and 61 asked by the Hon. member for Christ Church West are ready.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 65 asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is ready.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of several questions standing in my name.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Lucy is asking leave of the House to give notice of questions standing in his name. If there are no objections leave will be granted. Leave is granted.

Mr. GREAVES:

To enquire of the Minister of Lands, Labour, National Insurance and Housing

Is the Minister aware that Government has stated that it intends to develop the River Bay area in St. Lucy along the lines of Bath development in St. John?

Can the Minister state when the Government intends to begin this development?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Is the Minister aware that when there is a heavy downpour of rain the residents of upper Pie Corner encounter difficulty in reaching their homes because of the heavy flow of water?

Is the Minister aware that many requests have been made for the construction of a Bridge to alleviate this difficulty?

Will the Minister state what findings the Surveys of the area which have been undertaken show?

And will the Minister state what Government intends to do to solve this problem?

To enquire of the Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware that the Main block in the St. Clement's Senior School does not have electricity?

Is the Minister aware that this limits the kind of visual aids which can be used in the school and at the same time causes a general inconvenience to teachers and pupils in the school?

Will the Minister ensure that this matter is rectified immediately?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Is the Minister aware that since 1954, requests have been made to Government to have a road in Graveyard, St. Lucy leading towards Air View constructed?

Is the Minister aware that the residents of this area suffer much inconvenience because of the lack of a proper road?

Will the Minister state if the Government intends to construct the road referred to above?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state when he envisages this being done?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 NO. 29 A Resolution for \$16,546 was called.

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance (1) General Administration - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 9,, I think the notes are sufficiently explanatory and that members would not require much more information from me. The position is that a sum of \$105,460 was included in the current estimates to meet payments of National Insurance contributions for this Ministry and the Departments under its control. The actual expenditure at 31st

December, 1972 has been incurred at a monthly rate of \$10,000. At this rate an additional sum of \$30,000 would be required to cover the expenditure during the period January to March 1973. With the unspent balance of \$15,460 available, the additional sum required would therefore be (\$30,000 - 15,460) i.e. \$14,540.

There is a similar note to the other one. I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 16 - Cabinet Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16 stand part. This is just a revote of money which had been voted but had not been spent.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$16,546 do now pass.

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. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr.

CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and Mr.

SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 12.45 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. Talma, seconded by Hon. G. G. Fergusson, the Resolution was read the first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next; Item I propose to deal with is Item No. 3. It stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914. I am asking for leave to deal with the matter in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted.

SAVINGS BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would provide for the increase of the salaries of the staff of the Savings Bank in accordance with the decisions of the Cabinet on the general revision of salaries and wages for the entire Public Service. This Bill should have been dealt with last week when the various Civil Establishment Orders were dealt with and the Resolutions connected therewith, because it is the same matter. This is merely to regrade the salaries of the staff at the Government Savings Bank which has to be done under a separate Bill.

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.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1-3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF
LAND NEAR BOTTOM BAY,
ST. PHILLIP**

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which, I am sure, will warm your heart. I know how very interested you were, as the representative of the Parish in ensuring that this area is reserved for the people of St. Phillip. This has been a bit long in coming, principally, because the land had several owners and, therefore there should have been several titles that Government had to investigate. In fact, we are not ourselves satisfied with the titles, and that is one reason why we are here for the compulsory acquisition of the property.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to acquire 36,400 sq.ft. It is owned by at least seven different persons. Most of this area is intended to be used for vehicular access to a beach known as Bottom Bay which had been used for several years by the residents of the Sam Lords/Well House area. About four or five years ago there were attempts to deny the residents of this area access to this beach by persons claiming the rights of ownership over the roadway. The Government could not permit this, especially since the persons had been using this beach land for some time. The matter was investigated, and we are satisfied that the area should be reserved for the people of St. Phillip and others who want to use it. It is intended to acquire this property and to put in a 26-foot wide roadway leading to the cliff and a path leading to the beach as well as to provide a parking area for at least 20 vehicles.

We have to acquire the property compulsory, principally, because the title appears to us to be defective and in the light of the time factor for negotiation with several owners, several of whom we are not yet sure about. The land was vested in deceased persons, and we are not sure in whom the title now resides.

I move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, happy to know that the Government has found it possible to bring this Resolution before the House of Assembly. As a representative of the constituency, I would be failing in my duty if I did not express my gratitude to the Government on behalf of the people of St. Phillip. You will remember, Sir, that during my term of office in the former Vestry and, subsequently, in the Local Government, I did my utmost to bring home quite forcibly to the Government that something should be done to alleviate the hardship which the people of that area had suffered through the methods which the owners of the land and the beach had used at that time. 12.55 p.m.

Since then, Sir, you and I have the honour to represent the parish, and I am indeed happy to know that

you too have done everything possible so that this Resolution could come here before us today. The people of that district and other districts in St. Phillip will never forget the Government for the consideration which has been given to them on this particular occasion.

Now, Sir, this Resolution is for the specific purpose for providing an access road and car park to the beach at Bottom Bay in the parish of St. Phillip. This Sir, is long overdue. It is a necessity. It will help the people of St. Phillip. As you are aware, Sir, people were not allowed to enter on certain private lands, and therefore could not find it possible to have seabaths; but now that my Government has found it possible to do this, I hope that people from all over the Island will visit that area to see what a lovely beach we have in the parish of St. Phillip. This Government has always done its utmost for the people, but we must realise that the resources of this Island cannot afford everything at the same time, and now that the time has come for the Government to assist the people by purchasing various portions of land, I know that you would associate yourself with me in saying how pleased we are to know that we are here at this particular time as members of this House to associate ourselves with the passing of such a Resolution.

I will also remind the Government - and I think this is the occasion to do so- that there are other beaches in St. Phillip which in my opinion it would do well if the Government would do something about them. There are Crane Beach and Foul Bay. As you are aware, people are accustomed having excursions and so on at these beaches, and I think the time has come when the Government should do something for the people at these two beaches. It is true to state that I am grateful to the Government for dealing with Bottom Bay, but I think this is the appropriate time for me to remind them of these two wonderful beaches, namely Crane Beach and Foul Bay.

Mr. Speaker, you Sir by virtue of your office are not in a position to speak on this occasion and I as your colleague take it on myself to thank the Government for what they have done for the parishioners, and I know you will be pleased for me to express your gratitude to the Government for the interest they have taken in the parish of St. Phillip.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to stray from St. Lucy to St. Phillip and to say that I am glad to see that provision is being made in a rural constituency for providing an access road and a car park to the beach up there. I happen to know this area and I consider it is one of the better areas in the island from the point of view of viewing and also from the kind of arrangement of the beach, and I know it is an interesting and enjoyable area. One thing that really struck me, and I was listening to hear whether the Minister introducing the Resolution would have made mention of it, is that I thought some provision would have been made for changing room facilities in the area, because when the area is developed, lots of people will go there, and I think we must try to develop the concept in an area where people are going to be concentrating on bathing, and this is obviously going to happen in this particular situation, and I feel that some provision should be made for people to change because not only will people who live in the immediate vicinity of Bottom Bay make use of the beach when it is developed, but people who are coming from afar, and I think the Minister should give some consideration to this kind of development. I am saying this because I am thinking that when the River Bay facilities are developed this is the kind of situation I would want to see, and that is why I say I am glad there is an effort made in this area because I hope this is a new era as it were for rural constituencies and in the not too distant future we will see a similar development or better development in my own constituency in St.

Lucy.

In congratulating you and your colleague in getting this development in this particular parish, I am appealing in a roundabout way to the Minister to treat the River Bay facilities and development as one of urgent and top priority.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, I know that St. George does not have a sea and I am proud of that. However, the situation is that I would like a statement as to the acquisition of land at Bel Air, St. George, which I have brought to his attention for some time, since the residents there have been worried as to whether or not they will have to be removed. 1.05 p.m.

Many questions have been asked on the acquisition of this land, and I have been told that the former owners no longer own this land. I am taking this opportunity to ask the Minister if he would make a statement or clear the air as to the situation at Bel Air, St. George where the residents have been wondering what the true position is, whether the Government intends to take over that land or not.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This resolution deals with the acquisition of land to give access to beaches, nothing more.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, as you have said this Resolution deals with the acquisition of land to give access to beaches, but one thing, I should like to say is that Government should bear in mind that when these facilities are provided that they should also provide facilities for human beings as well. It is indeed strange that this Resolution should come before the House after my question last week in respect of the Tent Bay area. There is quite a bit of land running along the sea front in Tent Bay which is apparently not in use, and the occupants of that area have been asking over the last ten years for bath and toilet facilities. There is also a fishing fleet which come in there, and I believe that old members of this Assembly will remember the long struggle which the people of St. Joseph had even to get a standpipe in that area because certain obstructionist attitudes by certain people in that area.

I would hope that with the purchase of this land Government will also purchase land in the Tent Bay area to create the same facilities for which this land is being acquired. I think I am well aware of the reason for the purchase of this land, to give public access to one of the few beaches which are accessible in that area. I would hope that they would do the same thing in the Tent Bay area in St. Joseph to give the residents of St. Joseph the necessary facilities which are needed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I recall a former Minister of Communications and Works coming before this House with respect to the purchase of an area of beach land to provide an access road to the beach at Prospect in St. James. I queried at the time whether or not the Minister was sure of the area of land, and I think it is on record that the Minister gave us to understand that it was an area of something like 16 feet wide. I expressed the concern over the matter at the time, and I have since been fortified in all I had been saying at that time, because what has since been provided as the access to the Prospect beach is nothing like 16 feet wide, could hardly be 8, but what is more - and I believe the present Minister of Communications and Works can bear me out now - that I understand that some hoteliers have taken it upon themselves to

encroach upon what was supposed to be part of the land we were acquiring to provide this beach access

While the Government is providing these accesses to beaches, the protection of the beaches provides some concern for Government as well, because at the same Prospect beach the hoteliers have set about to pollute the waters immediately where the access road leads to the sea. These are matters of very grave concern. It is a case where the access road to the beach goes along or very near to the boundary of the hotel, the hoteliers do not want black fishermen to pass that area, and the result is that the waste from the hotel is seen going into the water exactly where the people normally go to bathe, and these are matters I would like the Government to look into and see what can be done about them.

Whilst we are on this subject of acquiring land compulsorily, I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to tell us what progress has been made, if any, with the negotiations which were supposed to have been made with respect to acquiring land from Springhall Company Limited.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You are straying from the resolution. This is completely unconnected.

Mr. HINDS:

You have given the member for St. George North that latitude.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is within my discretion to give members latitude.

Mr. HINDS:

If you give one member latitude to discuss land purchase you have to give each and every hon. member the same latitude. I am demanding that, I am not asking for it now. This is not Trents Plantation we are discussing, it is the question of access to the beach not 22 acres of land to be given to anybody.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I noted with some surprise the remarks of the hon. member for St. Peter, and I hope that if he is aware of any pollution which is being deliberately or accidentally dumped by hoteliers on areas which are public areas that he will bring it to the attention of the authorities. I do not know of any of this, maybe the Minister of Health or the Minister of Lands is aware of it, but if he is aware of it let us have these facts. I think he owes it to the public to bring these facts to them when he makes these allegations.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I propose to deal with Item No. 4. It is to move the Honourable the House of Assembly to adopt the Report of the Standing Orders Committee which was presented on the 12th December, 1972. I think that hon. members have had ample time to peruse the various amendments which have

been made by the Standing Orders Committee, and I think we should be ready to deal with the matter at this stage. We have certain amendments which I would like to have incorporated, and which I intend moving at the appropriate stage. The amendments which I propose to move are not very substantial. They relate to the change of time of the sitting of the House from 12 noon to 9.30 p.m., and the moment of interruption being 9 o'clock instead of 12 noon to 11 and the moment of interruption being at "12.30", as recommended by the Standing Orders Committee.

Question Time is being changed from "2.45" to "3.25" in lieu of "2.45" to "3.45", and Private Members' Time from "3.15" to "4.45" instead of as recommended by the Standing Orders Committee.

In Standing Order No. 30(1), delete the words "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister." These amendments are very straight forward and simple, and it does not take much time to settle them. Although the time has been agreed upon between the Union representing the Reporters and the Government, the time is fixed and it should-net be later than 11 'clock. After further consideration, it was felt that the time should be changed from 12 noon to 9.30 p.m. and not 11 o'clock. In reality, the body of the amendments are approved, but a little adjustment has been made to the time.

So far as the amendments to Standing Order 30(1) are concerned, it would appear that, on the advice of one of the members of the Committee, this was inserted, and I think it was copied from the Canadian Standing Orders. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may be able to throw light on it. The amendment says "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister." It seems as though in certain Parliaments some member supports the Minister after he has spoken. We have deleted that and it is only the Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition and Ministers who will be allowed to speak for longer than the prescribed times.

We propose to deal with this matter in order to get it out of the way. It has been pending very long, and we have been deferring consideration of the matter week after week. We have given ample time to members of the Opposition to peruse the Standing Orders and submit amendments. Copies of all the amendments were sent to all members of the House, including the members who were not members of the Standing Orders Committee, many weeks ago. It could not be said that they are not aware of the contents of the amendments. We have adopted that strategy in order that members may be au fait with the amendments made by the Standing Orders Committee. Hon. members were aware of them long before they were laid in here, and they should be in a position to say what other further amendments they would wish to make.

I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour pleases, Item No. 4 is an Item which asks the House to adopt the Report of the Standing Orders Committee, but it should be noted by the House that, during the deliberations of that Report I particularly reserved my position and said that I would make the matter of the proposed Standing Order 39(10) the matter of a Minority Report. No Minority Report to that effect has been submitted to me for my signature. Your Honour will well remember that reference to the proceedings

will certainly reveal that this point was reserved.

I am informed that it has been many years since a Committee such as this has had to sit, and I was not present in the House at that time. I am also informed that the standard procedure in Committees such as this dealing with the Standing Orders is that all members of the Committee are invited to sign the Report. There is a practice by which if you sign the Report, then you are not heard to make amendments to it and so on. It is also the practice that when you have concurred in a Report such as this, then you are not heard by the House to seek to vary its terms and that you should leave that to members who were not members of the Committee. I am, therefore, querying whether the Report of the Standing Orders Committee is rightly before the House. This has been queried informally, but no opportunity to make formal objection has yet presented itself to Private Members of the House and to Members who are not Members of the Committee. Certainly I am going to say at the earliest possible stage that I intend to move the deletion of the proposed Standing Order 39(10), and I will give constitutional reasons for so doing. I am not going to be bound by any Report in so moving. I have not signed the Report of the Committee as a whole, nor has the Minority Report, which I particularly asked to have prepared, been submitted to me for my signature. I am, therefore, not holding myself bound in any way, if Your Honour allows debate to proceed upon the Motion which has just been moved and on the document which has been circulated for some weeks. I think I am correct in saying that all members of the Standing Orders Committee who sit on this side of the House, that is, the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown, the hon. member for St. Peter, and the hon. member for Christ Church West - all of us reserve the right to oppose all or any of the provisions of the present Standing Orders. 1.25 p.m.

We have not had the Report presented to us for signature and my Minority Report has not been prepared despite specific requests and we are not regarding ourselves as bound by the terms of the circulated document.

Mr. SPEAKER:

My ruling is that the Report is properly before the House. I have signed it on behalf of members who comprised that Committee, and it is entirely up to the members who comprised that Committee to move amendments at this stage or any other stage.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to get the records straight. Your Honour said that you signed on behalf of all members, but I would like my position made clear on this. You signed on my behalf but not at my request. Let it be straight on the records.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to make it known that Your Honour in stating that you signed on behalf of the members of the Select Committee did not sign on my behalf because I did not so instruct you, and I do not hold myself in any respect bound by anything that Your Honour found yourself inclined to do in that behalf.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, it is appalling to listen to the sort of arguments and statements which are being made. Members of the Opposition who are members of the Debates Committee absented themselves on numerous occasions, and now they come in here and say that when a

report is signed, it is signed on their behalf. They had an opportunity to be present to make their contributions. I sympathise in this respect with the Leader of the Opposition because he made an invaluable contribution in the various amendments to the Standing Orders. He did in my opinion a most outstanding work and we owe a great debt of gratitude to the Leader of the Opposition who did a lot of research into Canadian Parliament, Australian, Jamaica, Trinidad, Ireland and many other places, but his colleagues are manoeuvring and he is hamstrung. Having made a valuable contribution at a time when we needed him, today he finds himself hamstrung and he has to go ahead with his colleagues. I cannot explain how I feel, but they were members of the Committee and if they want to say that you as Chairman could not sign for them, the whole thing is reprehensible and wrong. If for no other reason, I intend to proceed with these amendments as we have vetted by our Party even though they are minor amendments, and proceed with the amendments today and the passing of the revised Standing Orders in order to be in time to deal effectively and constructively with the people's business at Estimates time in the consideration of our Appropriation Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to have been interpreted that the Leader of the House has replied, but I did not take it that he had replied because all hon. members had not exercised their right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the House has replied, but I thought the hon. member was rising on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT:

If you rule that the Leader of the House has replied, I accept that.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order ...

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the House has replied.

Mr. ADAMS:

The point of order is very simple. It is there in Erskine May's.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will permit the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

The point of order is that I am submitting that any member of the Committee, once he has put on record his observations and conclusions, is at liberty either to propose an alternative draft report or to move an amendment to the question for reading the draft report. So there is no question of being hamstrung. I am only hamstrung by the ignorance of those who put in Standing Order No, 39(10).

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made his point.

The question that the Report of the Standing Orders Committee be the instant Order of the Day was

put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows;-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DAC. EDWARDS; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WALCOTT; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. MORRISON - 10.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. MOTTLEY Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 5.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, before the Minister gets up, I should just like it to be known that the Opposition also gave notice of amendments, but we are having them done now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is open to members at any stage to move amendments.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am telling hon. members that they will be circulated shortly. That is all.

ADOPTION OF REPORT OF STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, there are certain proposed amendments which I intend moving to the new Standing Orders. In Standing Order No. 6(2) on page 6, line 4, delete "11" and substitute "9.30" therefor. In Standing Order No. 6(4) on page 6, line 1, delete "10.30" and substitute "9.00" therefor. In Standing Order No. 6(6) on page 7, delete "11" and substitute "9.30" therefor. In Standing Order No. 6(8) on page 7, line 6, delete "10.30" and substitute "9.00" therefor. In Standing Order No. 16(4) on page 20, line 2, delete "3.45" and substitute "3.15" therefor. In Standing Order No. 18(3) on page 23, line 6, delete "8.00" and substitute "6.30" therefor. In Standing Order No. 18(4) on page 23, in line 1, delete "10.30" and substitute "9.00" therefor; in line 3, delete "8.00" and substitute "6.30" therefor and line 6, delete "10.30" and substitute "9.00" therefor. In Standing Order No. 20(3) on page 24, line 3, delete "5.45" and substitute "4.45" therefor and in Standing Order No. 30(1) on page 38, lines 6 and 7, delete the words "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister" and insert a full stop immediately after the word "Opposition" in line 6. 1.35 p.m.

Page 38, lines 6 and 7, delete the words "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister" and insert a full stop immediately after the word "Opposition" in line 6.

These are all the amendments, they are quite straightforward and simple, copies have been circulated, and members are aware of what the proposed amendments are. I beg to move that the report of the Standing Orders Committee as amended be adopted.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

If Your Honour pleases, the Standing Orders Committee report comes before the House in paragraphs. It has always, in my respectful submission to Your Honour, been the case that you treat paragraphs of reports as you treat sections of a Bill. It will be much easier anyway. I am suggesting to the Leader of the House that we have a little order in this respect, because we will never get through anything if the Leader of the House's amendments are put, our amendments are put and we adopt several Standing Orders like that.

I am respectfully suggesting that the Report be taken seriatim, otherwise we will talk till 6 o'clock and nobody would know on what Standing Order we are speaking. The form in which the report comes around says that the Committee have the honour to recommend that the revised Standing Orders submitted herewith to the House as part of this report be adopted as the Standing Orders of the Honourable House of Assembly. You may deal with these as a Schedule to the report, go through them one by one and decide on them. I urge upon the consideration of the House that we will get through more quickly and more relevantly this way, because we will separate the chaff from the wheat, we will separate the Standing Orders on which there is no controversy, such as Standing Orders 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, from the others.

Before we move the adoption of the report, the question may be put order by order relating to the Schedule. It is impossible to ask hon. members to pass 76 Standing Orders in one speech, so to speak, because really if every member is allowed to make only one speech - because that is the significant point - on 76 Standing Orders, we will not finish in here today during the time we have, and we will have a lot of interruptions and so on. I know of no provision to amend a Committee's report in that manner, and I am urging on the House that we take them one by one, that a series of motions be made that paragraph one of the Standing Orders be accepted, paragraph two and so on. Can the Leader of the House give any elucidation on this or would be like me to make a speech now on Standing Order 76? If I can make another suggestion to the Leader of the House, why does he not move the amendments one by one even if he does not think it possible to go through the Standing Orders?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir, the hon. members are at liberty to speak on any of the proposed amendments or on all. The fact that they are being moved together does not mean that they cannot speak on all, the Speaker is in the Chair and the House is sitting on this basis. I have given the report of a Select Committee appointed to go into the Standing Orders, there are certain consequential amendments which we have to make and other amendments and we have done that. The hon. member has his amendments which we will consider and probably incorporate them and finish. We are not expecting you to move them one by one, you can speak on any or on all the amendments. This is how I understand matters are dealt with which come from a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Opposition could crystalise his statement by moving a counter motion.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, the Leader of the House says that there are certain consequential amendments which have got to be dealt with. I do not really understand this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, what I said was this.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, he has not allowed me to finish what I was saying.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet. Please sit down.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, what I am asking is how there can be consequential amendments to the Committee's report that the Committee itself does not know about. What has just been handed to us is a list of amendments which have been made without the Committee's amendments.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member will give way, Mr. Speaker, there are certain amendments which we have which would require a change right through and which we have in this finished form now. The amendments which we brought would make certain consequential amendments necessary right through the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point has been made to move the Standing Orders seriatim.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I wish to move an amendment to the motion moved by the Leader of the House, that all the words of his motion starting from "Standing Order 16" down to "Opposition" in line 6 be deleted. In other words, I am asking to move that at this stage we only discuss Standing Order 6. This is the kind of time when I wish the Prime Minister was in here, because the Prime Minister unlike some of the loud mouthed members on his side can see things quickly and has been in the House for a long enough period to know how things are done. I do not want to reflect on the member for St. Michael South Central.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to the loud mouthed members on this side in one breath and in the next breath he referred to the member for St. Michael South Central. I ask that he be made to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not think it is necessary for him to withdraw those remarks. 1,45 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I have not seen the motion which the Leader of the House has moved, but I would move the deletion of those parts of the amendments which he proposes after Standing Order 16.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is that motion seconded? Mr. BOLDEN I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, we have no objection whatsoever to.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to get this matter straight. A motion has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the House and seconded. You have not yet permitted a debate to take place on the motion that has been moved. You are now allowing the hon. Leader of the Opposition to introduce another motion which has been seconded, and I am not clear on what I must speak. If you have two motions before the House, and you have not yet dealt with the substantive motion that has been moved and has not been debated and the only person who has spoken on this motion is the Leader of the Opposition, then I want to get the procedure straight. You have two motions before the House and this is a topsy-turvy affair. You have two motions on which four persons have spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think what has happened is that there is already a motion before the House to which an amendment has been moved. It seems to me to be quite proper that those who espouse the views of one motion may speak, and those who espouse the views of the other motion may speak, and then they will be voted on. It is quite simple.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. member cannot make an amendment to a motion when he is speaking on a substantive motion, unless he is concluding his speech. He cannot get up, make a motion, and then look around for someone to second it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I rule that the hon. member is speaking on an amendment to the substantive motion.

Mr. WALCOTT:

There cannot be an amendment to the substantive motion, when the motion before the House is that we accept a Report. The hon. member is speaking on that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member take his seat. I am grateful for all the assistance given. I have already ruled that the Leader of the Opposition is speaking on the amendment to the substantive motion which the Hon. Leader of the House has moved.

Mr. WALGOTT:

I want a ruling on that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled. The hon. member must take his seat; the hon. member is out of order. I would ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to continue.

Mr. HINDS rose-Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time.

Mr. ADAMS rose

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Leader of the House has made a motion, and I think I would have the right to speak on that motion. When the Leader of the Opposition makes a counter motion, I would also then have the right to speak on his counter motion. As I understand it, in your ruling you seem to be denying hon. members of their rights, and I am sure you would not like to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is certainly not the intention.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I really cannot understand what is the counter motion before the House. I would like some assistance in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Perhaps if the hon. member would sit, he would understand the position.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, we all want the Standing Orders to be discussed in here. You, Sir, and I believe, are aware of what would be the most convenient means of discussion. It seems to me that my counter motion will not be the most convenient means, and I am withdrawing it. I propose to speak on the main motion,

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objections, leave is granted to withdraw the counter motion.

Mr. ADAMS:

Now, Sir, the Standing Orders comprise of a document with some 76 paragraphs, many of which deal with different subjects. In due course one or another of the members of the? Opposition is going to move amendments to three Standing Orders. We already have amendments to 5 Standing Orders by the Leader of the House. Now, to my mind, Sir, the procedure by which when you are dealing with a matter divided into many parts is that it is dealt with seriatim. It is not a procedure designed to help the Opposition, or to help obstructionists. It is a procedure designed to help those who wish to get the matter through.

As it happens, upon this occasion, the interests of the Opposition coincide with the interests of the Leader of the House, because we believe that some of the amendments have merit and some have no merit. We believe that some of the amendments which we intend to propose have merit, and that the merit will be seen by some hon. members on the other side. We are being forced by obstructionists on that side of the House to debate these Standing Orders in the method most inconvenient for the proper transaction of the business. We are being forced by lack of understanding and a closing of the mind by deciding and going about a debate such as this.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to the fact that the hon. member is backing the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is quite in order to go and sit beside another member.

Mr. ADAMS:

None of us in any way wishes, I am sure, Sir, to obstruct the business of these Standing Orders. If you go through these Standing Orders, taking these amendments one by one, we will finish by tea time. If you go through the Standing Orders any other way, you will have to come back here tomorrow. There are certain people who, perhaps, want to impose their will on others more sensible than they but also more retiring and less interested in a fight. I would advise the members of the Cabinet not to be dragged by someone, who can hardly lead himself far less lead members of this hon. House, to a mature and proper consideration of what is to be done.

Now, certain amendments have been moved to these Standing Orders. I will deal with all of the Standing Orders which are in doubt, Sir. Standing Order 6 is doubted by the Government, because it is known that the Reporters, by Union agreement, cannot be here after ten o'clock and, therefore, commonsense tells you that there is no point making provision for the House to sit until eleven o'clock. I know, as a member of the Debates Committee, and the member for St. Peter will join with me - we are aware that the Reporters' agreement relates to eleven o'clock. This figure of eleven o'clock was fixed a long time ago. It was not fixed by this Committee; it was merely adopted by them, and I believe that events have overtaken us since then. Therefore, we are prepared to agree with that.

As far as the next Standing Order is concerned, Standing Order 16, Question Time was proposed to last to "3.45". It is now proposed that it should end at "3.15", as at present. We would not agree with this, and we would wish to divide the House on this narrow point. 1.55 p.m.

If hon. members on that side wish to say that Question Time should only last half an hour, or whatever, rather than an hour, let them vote for it and give us the opportunity to divide the House. It is a matter which is a clear matter of principle, and need occupy no time.

The next thing is "Adjournment - Definite Matter of Urgent Public Importance." It is commonsense that if you are taking one and a half hours of the sitting time in the evening that you have one and a half hours of the interruption time for adjournment on a definite matter of urgent public importance. We in the Opposition will vote for this.

The next Standing Order which I suppose is consequential is Standing Order No. 18(4) relating I suppose to times of interruption.

The next Standing Order is Standing Order No. 20 in which you are changing "5.45" to "4.45" It is the same objection which we on this side would make to the shortening of Question Time and to Private Members' Business, and we would wish to divide the House on that.

The final thing is that the new Standing Order No. 30 appears to be the result of a misunderstanding by

members on the other side,, certainly by the Leader of the House because the Leader of the House introduced this deletion of "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister" upon the grounds that that seemed to envisage that a member of the Government might speak after the Minister and be unlimited. That is not what it envisages. That envisages the principle of delegation by the Leader of the Opposition. That is what is embraced in those words. If I may read the Order as proposed by the Committee, it reads as follows: -

"In a debate on a Government Order, a Member may speak for 30 minutes, except on third reading of a bill when a Member may speak for 15 minutes, provided that these time limits shall not apply to the Prime Minister, a Minister moving a Government Order, the Leader of the Opposition or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister."

This does not embody the ideas of anybody on this side particularly. It embodies the idea of the hon. member for St. Michael North-West who was the first person to suggest things along this line, and it embodies the words of a Canadian Standing Order which recognises that the Leader of the Opposition does not reply to every Minister; it recognises the principle of Shadow Ministries. The member speaking next in reply after the Minister is the Shadow Minister, and the principle is accepted that the Shadow Minister will also not be time limited. If the Leader of the Opposition is not here for example, or if he is here and does not wish to take part in the debate, obviously he will delegate the right of immediate reply to the Minister to one of the Members of the Opposition. The Leader of the House seems to have a misunderstanding when he said that the member speaking in reply next after the Minister would be a Government member. That is not correct.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I may have misinterpreted it, but I would expect that even if the Leader of the Opposition is not here, the Deputy Leader takes his place as we understand it, but how would we be in a position to know which member has been delegated the authority to speak as a Shadow Minister on what subject? What we know is that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition carries on in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed. QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time. I recall that the answers to Questions Nos. 59, 61 and 65 are ready.

Hon.C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who asked Questions Nos. 59 and 61 is not in his seat and I ask that

the replies be laid.

QUESTION RE NEW POST OFFICE IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 65 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

"To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

What plans does the Government now have for a new post office in St. Thomas?"

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows

"The Government is investigating the possibility of acquiring an area of land at Welchman Hall for the construction of a new post office as a replacement for the existing post office at Rock Hall."

Mr, ADAMS:

May I congratulate the Minister on, after so many years, taking the advice of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and now the only member of St. Thomas in placing the Post Office at Welchman Hall?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a supplementary.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am thanking him.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is entirely out of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

May I ask the Minister how soon he expects the acquisition to be concluded and construction would start?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

That would depend on the acquisition of the land by the Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance.

Mr. ADAMS:

Will the Minister consider making the facilities of the new St. Thomas sub post office also available to persons in Sugar Hill, St. Joseph for whom it may be a good deal nearer than the post office in Horse Hill?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not a proper supplementary. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Private Members' Business time.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the first Item under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member say what is Order No. 5?

Mr. ADAMS:

It is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952. On the last occasion the hon. and charming member for St. Michael North East was speaking.

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

IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. SPEAKER:

When time expired on the last occasion, the hon. member for St. Michael North East was addressing the House.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I seem to be getting some glowing compliments from the member for St. Thomas. When last I was speaking on this matter, I was showing that I did not agree that the foreign, husbands of Barbadian women should have the privilege of coming into Barbados freely. I should have thought that the Leader of the Opposition as a Barbadian - and I have often thought of him to be a very dedicated Barbadian - would be the last person to have proposed such an amendment to the Immigration Act knowing the unemployment situation in Barbados, and I would have thought that such a dedicated

Barbadian would have realised that this is something that should be fought by women at an international level. 2.40 p.m.

It is an international law and it not only affects Barbados but all international countries. As I said previously, I could not see how a small country like Barbados with such a large population could open its doors to foreign husbands of Barbadian women. Under the law as it stands now, certain concessions are given to foreign husbands of Barbadian women, if those husbands have special skills and they are needed to promote Barbados and to help in any way that they can. The Government is very lenient in this respect to make sure that the husbands come into Barbados with their families. As I said before, if a

man is the master of his land in this country as well as in another country, Barbadian women should be satisfied to make their homes in their husbands' land. If they are not satisfied there are several organisations which can take up their appeal at an international level and deal with it, but I cannot see how the hon. member for St. Thomas could expect the Government just to open the doors and accept them like this.

I am a woman and I would hate to think that even if I were to remarry - because the hon. member said that if my husband should die I might wish to marry a foreigner - but even if this should happen I would have to think clearly and remember that my husband should be able to take me to his homeland and support me. I should think very clearly when making that second step that it is not a step for love but one for security, and I should think that my country would not be able to take care of an alien. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is all right for women to think of their marriage to foreign husbands and that they would want their husbands to come to Barbados. I can see why they would like this, because they do not want to be separated from their husbands, but they must first remember that when they marry and they take those vows they are the ones to go where their husbands have their rights and privileges as men. I do not think that any man would want to come into Barbados and be a second class citizen, because the wife should be able to support him if he cannot get a job. How many men are privileged to have women who can support them? If I had to take the second step I may be able to say I can support a foreign man, but if I am not in a position to do that I would have to be one who decides to live in my husband's country and accept his nationality.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want anyone to think that as a woman I cannot see the reason why women would like their foreign husbands to live here, I know that some women would like to return to Barbados with their families who are poor and cannot support them, and I am in sympathy with such women because when these women have their husbands miles away, temptation can be very great and it can cause total separation, because the man may find someone else in his homeland or the woman may do the same, but you have got to be realistic, we have to think as true Barbadians, we have to think of our country, a small country of 166 square miles. We have to think of our men folk, we have to think of our school children, so many boys who are leaving school yearly. Can we provide the jobs for them? We have to look at the young able-bodied men who are unemployed. What must this Government do, Mr. Speaker? This Government has to stay in power, this Government cannot just open our doors and take in every foreign husband; if it were to do this, when these men come in and take the jobs away from our sons or from the Barbadian men who are now out of work, what are we leaving them to do? It is all right for the Leader of the Opposition to come in here and ask us to amend the Immigration Act to bring in the foreign husbands of Barbadian wives, because he is on the opposite side; were he sitting on this side I think the story would be quite a different one.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I give the House my assurance that when I am sitting on that side the story will be the same.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot see how I can vote for this amendment, it will be against my principle and I could be considered as one who is not really nationalistic. I am very proud of my country, my people, my Barbadian men, and I would wish that my Barbadian men would be just as proud of their country. I am sure that my Barbadian men, although they would not be against the foreigners coming here, would not want the place flooded with all foreigners and I would say that representing the lower classes as I do, I know that the women of that bracket would be the last ones to think that Gertz Eastmond would vote for such an amendment. 2.50 p.m.

These women, as it were right now, cannot entertain marrying foreign husbands; they cannot even entertain marrying Barbadian husbands, they have it so hard. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be voting for this amendment as a Barbadian woman.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never intended taking any part in this debate, but when my colleague referred to the charming member for St. Michael North East, I would go a bit further and pay her a greater compliment. I would say the courageous member for St. Michael North East, because I am convinced that you have to be courageous to get up in here and talk the amount of nonsense the hon. member has just dished out here.

In the first place, the hon. lady said that she was proud of here Barbadian men, but I thought she would have gone on to say that she is proud of her Barbadian men bringing in foreign women, but she is not proud of her Barbadian women bringing in foreign men.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the then Minister of Home Affairs once said in here that it was a matter of a divided opinion as to whether Barbadian women marrying foreign men and allowing them to work and live in Barbados and vice-versa. Now, I share the views of the Opposition on this matter. We have young women leaving Barbados and going abroad to study. In these challenging days, they are taking up skills that men, several years ago, had taken up. You have young women coming back here as doctors, lawyers, and very soon you will see them back here, probably, as engineers. In the Air Traffic Control Office at Seawell Airport you have girls there doing the jobs which were originally done by men. You have girls winning Barbadian scholarships and going abroad to study. Are we to believe that when these girls leave Barbados to go abroad and study, that they must do so with the understanding that they should not marry a foreigner and bring him back to Barbados? That is nonsense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have | girls who have gone away to do Nursing. They might be away for fourteen or fifteen years, and they have to come back here to take care of their old parents. In the circumstances, they cannot be married to anybody abroad other than a Barbadian. If they marry foreigners then, they will not be able to bring them to Barbados, because their husbands might not be allowed to work here and they may have to work and support their husbands. I feel that it is a discriminatory act to allow Barbadian men to go abroad, to marry foreign women and bring them back to Barbados where we have several thousand young women who cannot get work in Barbados.

However, you are allowing Barbadian men to go abroad, marry foreign women and bring them back here, if I may use the same term used by the hon. Lady member, to flood the market. You are asking all young girls here to sit back and allow foreign women who are married to Barbadians to come to

Barbados. In the same breath you are telling the Barbadian girls that when they go abroad they must not marry foreigners and bring them here, and they should only marry Barbadian nationals. This is nothing else but discrimination against Barbadian women. That is my view.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think a woman should be allowed to make her choice, whether it be an Italian, an American, a German or an Englishman. She should be allowed to marry whoever she wants and to bring her husband to Barbados with her. I feel that her husband should have the right to make a contribution in Barbados whether he is a doctor, engineer, printer, fisherman or road sweeper. If he is not allowed to make a contribution, then you will be discriminating against the women.

I, seriously, think that because an amendment of this nature comes from this side of the House, the members on the Government's side would oppose it. It is a reasonable amendment. You have girls who go abroad, they work in hospitals for several years, they fall in love and get married to men, and when they are ready to come back to Barbados they are unable to do so, because their husbands would not be able to work here. If they decide to return to Barbados, then they would have to work and support their husbands. On the other hand, a Barbadian can marry a foreign woman, bring her to Barbados and she will be given a job here. This is clearly an act of discrimination, and it is a bad piece of legislation.

The Leader of the Opposition has brought this matter forcibly to the attention of Parliament. I hope I am not speaking out of context, but he pointed out that in the United States of America Barbadian men go to the United States on the Immigration Scheme, and marry American women in order to get back to America. America is a highly developed country and it does not prohibit something of that nature, but in Barbados you are trying to stop it. I do not see why you should tell a girl to whom she must be married. If that is the case, when a girl is given a Barbadian scholarship this sort of thing should be incorporated in the agreement. She should be told that, if she decided to marry anybody other than a Barbadian national, her husband might not be allowed to work and live in Barbados. Some of these girls who go abroad may be married to someone who can make a contribution to some particular skill in Barbados, and you may be denying Barbados of this particular skill. I hope that there will be a change of heart on the other side. (Asides)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he says he is married to a doctor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Mr. CRAIG:

If the shoe had been on the other foot, it would have been a different matter. Mr. Deputy Speaker, why do you not ask the hon. member to stop heckling? If it were a Barbadian girl who went abroad, and the minister was a foreigner and a lawyer and he wanted to come back to Barbados with his wife, the same Minister would have said that the law was wrong. He would want to know what kind of bogus law we have here.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he cannot tell me what I would be crying out. In any country in which I live, with the ability God has given me, I can make a living. If I were English, I could make a living in England; if I were living in Timbuctu, I could make a living there. What would I have to come to

Barbados for if I were an Englishman? Exept on holiday.

Mr. CRAIG:

If I were in your position, I would not have left Barbados. I would have lived in Barbados all of my life, and I would not have had to run out of Barbados. Apparently, you were not doing very well in Barbados and that is why you ran out!

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was one of the best criminal lawyers in Barbados. When I left here I had a good practice and was making money. You can go to the Bar and ask about it. I used to get all of the Sessions cases in town.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member please take his seat. I should like to hear about the Immigration Act;

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never heard of the hon. Member as an outstanding lawyer!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I want to hear something about Item 5.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

You must be a country boy.

Mr. CRAIG:

I was interrupted by a Minister, who seems to be an authority on all subjects. I hope that members on the other side will view this matter positively, and give it the necessary consideration it deserves. 3 p.m.

There are 17 males and one lady member on the other side. They may have three or four girls who go abroad and marry, and we are to take this into consideration. Some of them would like to see their grandchildren, but the daughter cannot come back to Barbados because she would have to bring her husband with her and support him; so you would be putting an extra burden on the woman. I hope that hon. members would not view this as an amendment coming from the Opposition bench, but in the manner in which it should be viewed for the purpose of not discriminating against Barbadian women, because to my mind it is just a part of discrimination. It is only some additional measure which they are using against the women folk of Barbados.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the effect of this amendment if it is accepted by this Honourable House would be to remove the husbands of Barbadian women from the category of being prohibited persons, and I think members should view the Bill as a Bill which has been moved for a very limited purpose on this occasion and which in terms of principle should be accepted. It is very difficult, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to sell the idea of equality of the sexes. Indeed one finds that the most normally liberal minded of persons put the shutters up every time a suggestion comes forward which seems to offer to female persons equal rights with the males. This does not surprise me. It has been a historical attitude for several centuries by many people, and indeed part of the problem has been that the educational system in our country and

indeed throughout the world has conditioned us to think in terms of people as segregated into the categories of male and female, with the female having traditional roles to perform and the male having traditional roles and obligations to perform and to carry, and I think why it is so difficult for a Government to accept an

amendment such as this is because first it is confronted with the traditional role expected of the male in society, and secondly it has the fear which is expressed by the hon. member for St. Michael North East, I think, that if one opens the door you are letting in a flood of people. But it fails to remember that there is at stake a fundamental principle that is, are women to be treated as human beings or are they to be continually discriminated against?

As our Immigration Act stands there is no doubt that it does, like our Citizenship Act, discriminate against the female sex. This amendment removes only one; discrimination, and it is easy to show from one example how this discrimination works. A girl of Barbadian parentage with all her connections in this Island wins a scholarship which obligates her to return to her country and work and give her services and talents to the country. She is like any normal human being male or female of course prone to fall in love. She falls in love and does the correct thing; she gets married, she does not, as she is entitled to do like any normal human being, choose her husband by virtue of his nationality, but rather because cupid has struck her and she feels she should be married to him. She finds herself at a disadvantage as compared with her brother who has gone abroad to England, who is likewise obligated, who wins a scholarship, who comes back to offer his talents, who has also been stricken by Cupid, who marries a girl of foreign nationality and whose wife comes here and automatically is entitled under our Constitution to citizenship, subject only to two limitations, almost as a right she has a strong privilege, and secondly who is not a prohibited immigrant under the Immigration laws of Barbados.

I could not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a matter of principle, support any law in this country which discriminates in this way between two normal healthy Barbadian young people at all, who have the right to choose in my view as Bajans whether or not they want to live in this country. I think on this Bill as it stands, although it is a limited amendment, it does strike at this fundamental principle. I agree that Government might say at this time that they have not got the figures, but that is no reason for denying that a principle is at stake, and that throughout the whole progressive world today the trend has been towards removing the vestiges of discrimination against our female folk. We must be progressive in this sense. Of course we owe an obligation to the people of Barbados and we owe an obligation to see that our employment opportunities advance, if you want to use the word. We owe an obligation to our men folk to see that there are employment opportunities for them coming out of the schools, and also for their wives regardless of whether their wives happen to be local or foreign wives, but we also owe an equal obligation to our women to see that there are opportunities for them, and if it is their lot and their good fortune sometimes to marry someone who is not from their own country, we owe an obligation to see that this is not held against them.

I think hon. members have disclosed their interest in so far as stating that they are married to foreign wives. I have the good fortune of belonging to this category of persons, and I am glad that it was never held against my wife, the fact that she married me, because if the legislation was otherwise, she may well have found herself in the category of prohibited persons. Mr. Deputy Speaker, could we really on a matter of principle see that there is anything wrong with an amendment which seems to equalise the position? I am appealing to hon. members to look at the position as a matter of principle and as a matter

of progressive thinking.

I am not concerned with the fact that the country may have made an error of giving the Government eighteen members. Thank God it did not confer on them all the intelligence to bring every progressive measure to the House, and having brought progressive measures to them, the Government should be wise enough to see it and to accept the amendment. I should like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it takes all my lifetime to convince this Government or any Government that may come after of the righteousness of the cause of women, and if it takes all of my lifetime and my energy to convince the men of Barbados that they must not discriminate against their women folk, I give you this pledge in this Honourable House that I intend to do that on their behalf, because I have been convinced for several years from the time I have been accustomed to thinking on these things, and as a matter of fundamental principle with me I can see no reason why women should be treated differently from men. There are many other categories of persons that we should deem prohibited persons who have many facilities in coming here and getting into the country easily, but instead we do not look at them in this light. If I asked the Government today to give me the statistics on the number of such persons immediately who would fall into this category, they do not have it, and yet they would vote against the Bill with some unknown fear that every Bajan woman is waiting to run overseas and marry a foreign man and bring him back to her country. 3.10 p.m.

If this is so, this is the failure of Bajan men to convince their women that they are fit, able and proper persons to become husbands. I do not concede for one moment that this is so, I think that Bajan men are equal to some of their rights and some of their obligations. Some will fall down sometimes in some respects, but this is no reason why they should continue to dominate their women and keep them in the position of subjection, and I am again appealing to the Government not to take a hard line in this matter, to look at the matter as a question of discrimination or non-discrimination and to have an open mind on the issue. At least send it to a Select Committee for consideration, take evidence on the matter so that they will have all the evidence available to them before deciding whether to accept the measure on the third reading of the Bill or not. This is what I am asking them to do, Sir, because it does make some inroads towards equalising the position in this country. I do not want to speak outside the four corners of this Bill, but I think the principle of this Bill is absolutely clear, it is a correct principle, and I urge the amendment on the Government very strongly.

Mr. MORRISON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to think that in a matter of this kind legislation should not be brought in for a small sectional interest of the community. I would like to think that in dealing with everyday matters we should bring legislation to accommodate the majority of the people, but since in these things there are very few people involved - because I believe that 99% of the women in this country are married to Barbadians and about 1% are married to foreigners - I think it is too narrow a principle to ask us to amend the Immigration Act.

I believe that those persons who are involved should be dealt with more by the Ministry of Home Affairs on an individual basis, because I do not think it is the duty of any of us to sit down here to deal with this now, because there are more important matters of sectional interest to this country which are being neglected and which nobody has spoken about, and this is not the place to bring the small sectional factions to bear on the whole House of Assembly. The hon. member for Christ Church West mentioned the fact that Barbados Scholars go abroad to study and meet people there, but to my mind this

seems to be a case being made for the people who are better off in our community, who are married to foreign people and who they would like to see bring their foreign husbands there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have some very strong ideas not only about Barbadian women who marry foreign men but about Barbadian men who marry foreign women, because it is most of these scholars who go out to study on the taxpayers' money who do not see it fit to marry someone from their own country to uplift them. I am very strong on this, because if it is these people to whom this amendment is directed, then I am not for it at all. I am sure that if there were poor people in this country who had the same problems as probably experienced by the intellectuals this would not have been brought here, because there are some small people in this country who are married to foreigners and it has not been mentioned before, but now since some of the so-called intellectual people who were granted scholarships are affected by this law you get this kind of thing. I believe this should work both ways. If you were a Barbados Scholar who was educated at the expense of the taxpayers of this country you should come back here and work. A man cannot tell another man whom he should marry, but to my mind, the reason why our girls do not look up to us is because the ones who seem to have ability and who have received education at the hands of the taxpayers, in most cases, marry foreign women much to the exclusion of our Barbadian women, and it would seem as if we do not have girls suitable enough to make good wives, but I cannot tell people who to marry.

I think when a man is married to a woman he gives her the citizenship of his country, the protection of its laws and all that there is to it, and since she has consented to marry such a person she should abide by whatever the man has to do in his country. I do not see how the responsibility can fall on the woman, the man is entitled to carry his wife where he wants to take her. If it is his choice to live in Barbados it is very unfortunate if he cannot, but the laws are made for the majority of people and have to affect the majority, and since the majority of people in Barbados do not have that problems we should not change the laws.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker,

if a member of the public had come into this Chamber this afternoon, he or she would have been entitled to wonder whether the resolution under debate was resolution five under Private Members' Business or resolution eight under Private Members' Business, especially when one heard the hon member for Christ Church West speaking, which leaves one to wonder whether indeed that was not the purpose of introducing this particular resolution under Private Members' Business last week. A certain amount of confusion and diffusion has taken place as a result of this debate in respect of Item No. 8 under Private Members' Business.

There are a couple of points I would like to make, and I would like first to refer to a point made by the hon. member for Christ Church West when he stated that the effect of this amendment would be to remove the husbands of Barbadian wives from the list of prohibited immigrants. I do not believe that that is quite correct, the hon. member may wish to elucidate, but as far as I understand it, that is what he said.

Mr. FORDE:

If I may explain to the hon. member, section 5 of the Act says "The following persons or class of

persons shall not be prohibited immigrants for the purposes of this Act," and the amendment seeks to add to that category of persons who are not prohibited immigrants, the husbands of Barbadian women.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not about to take up such an eminent lawyer on a point like that, but it does seem to me that if a person is not a prohibited immigrant it does not seek to remove him in that way. The point is that the foreign husband of a Barbadian wife has just as much right to come and live here like anyone else, provided he fulfils the requirements and has some kind of qualification which we need.
3.20 p.m.

There is no restriction or prohibition on those people. They can come and live here by applying in exactly the same way as any other foreign man or woman. Now, a question was asked by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works last week, and I am yet to hear the answer. He wanted to know if, indeed, there are any countries particularly developing countries, where husbands of foreign wives are allowed to come in. I hear that the point is automatically. I heard this afternoon reference made to the United States. I believe that it is quite possible that the husband of an American woman may get into the United States, but he has to fulfil all the requirements. He has to make application, and he must have some reason; for going there. The difference between the United States and ourselves in this particular context is that they take in immigrants. We do not take in immigrants. We have no possibility of taking in immigrants. We do not want immigrants unless they have specific skills. In the United States and Canada they are taking in people from all parts of the world for various reasons. They are an immigrant society in that way, but we are not.

Now, reference was made, I think, by the Leader of the Opposition to the situation in the United Kingdom, and I would like to read a part of a letter here which refers to this, and which I would be willing to make a document of the House. This letter is by a lady called Francis Schofield. I do not think she is any relative of the Schofield of recent discussion, It states:

"I am English and hold a British Passport and ventured to Canada where I met and married my Canadian husband. For the past year my husband and I have been trying, without success, to achieve immigration status for my husband. I say, without success, because we have not even been allowed to fill out an immigration form. We have been told repeatedly over the telephone that my British heritage means nothing as far as helping my husband to emigrate to the country of my birth.

A British male, on the other hand, can bring his spouse into Britain and settle without any problems. Is this fairplay?

Francis Schofield."

The situation here is not very much different from any other country in the world. Certainly applications must be made, as far as I know, even to those countries that are glad to take in immigrants - even Israel and other countries that want people to come in and settle. In Barbados it is still possible for the foreign husband of a Barbadian woman to come and live and work here, providing he has some skill which is needed here and he is not going to put a Barbadian out of work. This is the whole point. Not only have we a very large population in Barbados already, but in addition to that, we have serious unemployment. As a consequence of this, it is impossible to allow a lot of men to come into this country

to displace not only Barbadian men, but Barbadian women, because, as has been pointed out this afternoon, there is a great interchangeability between men's and women's jobs these days for particular jobs.

There is another problem which I would like to point out. This whole matter of immigration and, indeed, the women's rights is a very complexed one. It is not a simple question of saying: "If you do not vote for that, we will tell somebody in the country that you hate women", as was said at one stage of this debate. It is not as simple as that; it is a very complexed business.

I would like to refer, for a moment, to the question of undesirables. I think that most of the hon. members in this House will agree what the main undesirables on the top of crime, dope and so on, are men. They are at the top of the poll with regard to organised crime and such things in the world. You will hardly expect to find the same kind of content of a book or film if it had been entitled "The Godmother" as one found with "The Godfather". We do not hear of too many women leaders of the Mafia. The situation then is that if any of these undesirable people wish to come and live in Barbados, and wish to pay a certain amount of money to a Barbadian woman to go through a form of marriage with them, there would be nothing we could do to stop them and keep them out.

There was a situation quite recently, which we read about in Barbados, where a man was living all around South and Central America, having been thrown out of Israel, I believe, who was willing to pay 1 million (US) non-devalued dollars to be able to get into a country to reside. His name was Mr. Lanskey. He was one of the top crime men. (Aside.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will hon. members not addressing the Chair please speak in undertones.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

He was one of the leaders of what is known as "The Mob" in the United States, and was particularly so at the time when there was gambling and all of the other vices in Cuba. This man went from country to country offering \$1 million to be allowed to reside and no one would have him. Eventually, he had to go back to the United States. He arrived in Miami, Florida, and was promptly arrested.

If this amendment were accepted, and that man wanted to pay \$1,000, \$10,000 or any thousands that were necessary to go through a form of marriage with a Barbadian woman, there would be nothing we could do to that particular man who nobody else wanted. This is the kind of situation which might well arise, if this amendment were passed. All types of undesirables from all parts of the world could come in here being married to Barbadian women. The situation is not quite so uncomplicated as one might have thought.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would even say that there is some merit in Resolution No. 8 on the Order Paper, which gives an opportunity and a possibility of considering at length, without heat, and hearing all of the views of different interested parties on such a matter as this. Therefore, I suggest that it be considered in the light of women's rights as a whole and not in isolation.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my intention to make my final reply, but I did not wish to deprive anyone of

the right of speaking. That is all, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Go ahead.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order! Will the Leader of the Opposition continue to make his final reply.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to make my final reply. I have heard a number of arguments. I am glad to say that the challenge which I threw out, particularly to the Leader of the House and, I do not know what he is the leader of, Sir, the Leader of the Back-bench Ministers, perhaps, I must call him, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, has been taken up and they have not disappointed me, Sir. 3.30 p.m.

They have proved themselves not to be hypocrites. They have made speeches against women in precisely the same manner as they say they will vote against them, for they have spoken against women having the same right to bring their spouses here as men have. Both of them. Now the argument of the Leader of the House is impossible for me to reply to because I could not understand it. I took it that his argument was that it was wrong to let these people come here. I was not sure whether he was referring to what I had previously heard him call the wicked prostitutes who may marry a man and then come here, or whether he was referring to the useless husbands. He didn't say anything about the wicked women upon this occasion, but he has mentioned it in here. I could not understand his argument well enough to make it worthwhile replying to. All that I understood him to say was that the Government was not going to support this Bill, so I will really have with great respect to gloss over his contribution to the debate.

The gentleman from St. Michael South Central. Sir, he started well; he got himself under control and started well. It is true that no speech that has ever been made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has failed, even a Resolution of sympathy, Sir, to tell you what a remarkable man he is, how he played football for Barbados, how good a lawyer he was, what a good speaker he is, how nothing can stop him from being the next Prime Minister and so on. He must touch on one of these themes no matter what he is talking about. I believe that if he asked you to pass the mustard or the hot sauce in the dining room he would have to say "I am Sleepy Smith, I am a lawyer, I can made a living in any country, please pass the hot sauce." In the course of his speech or at some stage he said that I was being too persuasive, why I did not reserve that for the jury and try to make the jury understand.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, I never said he was too persuasive. I said that as a lawyer he must know that when he says he is logical, that no lawyer who knows his

salt uses pure logic to a jury. I did not say he was persuasive. Whom can he persuade? He did not persuade them in 1971. We have eighteen seats, so whom did he persuade?

Mr. ADAMS:

I do not blow my trumpet very much, but if I choose to use logic to persuade the jury, he must allow me to use logic to persuade the jury. I have appeared before jury, and unlike the hon. member I have

never lost a murder case yet. Not one of my clients has ever been hung. Nobody I have ever defended indeed charged with an offence against the person has ever been locked up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I ask the hon. member to stick to the subject of the debate? No murder cases, I hope, will every occur from the House of Assembly.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The hon. member is accusing me of blowing my own trumpet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member please take his seat? Let us have some order!

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just say, when I attempt to speak logically, I try to be logical. I have never been in the rum shop yet with any of my clients who have been sentenced to death or any ting else because they do not get sentenced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That has nothing to do with the Immigration Act.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am replying to the speech made and what was said. I do not want anything to go down on record in the Official Gazette suggesting that I am an unsuccessful lawyer who has had to run from Barbados because the jury used to lock up my clients.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, I am the only member who has left Barbados who has walked into this House without any problem. I did not leave Barbados because I was unsuccessful, because the records show it. Ask any of the judges or any of your colleagues who were at the Bar. You were not at the Bar with me. You are a junior. When I was practising law about here you were nowhere around; so what do you know about me? You were studying to be a judge.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us have some order.

Mr. ADAMS:

When I was studying to be a judge for ten or twelve years, ask the Minister of Education to look up what the Council of Legal Education said and recommended to the Ministry of Education here in respect of my performance in the first Bar examinations I took. I would not even say what it was. (Hon. F. G. SMITH What about the last one?) I have never failed one yet, and you can't get up and say the same thing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am still to hear something on the Immigration Act.

Mr. ADAMS:

I have never failed any examination of any sort in my life, and I won a Barbados Scholarship.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the Leader of the Opposition addressing the Chair? I am willing to hear you on the Immigration Act.

Mr. ADAMS:

I heard the hon. member saying he knew this and he knew that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Pay no attention to the asides. I will deal with them.

Mr. ADAMS:

Anyhow, Sir, all this is very unbecoming. Blowing your own trumpet, promoting yourself, talking about yourself, saying how remarkable you are is not only unbecoming, it is irrelevant. (Asides) But you weren't in the first four, so you can't talk. You were not in the first ten, so if there were ten you would not have won one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

If this does not stop I shall suspend the sitting or have the member who offends leave the Chamber.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central started well. He spoke cogently at the beginning and I said to myself that we were seeing a new hon. member, but he disappointed me. The burden of his argument, I take it to be, is that Barbados has an employment problem and you cannot allow any massive influx as a result of passing this Bill. Sir, none of the hon. members opposite except very indirectly the same hon. member and the hon. member for Christ Church South Central have stated although they drew different conclusions, and in the case of the second hon. member obviously quite specious ones, has paid attention to what was said in the beginning speech or has drawn the correct conclusions from the fact that the problem is a small one. The Minister of Home Affairs said that only 70 applications were made in five years by husbands of Barbadian women.

Seventy people cannot drown Barbados. If the public good and the equality between the sexes demands that a wrong be righted - and I will come back to this again - the fact that 70 more people will be allowed into Barbados cannot in my suggestion to the House, over five years, make much difference.

Sir, we are a very selfish lot in here. The following hon. members are married to foreigners: The Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Communications and Works, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Christ Church West and the hon. member for Bridgetown. That means that one-third of this House is married to non-Barbadians, a notable percentage. Any argument that employment is threatened by the influx of spouses should be directed to stopping the wives of Barbadians from coming to live here. If you take the House of Assembly as a typical example, nearly 40% of the male members are married to foreigners. If you took

the statistics which we know, you could argue that in the interest of employment of Barbadian girls that the wives of Barbadians should not have a democratic right to live here. My wife, the Leader of the House's wife, the Prime Minister's wife, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central's wife are all taking the bread out of the mouth of some Barbadian girl.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, my wife is the only permanent Medical Officer of Health in Barbados. All the rest are on contract. Which girl as a doctor can go and do the things at Enmore? Don't talk nonsense.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my wife trains Barbadian women as dress makers and designers. She does not take any bread out of anybody's mouth.

Mr. ADAMS:

Everybody will want to get up and say something. Nobody for one moment would gainsay the very splendid contribution that an outstanding woman like Dr. Smith makes to Barbados, or Mrs. Talma. The point is that I am trying to show the lack of logic in the argument whether these ladies happen to be distinguished ladies; they might not be. Whether they are distinguished or whether they are not, they have the right to come here and take the bread out of the mouths of Barbadians. You may not want to look at it but that is what they do, but get it in your minds that that is what the wives of Barbadian men do. They come here and work and take the bread out of the mouths of Barbadians. Why do we accept it? 3.40 p.m.

All of us accept it because Barbados is the home of the men and it is recognised that a man should be able to live in his own home and his wife with him. We are saying on this side that in the same way a man can live in his own home and his wife with him, a woman should be allowed to live in her own home and her husband with her. Every argument that I have heard in here about how only 1% of Barbadian women are married to foreigners - and do not forget that nearly 40% of the members of this House, of Assembly are married to foreigners - every argument that I have heard about how the foreigners come here to destroy the employment situation applies with greater force to the wives. If you argue that then logically you must go on to argue that at the very least they take away the very rights of Barbadian women to work. At the very least you should argue that; let them live here but do not let them work. You cannot on the one hand get up and make a speech and maintain the rights of Barbadian wives freely to be here and yet deny the right to the husbands of Barbadian girls to come to Barbados as well. It is hopeless logic.

Historical example was another of the points made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. We have a lot of historical example before us. Thirty years ago you could very logically argue - and it was argued here in the House of Assembly as reference to the debates will show - that it is wrong to let an agricultural labourer when his plantation needs him to come and weed to go and get a job somewhere else. That has been argued here in this House, but upon what basis? Historical, because up to 1940 at any rate in Barbados if you worked on a plantation and went and worked somewhere else you could be fined for absent days. Other members of the older generation are thoroughly familiar with the fact that this was one of the first things that destroyed the Barbados Labour Party, and the argument in favour of it from the predecessors in mind and spirit, if not in colour or economic positions, certainly of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, they are the people who argue it has always been so, so it should

always be so.

We have another speaker who spoke of the fact that in other countries it is so, and read out a letter from one Mrs. Schofield. I have a fairer knowledge, perhaps a greater knowledge, than either Mrs. Schofield or the hon. member for Christ Church North Central of the conditions under which the husband of an English woman can reside in England. The hon. member must assume that I know, if he does not mind my telling him both as a lawyer and as a person in

that position, I might be well placed to know, but the fact is that until a very short time ago the husband of an English woman could reside with her in the United Kingdom, and not just an English woman, a resident of the United Kingdom. She could be a Barbadian and she would have her right to have her husband reside with her in the United Kingdom. The law indeed has only been definitively changed as of the beginning of this year, but as long as the woman was resident in the United Kingdom she had the right to have her husband reside there with her. The law has been changed because it has been said that there were abuses. One of the possible abuses is the abuse of a bogus marriage, and this is one of the things which in the Bill now before the House is sought to be avoided. If hon. members really believe that a bogus marriage is important, or that the problem of bogus marriages is important, they are at liberty to seek to amend my Bill either here or in Select Committee. Bogus marriages are known to be in Barbados; I know of at least one case where a woman has procured a marriage in order to be allowed to stay in Barbados and does not live with her husband. He is an elderly man who married this lady in order to give her citizenship; I do not know if she has got citizenship.

There are other cases where ladies who have come to Barbados suddenly appear with husbands, and I believe they are known to some hon. members on this side and I daresay to members on the other side, girls who move around in Barbados getting trouble with the Immigration Officers and so on, all of a sudden you see they are married. The husband may be a young gentleman whose previous occupation appeared mainly to be lying down on the beach at Accra. There are a surprising number, and you must not assume when you see them lying down in pairs at Accra now that their union has not been sanctified by Mother Church or at least by a Magistrate, and there are girls who I believe have undertaken marriage too to stay in Barbados. In the United States where there is a very general permission for spouses to join their husbands, the American immigration law specifically states that as long as the marriage was not contracted with a view to avoidance of a particular statute, and they have to satisfy the Immigration Officers that the marriage is a genuine marriage. Those of us who sometimes have to advise on this point are very familiar with this. Again, it is not so long ago that I had to give advice to a Barbadian in the United States when he proposed to one or two of us that he would get married to this American lady who wishes him to marry so he would stay in the United States, I advised him in New York that the Immigration Officers would

be entitled to go behind the marriage to see whether it is a genuine marriage or otherwise a marriage contracted with the purpose of allowing him to evade the immigration restrictions, and this was a man, so there is some knowledge, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of members on this side about the practical operations of what is now suggested.

The next speaker was the hon. and charming member for St. Michael North East. Last week her ideas did not seem to be quite so well formed as they were this week, and she has come this week with her mind decisively made up against - if I may say so with respect - her sex. She has said that the working

class women who do not get married, they cannot marry foreigners, they cannot even marry Barbadians, but that is a separate problem. Things are too hard for them to get married. I was not aware that was a serious problem, but the hon. member obviously would know what she is talking about, and in dealing with this I would also like to deal with a bit of what the hon. member - a recent convert if I may say so - for Christ Church South Central has said on this subject about its being the intellectuals and so on.

This Bill will not benefit the intellectuals. The prejudice against the husbands of Barbadian women is the anti-intellectual prejudice. It is the prejudice of people who do not like those who, make money or who had good education, and it is against even girls who have money or a good education that such prejudice is being exercised. My opinion is that there are more, what is described as, working class women in this country married to non-Barbadians than the intellectuals of whom we are speaking. Who is familiar with the cane cutters who come here every year and who does not know they marry Barbadian girls and try to get off the contract to stay here? In my own constituency of St. Thomas I am perfectly sure that I can find at the present time more foreign men living than foreign women, that if you go through the agricultural districts of Barbados you will find much liaison between Vincentians and Barbadian girls, between St. Lucians and Barbadian girls, but you will also find a number of marriages perfectly genuine and perfectly lawfully and validly entered into. They are not the marriages which catch the headlines, it is the well known people who attract attention. The hon. member for the City will, I am perfectly sure, be able to tell the House about the large number of Barbadian women married to St. Lucians, Dominicans, Vincentians and Guyanese who live in Bridgetown, because this is one of the centres where they live. It is a desperate and foolish mistake to think that the problem only affects the 70 husbands who apply from overseas. 3.50 p.m.

I believe that the number is far greater than that. We have no way of knowing, because these West Indians do not promote themselves in the same way. I would suggest that the number of West Indian husbands of Barbadian girls operating in the humblest walks of life, far, far, exceeds the number of 70 which is the only official figure we have in respect of the North American ones, and they even include a few West Indians among them.

It is significant, perhaps, that it is two hon. members who have not been in the House very long and whose contact with their constituencies and with the general pattern of life in Barbados, whatever they may think about it, may not be so great as the contact of those of us who have spent a little longer in the House. Of necessity we may tend to know both our own constituencies better and the whole spread of Barbados better, but I do not believe that they would say that only one percent of Barbadian women are married to foreigners, anyhow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, on these statistical arguments, I have shown how many more women there are in Barbados than men. Any measure that allows women to come in freely but makes it difficult for men is an antisocial measure. The present law allows women to come in freely if married, but does not allow men to come in freely. We should be encouraging men to come here; encouraging Barbadian women to find a man from the ranks of outsiders, since they cannot find Barbadians.

The true reason of why the working-class women of whom the hon. member for St. Michael North East speaks - women her own age, perhaps - the true reason why they do not marry Barbadians is that they do not have enough Barbadians to marry. There are not enough men. We should not be putting any further barriers in the way of these ladies finding suitable partners.

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central does not speak very much in the House and, therefore, he does not give us the opportunity of assessing his views a great deal. I will say that if every speech made by that hon. member is going to contain phrases such as "he has very strong ideas about these people who A marry foreign women", I would really advise him - I am going to use a strong expression - to learn a little manners towards the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Communications and Works and others. I resent it to be told that I must be dictated to. I resent it on my behalf, on behalf of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, and all of those other hon. members,

Mr. MORRISON:

On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. My point is that a man is entitled to marry whom he likes, or to do what he likes. I cannot tell anybody in Barbados whom to marry, whom to make a wife, or whom to take as a husband. My view is my view. I do not make many speeches in here, because I feel strongly on a lot of things, and what I say I mean. I am not trying to be rude, or to be unmannerly to any member of this House by expressing how I feel on any particular matter. My point is, and I will say it again, that our most brilliant sons have gone abroad and married. I say that they did not find it convenient to uplift one of their own people. That is all I have said. I am not saying that they are wrong in doing this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made your point.

Mr. ADAMS:

So far as the explanation consists of the withdrawal of any offensive sentiments, Sir, I will be glad to accept the hon. member's withdrawal. I think, perhaps, I am reading more into what the hon. member is saying than the hon. member is capable of putting. I do not think the hon. member understands what he was saying at the time. I know that marriage is a sensitive subject with him, Sir, so I will not pursue it to any greater degree. His argument that the better, well-off people marry to foreign women, I take to be an argument in favour of amending the Act so that wives no longer receive an exemption from the Immigration Act. If he says, in effect, that he does not like these sons of Barbados going abroad to marry foreign women and so on, then he should make it more difficult for them to do so. Put men and women on the same footing, and say that foreign wives are subject to immigration control and have to apply for permission to reside in Barbados, and so on. That is what he must logically say.

He made another point, Sir, which has the appearance of, again, being a point of inexperience. This point relates to his view that you should not legislate for a small section of the community. That is foolishness; Sir, Every day we come in here and pass a Resolution for 20

people: carters formerly employed by the different Vestries who do not get a pension because they were not Vestry employees. We have passed a Resolution for the Reporters of the House of Assembly - 6 people. We have passed a Resolution for one person sometimes. We used to have Pension Acts for individuals on occasions. The hon. member really cannot produce that as an argument. Every section of the community, if it deserves relief, should be given relief by the House of Assembly, if it is one person

or a hundred thousand. The capacity of seeing the need in a section of the community does not rest upon that side or upon this side. All of us can see it.

Every now and again the hon. member for St. Michael South Central gets up and says: "You are not the first people on that side to say something or to see something. We knew that." The hon. member for St. Michael West, from his vast experience - how surprised he will be to hear that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said he had been in Parliament longer than anybody in here except the Leader of the House. The member for St. Michael West.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke the member for St. Michael West was not in the House. I said that I got in in 1956, and nobody on the Opposition and nobody except the Leader of the House got in before me. The hon. member for St. Michael West was not in the House at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not in his seat.

Mr, ADAMS:

I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West was in the House. He may be ill considered by the member for St. Michael South Central. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central may not have noticed him or the Member for St. Andrew. I think they were in Parliament longer than him.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I was elected to this Chamber in 1956, Apart from the Leader of the House and the member for St. Michael West, no one member of this House was elected in 1956.

Mr, ADAMS:

The point was not whether you got elected and ran away. The point is how long you were in the House.

Mr, SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member get back to the subject of the debate.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Prime Minister was in the House in 1951. Do not mind that he lost his seat in 1956, too. At least the Prime Minister never

had the experience of every single member of his Party, of which he was Chairman, saying that he was not going to serve under him as Leader of the Opposition. At least that is an experience denied to any member of this House: that every member of the Party which he notionally headed refused to have him as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What has that to do with the matter before the House?

Mr. ADAMS:

Nothing at all, Sir. I apologise. I was dealing with the speech of the member for Christ Church South Central. Interests have to be legislated for. I am going to wind up, Sir. I am going to wind up by returning now from Omega to Alpha. I have gone from Alpha to Omega. If the member for Christ Church South Central does not mind my- describing him as the Omega to the member of St. Michael South Central's Alpha, for I do not think there is really that much difference between them. If I can deal with the two, we are told that we must not legislate for these interests by the last member, and we are told by the first member to speak that you must pass the Resolution of the hon. member for Christ Church West because that covers the whole subject. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES "Nobody said that.")

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order!

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and I have just heard it said and the hon. member for St. Michael North East, both indicated general support to the terms of the Resolution. I heard the member for St. Michael South Central myself. He said that if that was the Resolution before the House, he might be able to support it or some expression such as that. They both indicated general support for the Resolution to be moved by the hon. member for Christ Church West. I hope, Sir, I am not anticipating it by referring to it. It has been referred to already. 4.p.m.

If you support that Resolution and support the principle of equality for women, you will not make women equal by passing it. You will not be able to gain the credit from the public by saying that you supported the Resolution of the hon. member for Christ Church West and expect that we will not then tell the public "ah, but the first practical measure, the only practical measure to put the principle of that Resolution into effect you voted against!" Hon. members will not be allowed to get away with saying they support the equality for women, it is only a Resolution, saying that secretly on the side, it is not going to

make any difference, and then think that when something to solidify those words in one most important respect, a woman's right to choose her future partner, is brought, they vote against that.

I urge all hon. members to support this. Sir, I said one final point. I have not mentioned the hon. member for Christ Church North Central. The hon. member for Christ Church North Central has a deep and profound capacity for not understanding an issue. If something is given to him to read and you read it out sometimes, he would produce a more convincing argument than I have seen him produce. The first point he made related to Barbadian wives being removed from prohibited immigrants. That was dealt with by the hon. member for Christ Church West. This may not be understood. Anybody who is not born in Barbados or entitled to citizenship of Barbados could find himself to be a prohibited immigrant. The former Minister of Home Affairs will know that. Overnight tomorrow the Minister of Home Affairs can revoke the citizenship of that hon. member and he will be a prohibited immigrant. He would not be a prohibited immigrant because he has lived here for a time. (A VOICE: He is a citizen.) Citizenship can be revoked.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members who are sitting must observe the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member for Christ Church West must not try to tell the House from his seat or otherwise that citizenship cannot be revoked. It is in the Constitution and it is in the Citizenship Act.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

If the hon. member would give way, I would explain to him under what circumstances it can be rejected.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Are you on a point of elucidation?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But you have not spoken on this matter and then you cannot elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am not suggesting that it can be revoked at will, but do not tell me it cannot be revoked. A procedure has to be followed and circumstances have to be satisfied. And don't tell me necessarily that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central in such an angel that there are no circumstances under which he might come within the conditions of revocation. We have heard people come in here and talk about water-washed Englishmen who arrived here on a boat. Nobody on this side.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, I am objecting to the last remark because he is insinuating that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central is a shady character. He is asking you not to assume that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central is such a person that there is not something in his character that might entitle him to have his citizenship revoked. That is a subtle and nasty slur by the Leader of the Opposition and you should see that he withdraws it. I am a lawyer and I am not the world's greatest fool either, and I ask you to see that the hon. member withdraws that remark because he is saying publicly that he knows or suspects that there is something in the member's character which would entitle the Minister of Home Affairs to withdraw his citizenship.

Mr. ADAMS:

I did not even think so. I only mean that nobody is perfect. Truthfully, Sir, the hon. member for Christ Church North Central is such a pleasant man to have ordinary everyday dealings with that if I knew something shady about him, the last person in the world I would let know something about it would be the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for your ruling on this.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Thank you. The hon. member has made his point. I see no direct reference the hon. member for Christ Church North Central.

Mr. ADAMS:

As far as I know the hon. member for Christ Church North Central is a man of exemplary character. I am not saying it sarcastically either. I am just going to say something else. Just let me put my own Tom Adams' view on record vis-a-vis this matter of citizenship.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I ask you to refer to yourself other than by name, and also to take your seat when I stand? And to stick to the Resolution!

Mr. ADAMS:

Nobody who has chosen to make his home in Barbados will ever be attacked by me or sought to be removed from Barbados or have his citizenship questioned or anything like that. If a man chooses to make his home in Barbados, he can come here and go to prison as far as I am concerned. When somebody has chosen Barbados and lived here as long as the hon. member, I am not going to be lending my name or my voice to any move to disturb him. Mr. SPEAKER But the hon. member has nothing to explain away about the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS:

Nor has the hon. member objected. I may have one or two things to say that are hard about his understanding of politics, because the fact that he is a nice man and a worthy citizen does not mean that he is a politician to whom the people of Barbados should give a great deal of weight. One of the statements he made that the husband of a Barbadian woman has as much right to come here and live as anyone else is not true. The husband of a Barbadian woman has not got the same right to come and live here as anyone else. He has not got as much right as the wife of a Barbadian man, so it is a serious.....

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

On a point of elucidation, I think the hon. member has cut the sentence off short and has not fully explained what I said. The husband of a Barbadian woman has just as much right to come and live and work here as any other foreign person. He can make application in exactly the same way as anyone else, and he will be judged on the merits in exactly the same way.

Mr. ADAMS:

I appreciate the explanation because I do not think his words were so profound that he would expect me to take down all; but what he has just said has only made it worse because what he has just said is not true. The husband of a Barbadian women has not got just as much right to come and live here as any foreign person. He has not got the same right as the foreign wife of a Barbadian man, and that is what we are aiming at. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members who are not speaking, please observe the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

In the eyes of the law my wife is a foreigner and they are giving her a lot of trouble getting her citizenship through. I had to threaten to put the Minister in Court. The Minister knows that. The Minister has an ultimatum from me saying that if my wife is not granted citizenship by the end of this month the

Supreme Court will decide it. Are you telling me it is not true? Counsel has been retained if the Minister wants to "know. Why should I talk about that? They are forcing these things upon me now. You try to talk relevantly on the Resolution and every minute you hear something is not true. (Asides) A wife cannot be removed under this Act. A wife has a right of residence, and this does indeed lead me into the last point. A wife has a right of residence and this is all that I am asking hon. members to give a husband. I am not asking for citizenship.

The one really deep and sensible remark made on that side of the House is that more consideration should be given to this matter, more mature consideration. It is a remark which of course can be made about almost anything by a conservative, and it was made by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central at the end of his speech. 4.10 p.m.

The proper place for such consideration is in a Select Committee. I am urging that upon the House. A Select Committee can examine this matter, can call the Minister of Home Affairs as a witness or whatever. All of that can be done, and let us not forget that if this Bill is given a second reading it will go to a Select Committee. I am urging hon. members even at this late stage to take counsel and have a Select Committee in which the hon. member for St. Michael South Central will be one of the leading lights, send it to a Select Committee and let it be dealt with there.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member is reading a newspaper, Sir, you cannot read a newspaper in the House.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member is assisting me with the laws of Trinidad relative to this subject. The hon. member is telling me whose picture is on a page and who is married to a Barbadian woman. Would the hon. member for St. Michael West like to join us over here so that he can see the picture too? I am urging on all hon. members to vote that this Bill be now read a second time.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. LOWE. Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. GREAVES, Mrs. EASTMOND, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. HOPPIN, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. WEEKES - 12.

AYES:

Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HINDS, Mr. BOLDEN, Mr. FORDE

- 6.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the next Order under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Peter was speaking when the time for Private Members' Business expired.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, since this debate has been entered into so much water has passed under the bridge that I have to wonder exactly how much useful purpose can be served in continuing, but whilst hon. members on the other side seem to be enjoying that part of it, I am sure that we heard in this House quite recently that this country is at its wits end, and none of this was envisaged in the financial statement and budgetary proposals of the Minister of Finance, but we find now that it would appear as if bankruptcy has taken over.

There have been times when the best brains in the country have had to battle with situations, but it would appear to us that the plot has been hatched where we find that as a last resort the land prices have been jacked up to see if it would smooth the waters and restore some sort of economic balance for us, but I can assure you that everywhere one goes today in this Island there is to be witnessed a disturbance of mind, an unbalanced, uneasy and unsteady state of affairs resulting from what we had been led to believe was the skilful skippering of the affairs of this country. Mr. Speaker, you and I have heard people on the street from time to time saying "keep the dipper skipper", you and I have cause to stop and think, but you and I have been placed perhaps in a position much better than many of the people who have been given this sort of cheap gibe and you and I know that today a lot of uneasiness has resulted from the jacking up of these land prices, the high taxation, and people are running crazy, some of them wondering if it is not better to tell the Government to take the land. 4.20 p.m.

I remember, Sir, the tax free Budget that was presented in this Honourable House. I remember the Hon. Minister of Finance winding up his debate with the word "Advance". Mr. Speaker, what is the true position today? Are we, the representatives of the people, doing justice to them well knowing the plight, of this country? Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, it was the words of the Prime Minister. He called on the young people to rebel. If there was ever a time for the people in this country to rebel it is now. Why? The last measure taken by this Government gives no incentive or encouragement whatsoever to young people to become landowners in this country. It frightens them away; it gives them the feeling that it is much better to work for the dollar, to eat it out, drink it out, and as the Barbadians would say "to live it up".

What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the time has come when the situation can no longer be blamed on the changes in our fiduciary system, and the currency upsets worldwide from time to time as the case may be, and so on. We cannot continue to fool the people that we import all the inflation that there is and expect them to accept this blindly. The truth is that selfishness on the part of the present Government has landed this country somewhat into its present state, and all of us will be saddled with a portion of the blame.

You and I, Mr. Speaker, were not taken into anybody's confidence in the planning stages, but now that the ruins have come about, you, in your spare moments from the Chair or otherwise, have to direct your mind and address your attention to every request from everybody, whether he is from your constituency or my constituency. As long as he is a Barbadian and he puts forward his request, we will all have to join heart and hand in giving him some measure of satisfaction and contentment.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that people are going to be faced, within the next few weeks, with a situation that is going to tax them past the limits to which they are already taxed. It is going to be a taxing upon their nervous system. Many people are already trying to find out if, as in the case of our land valuation, the new valuations, given for taxation purposes by the Government, are going to be accepted by our Commercial Banks.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, this is a Resolution dealing with the Budget Speech made by the Prime Minister in June, 1972, and I am yet to see how it relates to what happened last week. I am not debating his rights to bring a substantive motion to debate anything. What is the relevance of something that happened last week to a Resolution based on budgetary proposals in June 1972?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member confine himself to the Resolution before us.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Budget Speech to which the Hon. Minister who has just sat down made reference was a Budget Speech telling us about the millions that were going to be raised from the land tax. That is exactly what I am replying to now, Sir. I know that the Minister was a lawyer.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am still a lawyer.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We will have no personal remarks.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I agree that what the hon. member is fearing is not something that is very palatable to him but, nevertheless, it is something that has to be faced. He would, perhaps, like to hear us bring some substantive motion before the House, and when the time comes for voting he would run out. He would like to have the Prime Minister or the Government overthrown, but he would not like to vote for it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

That is a nasty reference to me. I have no intention of overthrowing the Prime Minister at any time, and I want that to go on the record. I would not have any member of this House making a reference to me and saying that I want to have the Prime Minister overthrown. I am a member of this Government, and I support him loyally. When I am not willing to support him, I will leave. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark that I want the Prime Minister overthrown. 4.30 p.m.

I am a member of his Government and I support him loyally. If I am not willing to support him, I will leave; so I ask him to withdraw that remark that I want the Prime Minister overthrown.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. HINDS:

I said perhaps.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, you have asked me to withdraw it and I have got to withdraw it whether it is offensive or not.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It now being 4.30 p.m., Private Members' Business is now concluded.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

At 2 o'clock when the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking on Item 4 of Government Business.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to speak to the Leader of the House during the interval and I wonder if he would like me to give way to him.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, I had the opportunity of discussing procedure with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and he agreed that it might serve a useful purpose if we decided to take the proposed amendments seriatim, both the ones which I moved and the ones which he has in mind and which he will move at a later stage. Each amendment will be dealt with separately, not that every clause in the Standing Orders will be dealt with separately, and then each of their amendments will be dealt with separately before the question is put in order to be fair and equitable to both sides and arrive at a more reasonable conclusion.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, that being so, I am in the fortunate position of almost having concluded my speech on the Government amendments upon the understanding that separate divisions will be taken on each and we would not have to confuse ourselves by having to draw a lot of complicated amendments to achieve this object. I was dealing with Standing Order 30 - "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister". Sir, I urge on the Leader of the House to reconsider this one. This is a phrase which we took

in the Standing Orders Committee from the Canadian Standing Orders. It means that member of the Opposition who is replying. Now the Minister seems to think that he will have to be familiar with the names of the shadow Cabinet in order to administer this. I would suggest this is not so. It is an old and well established understanding in Parliament that Mr. Speaker recognises certain people on that side and on this side. We do not always know what Minister is going to introduce a Bill; we only know when he stands up. In the same manner whichever member of the Opposition stands up can be taken (Asides) Don't misunderstand me. I would not ask that the House hear a member at length and then hear me at length. I would not be asking that. I would not ask that the House hear me and then hear another member. If only the Minister is going to be able to speak at length and I presume the Prime Minister in reply, I would not ask for that. All we are asking is that one member of the Opposition be heard at length, and this phrase "or the Member speaking in reply next after the Minister" really is a phrase which I submit Your Honour will have the dealings with, because just as in all House of Commons and Legislative Assembly that have two sides, Your Honour's eye falls naturally on one side of the House at one moment, and falls on the other side of the House at the other, and Your Honour will see one of us get up and he will obviously be the person speaking in reply. The words "in reply" have to be given due weight because you do not expect a member of the Government is replying to the Government, and "in reply next after the Minister" can only mean in reply to the Minister, and I would urge this construction upon the members of the Government.

Now, Sir, since reason is prevailing, I think I can safely conclude that part and move my own amendment. This, Sir, must be understood subject to the right of hon. members on this side to speak on all the amendments in the same way that I have spoken to them. The amendment which has been circulated which we ask relates to the debate on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. This was canvassed at the Standing Orders Committee with Your Honour in the Chair, I think, - this was canvassed in the last Committee and this one - but one way or the other it got overlooked. The phrasing is our own.

"The two sitting days which shall immediately follow the Annual Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals shall be allotted to debate thereon."

This is anticipating that perhaps you will have the Budget at 4 o'clock on a Tuesday, you adjourn until the next day and the day after and finish with that. It would mean a heavy Budget week, but if you had to come the day after and the next week, you could finish with that. I think I can safely say that I know it was the wish of all hon. members that the Budget debate be concluded in a quick manner. There would be a time set aside when everybody would have his say, and I would move that that be Standing Order 31 and all other Orders from 31 be renumbered 32 et seq.

Sir I am only going to move the next point which is marked "B" on our list of amendments relatively shortly. I like things to be done constitutionally; I like things to be done the right way. There is a Standing Order thrust into Standing Order 39, paragraph (10) -

"Any remuneration or allowance to which a Member is entitled as a Member of the House shall cease, where he has been suspended from the service of the House, for the period of his suspension, or, where he has been expelled from membership of the House, from the date of his expulsion."

Now, Sir, dealing with the end where he has been expelled, he is not a member of the House and

therefore cannot get a salary; so that can't apply. That is in the Representation of the People Act and you do not have to worry about that. Where he has been suspended. Now point No. 1, any lawyer will tell all hon. members that the payment of members of Parliament is not a part of the procedure of Parliament. It is the subject of a separate Act. Parliament existed before payment and could exist without payment and indeed who knows may have to exist sometime without payment. Section 50(1) of the Constitution says: "Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, each House may regulate its own procedure and for this purpose may make Standing Orders." The House cannot over-ride an Act of Parliament by Standing Orders. The Remuneration of Members Act, 1949 and subsequent Acts are Acts of Parliament and the House cannot vote to over-ride these. This matter has arisen before in the Commonwealth. It arose in Ceylon where they tried to take away the salary of a member of the Opposition by Standing Orders. I am not going to tell hon. members that he brought a case and won, but what are the grounds on which he lost? He brought a case against the Clerk of the House of Representatives of Ceylon for his salary and the Privy held that he had sued the wrong man. Nowhere did they say that the House of Representatives can take away a member's salary. I am a lawyer and it is not for me to give people advice, but I would advise hon. members that in Barbados no such difficulty as arose in Ceylon can arise, because Ceylon did not have a Crown Proceedings Act. In Barbados you sue the Attorney General for your salary, no matter who maltreats you in Barbados, if it is Government money you sue the Attorney General. This is an Act of Parliament which was voted by Parliament. Sir, that is going too far because I am offering a legal opinion and I am not here to do that. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central says it is wrong. 4.40 p.m.

I notice that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was present at the Standing Orders Committee and was very insistent on this clause, but then he was the next person to be suspended from the House, and he did not come back to the Standing Orders Committee afterwards.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Now be fair. I resigned from the Committee after I was suspended from the House for reasons which I do not care to give to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Please do not be contentious.

Mr. ADAMS:

We are not being contentious. I really do not want to offend any hon. member, but it would take "Chalkdust" to deal with this.

An hon. member says that if you are bad behaved and you get suspended, take away your salary, and he was the first member to get suspended.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, the reason why I supported that.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of elucidation, the hon. member is quite out of order. The hon. member has not made a speech, will the hon. member please take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Is he allowed then to misrepresent or tell lies about my position on a Committee of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has a chance to speak like any other hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS:

I have no intention of telling any lies on the hon. member, I hope he will answer any misrepresentations very fully. I am just saying that the facts are that he supported this at the Standing Orders Committee and subsequent to that he was suspended from the service of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not aware that the hon. member was ever suspended from the service of the House.

Mr. ADAMS:

He was suspended from attendance at meetings.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not the right term to use.

Mr. ADAMS:

I withdrew and I came back. He was ordered to withdraw then. Now, Sir, the point which I think is conclusive is that the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act does say that no salary or allowance payable to a member for his service as such shall be paid in respect of any period during which he is suspended under the provisions of that Act from the Chamber to which he belongs. It is a statutory interpretation that where a Statute sets out the conditions under which something may be done, subsidiary bodies cannot thereafter add to those conditions or renege from them. That is section 29. It is clear that read in conjunction with the Remuneration of Members Act, section 29 sets out the law and we cannot change the law by our Standing Orders. The law is not silent, the law says a member shall be paid X, and further on it says if a member does Y he should no longer receive X. We do not make law in here, our Standing Orders cannot be law. The Standing Orders are only for regulating conduct in here, the Standing Orders do not even govern the Clerk's behaviour, it says what the Clerk must do, he has conditions of service to his employment with the Debates Committee, but we could not put in the Standing Orders that the Clerk shall not be paid his salary if the majority of the members decide otherwise and so on, that would be incompatible with the conditions of employment of the Clerk, so I am suggesting that since Parliament as a whole has already laid down the provisions under which a member will not receive his salary, since the House of Assembly as such does not pay anybody, that we do not disfigure our Standing Orders with something which is likely to come before the Courts.

Your rulings cannot be questioned, what goes on in here pursuant to certain things cannot be questioned. If an officer of the House does it the Speaker, Chairman, Deputy Speaker, Deputy Chairman, the House cannot by any resolution change the law in Barbados unless it is given power so to do, and this is what we are seeking to do. The law of Barbados says a member must be paid.

There are other considerations such as the fact that members of any minority feel a little apprehensive. I would be a hypocrite if I did not say so, members of any minority would feel a little apprehensive

about subjecting their financial position to their political opponents. I would be an outright hypocrite if I did not say that nobody would put himself in the position to take away the salary of somebody he does not like. That is an appeal to the majority. I put it to you, Sir, do not in any way seek to put yourselves in a position that by a vote of AYE or NAY you are taking away the salaries of members on this side. It is not in keeping with equitable behaviour and practice, people's salary, money, financial position - in any case is protected by the Constitution to some extent - but it should be affected only by some type of judicial ruling. Nobody in Barbados, nobody on this side is going to be easily satisfied - nobody on that side either - knowing that their parliamentary salary is at the mercy, however theoretical - and it is not all that theoretical - of their political opponents.

There would be no point in asking for remuneration of members and dealing with all members equally. I appeal to all hon. Members not to do it. As it is now I have not got very much fear of it because I do not think it is constitutional, I believe that the Constitution is against it, but do not put it in the Standing Orders at all. (Hon. C. E. TALMA: Was it not copied from the Canadian Standing Orders?) It is not copied from anything, the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act sets out how you lose your salary. I am asking hon. members not to have it there at all. How much can you underline a thing? Should a majority stop a minority from getting paid? We have had examples in the West Indies, in Guyana where we had the Speaker naming the Prime Minister and four other members during the budget debate when Dr. Jagan was last Prime Minister so that he lost his majority for the day. Nothing like that has ever happened in Barbados nor do I believe could easily ever happen. The occasion of very adverse comment in learned books on the subject of Speakers is there, but all of these things go on. Let us not introduce the contention, the dangerous and desperate feelings that will be aroused if something like that should become part of the Standing Orders and will have any effect.

Your Honour's privileges under the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act are already adequate, I am suggesting, and these being unconstitutional do not add anything to it, but they might be thought to add something to them, and, all they would add to the deliberations of this House would be a great deal of contention. I am urging hon. members to support my amendment that Standing Order 39(10) be deleted and 39(11) be renumbered accordingly. It would then become 39(10) because this would go up in number.

With respect to the last paragraph, I am formally moving it but I think there are other members on both sides who are better qualified to deal with it than I am. Some apprehension has been expressed that Select Committees find it difficult to get a quorum and take a very long time to report, but it is suggested - and this is the drafting of Mr. Brancker - that these two paragraphs should be added to the Standing Order dealing with Select Committees to provide that if a Select Committee does not report within three months that the Bill should stand committed to a Committee of the whole House. I seem to remember that it was originally suggested that the Select Committee could ask for leave to sit again, that it could move a half report in the same way as the Committee of the whole House can ask for leave to sit again.
4.50 p.m.

I do not see it here, but I imagine that since this is the last amendment to be put that, in due course of the debate, some form of words might be introduced into the copy circulated to provide for that. If a Select Committee cannot finish its work in three months on a Bill, it should be allowed to make an

interim Report and ask for leave to continue. Subject to that, Sir, I would urge these amendments for the attention of the House. I will work on that with the hon. member for St. Joseph who, I think, is interested in this matter. I will work on that as we go on, and I will try to produce something. Those are my comments, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder to your amendments?

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to reserve the right to move the inclusion after Standing Order 61 of two further Rules. This deals with the procedure for the Select Committees where a matter has been referred to such a Committee. The other one I would like to move, and I think we have also circulated copies of it,.....

Mr. ADAMS:

I have already dealt with that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

It has been dealt with already, Sir. I would like to move the one after 61, but I reserve my right at this time, since I will have to co-operate with the Leader of the House in the matter.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not too au fait with the Select Committee business, and I am leaving that for the hon. member for St. Joseph to deal with, but I am moving it formally.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it that all three amendments on this sheet are moved.

Mr. ADAMS:

Yes, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

The question that Standing Order 6 (2), as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Standing Order 6 (4), as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Standing Orders 6 (6), and 6 (7) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Standing Order 6 (8), as amended, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that Standing Order 16 (4)...

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order 16(4) be amended to "3.30 p.m." instead of "3.15 p.m." as suggested by the amendment. The position is that you are cutting down on Question Time to Ministers. We beg to move that the time be extended for a further 15 minutes, and make it "3.30 p.m." rather than "3.15 p.m."

Mr. ADAMS:

I beg to second that. We are extending the lunch time, I think, to "2.45 p.m." We are merely asking that if you extend the lunch time, you should extend Question Time for 15 minutes, too.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, we have also limited the number of supplementary questions which formerly could be asked before. We could have a multiplicity of supplementary questions, but we are now limiting it to three. I think that the number of questions the Government answers in one day could be dealt with in half an hour. That is my view. Very often we have very little more than half an hour. If you cut down on the supplementaries, then I think half an hour of good cut and thrust would be sufficient. I would suggest that you leave it as it is.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, even if it is extended to 3.30, and there are not a sufficient number of questions to be answered, then that will not interrupt the flow of work in Parliament. You can go on to Private Members' Business or whatever is next earlier. If you extend it to 3.30, it will give the necessary time for questions to be dealt with. Extending it to 3.30 would not interrupt the work of Parliament.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir, It would not normally interrupt, provided a further amendment is not made to increase Private Members' Time. It is suggested that the time be increased by 15 minutes, and in like manner you may try to put on another 15 minutes to Private Members' Time as a result of this amendment. I would suggest that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works should explain the matter and indicate our position.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, we are certainly going to ask for 15 minutes more on Private Members' Time, It is the right of the members of the Opposition to have enough time to do their work. It means half an hour in all between Private Members' Time and Question Time. If there are not enough questions to be asked in the relevant period, then Private Members' Business or any other business can be dealt with.

The question that the words proposed to be left out in the amendment to Standing Order 16 (4), namely, changing the figures "3.15" to "3.30" stand part was put. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will have to put the motion again. 5 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that the words proposed to be left out in the amendment to the Standing Order No. 16 (4) stand part.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there are two amendments one is for 3.30 and one is for 3.15. With respect, these are both amendments before the stage of standing part is reached, is that not so? Which is Your Honour going to put first? I want to vote for 3.30.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that the words proposed to be inserted stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, it is so confusing that on the last occasion the hon. member said he voted wrong. He voted "aye" and that is how we should vote.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, on the last occasion everybody voted "aye" so 3.30 stands part.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the last amendment was put first which is the 3.30 amendment which I have been suggesting.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will simplify it. I will move the question in terms of the words proposed to be inserted stand part. The words proposed to be inserted are "3.30". The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part, was put and resolved in the negative.

The question that the amendment to Standing Order No. 16 (4) stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the amendment to Standing Order No. 18 (3) stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the amendment to Standing Order No. 18 (4) stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Standing Order No. 20 (3) was called.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I believe that part of the time of any Parliament should be devoted to Private Members' Business and Private Members should be given adequate time to advance matters on behalf of their constituents and other matters of importance to the country. I also believe that that business should be dealt with expeditiously and they should be given adequate time. I readily concede that Government Business takes precedence over Private Members' business, but I think when we look at this amendment we must consider it against a later Standing Order, I think Standing Order

26, but I think that the effect of this subsequent Standing Order No. 26(3) is to say that if Private Members' Business has not been discussed because the Standing Order have been suspended for a period of time, after three calendar months any matter of Private Members' Business automatically comes off the Order Paper. It seems to me that there are two ways of dealing with this matter. One is either to extend the time properly for Private Members' Business or alternatively to have a savings provision in Standing Order No. 26 (3) so that that rule is only applicable other than when the House is in recess or only to twelve meetings of the House at which Private Members' Business has been discussed.

I can understand the anxiety of Government to get on with what Government considers to be the priority of business, but I think members must understand that members of Parliament and backbenchers particularly and private members must have a reasonable opportunity to advance measures in the House. To this extent we have all been sent to the House to conduct business on behalf of the people. Although it is readily conceded that Government Business takes precedence, yet I can see opportunities where the Government will ask for a suspension of the Standing Orders, use their majority - any Government, not this particular Government and Private Members' Business will not be discussed for twelve sessions, three calendar months, Private Members' Business introduced in that time lapses and they will continue bringing back Private Members' Business on the Order Paper. It seems to me that private members must have an extension of time and some reasonable opportunity of having their matters discussed.

I have seen already in my limited experience in Parliament members suffer under this provision. It seems to me that an hour and thirty minutes for Private Members' Business is not adequate as has been proposed, certainly not adequate if this House is to really give private members an opportunity to put forward their points of view. I think in such matters people can speak for thirty minutes on any motion, and if we seriously want to give a reasonable time, I think the Order as sent in by the Select Committee should stand and that 5.45 is a reasonable time, certainly at least two hours for Private Members' Business. An extension of time on this is called for. After all, Sir, if I may urge again on members, the House is also a debating Chamber not debating academic subjects, but they are not always debating Government's business. There are other measures that Government will accept coming from their own backbenchers. It may be a bit unfortunate that there are few backbenchers on the Government side, but certainly in Parliaments which have made their names and whose proceedings we have looked at with some sort of approval, private members have been given an opportunity by means of Question Time and by means of bringing forward substantive motions to deal with matters. A lot of these matters can be dealt with by accommodation between the Leader of Government Business and the Leader of the Opposition where sometimes the

Government will concede their own time and suspend the Standing Orders in this respect for private members' motions to come forward, but I think I could not allow this opportunity to pass without commenting on the lack of opportunities that we get to discuss matters of Government policy, and that is why you see your Committees of Supply and Committees of the whole House are sometimes used as an opportunity for wide ranging debates on policy.

I have been in this House and have not seen an opportunity for a debate on foreign policy. The Government never introduces a Resolution of this nature. It is left to private members to bring it forward, and how can we have any adequate debate on these matters unless we are given a reasonable opportunity. As a private member, Sir, I am really concerned about the cutting down of the time and the manner in which we are being limited on this aspect of the business, and I am asking the Government to

look at it in the sense that it is in the interest of every member to bring up a matter. Sometimes a member of Government may not want through Government aegis to raise a matter himself which may affect his own constituents, and one of his backbenchers raises it for him, but it seems to me that, as we are doing, we are more and more not only restricting members' rights to speak in Committees of the whole House or in

Committees of Supply, we are not only restricting the time being given to Question Time, but we are also restricting the time being given to Private Members' Business and I cannot see what is the point of members coming to Parliament if all we are to do is to listen to Government put forward its point of view, sit down and shut up. That is how the matter is appearing to me.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, after following Hansard in this country for several years, I must confess that this Parliament has so far shown that it can raise the standard of debate, and this is no doubt due to Your Honour's strong rulings and Your Honour's way of conducting the House and members' sense of commitment in this way. 5.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, after following Hansard in this country for several years I must confess that this Parliament has so far shown that it can raise the standard of debate, and this is no doubt due to Your Honour's strong rulings and Your Honour's way of conducting the House and members' sense of commitment in this respect, but I think now rather than a limitation of time members should be given a reasonable opportunity to put forward points of view leaving it to Your Honour or other presiding officers to deal with irrelevance and that sort of thing. I am moving that at least we extend the time and that the amendment should not be till 4.45 but it should be till 5 o'clock.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted be 5 p.m. instead of 4.45 p.m. stand part of Standing Order 20 was put and resolved in the negative with division.

The question that Standing Order 20 (3) as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that Standing Order 30(1) as amended stand part.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government accepts the principle of shadow Ministers, or if it does not it should, because one of these days no matter how long it takes this Government will be a Government in opposition itself and will need an opportunity to have leading spokesmen on some subjects. The effect of the amendment to this Standing Order will be to make it impossible for any shadow Minister who is following on after the Minister making the main speech for the Government on a motion to speak for not more than 30 minutes and to be limited, no matter how wide the Minister may range outside his portfolio, to be limited only to condense his remarks no matter how good they may be to 30 minutes. Some of us may be able to do that because we are trained to speak, some of us speak more quickly than others, but it seems to me a wrong principle in this Standing Order to have this form of provision.

If one is accepting in the country the principle of having shadow Ministers at all one must accept also the responsibility which goes with it, and that is, that you have a principal speaker from the front bench on the Government side and a principal speaker from the front bench on the Opposition side. This is so in every Parliament that I know in any democratic country, and on the basis of this it seems strange that the only limitation applying to the principal speaker on the Opposition side, except he happens to be the Leader of the Opposition, but there is no such limitation on the Government side. I do not believe that the Standing Orders of this House should be only for the entrenchment of the rights of the Government only, I believe that the Standing Orders should not be acrimoniously debated, they should be so organised to get through business expeditiously but they should also be organised to give people a reasonable opportunity to put forward effectively all relevant points of debate and all relevant points of substance. They should be organised to give the country an opportunity to hear effectively the other side.

Take, for instance, all major speeches on the Government side outside of the budget debate, what will be the position where the Opposition wants to reply adequately to that? Let us assume that the principal speaker in the Opposition on matters of finance following the Minister in his budget debate happens not to be the Leader of the Opposition but a separate Minister of Finance, I think that is covered by section 2. Let us assume the principal speaker in a foreign policy debate happens not to be the Leader of the Opposition but another member, what are we to expect in those circumstances? I do not think that members have seriously looked at the effect of this amendment. In some Parliaments there is a standing Standing Orders Committee which reviews the rules and sees how they are functioning, and I have no doubt that in the new limitation of time this would not be the ideal thing to have. I think that that is absolutely adequate to take care of any complaint that the Government might have, and there should be no reason for their harnessing the principal Opposition speaker regardless of whether that Government is on this side or on that side. There are many Governments which have made rules, certainly in Antigua when one Government was in power they made rules which eventually led to their being thrown out, and I am hoping that this Government will not find itself in a similar position. We are making rules here for all times, and they should not have to deal with the six Opposition members unless the Government is afraid of what the six of us will say. Certainly we should not harness the principal speaker who is going to reply to the Minister of Communications and Works or the Minister of Lands and Housing; can you think of a debate on housing policy in this country where the principal Government speaker put forward a proper policy and it is not debated by the shadow Minister on the other side, but one has a limitation and the other can talk at length? It is a matter for the House, but I should like to have recorded for posterity my remarks on this because I am sure one of these times that one of these Standing Orders might really prove the downfall of that Government in Opposition.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, these words were included in the original revised Standing Orders as the Leader of the Opposition said, they were incorporated from the Canadian Standing Orders, and at the time I do not think we looked into it as carefully as we should have. I am now more au fait with the effect of having these words than I was then. 5.20 p.m.

I would feel that there is a case when a member should speak after the Minister even when he is not the Leader of the Opposition. I will concede and go as far as saying that a member speaking in reply next after the Minister. The various Shadow Ministers in the Opposition are not clearly defined. The hon. member for St. Peter, I think, is the Shadow Minister of Health and Welfare. I think the Hon.

Member for the City is Minister of Housing.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member kindly give way.

Mr. HINDS:

I am in my place, Sir, and if the Leader of the House is saying in my presence that he understands I am the Shadow Minister of Health and Welfare and that is not so, then it is my duty to advise the Minister accordingly. I should like to let the Minister know now that I am not the Shadow Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a matter of personal explanation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I apologise, Sir, and beg to withdraw that statement. The hon. member is so knowledgeable on health matters that I thought that portfolio might have been assigned to him. I apologise for the blunder. The hon. member for St. Joseph is, presumably, the Shadow Minister of Agriculture, and the hon. and learned member for Christ Church West is, probably, the Shadow Minister of Finance, Legal Affairs, External Affairs and a bundle of portfolios.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I am the Shadow Minister for Education and Public Relations, but this does not mean that I am not competent to speak on any other matter.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, you will realise that I referred to hon. members with two exceptions. The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are clearly defined, but you can see the confusion which will arise. The Shadow Ministers as such have objected to my referring to them. I do not know exactly which Shadow Minister will be speaking and on what subjects. I am willing to accept an amendment along the lines that in case of the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, then the member speaking in reply, etc.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I never used the words "Shadow Minister". All the talk about Shadow Ministers came from the Leader of the House. I am emphasising that whoever rises on this side to speak will be the Opposition member to whom the privilege should apply. It will not always be the Shadow Minister who will necessarily speak first. The members of the Opposition, whether I am here or not, will choose somebody to reply to a Ministerial Speech. All I am saying is that I do not want the privilege to be personal. I want the privilege to be an Opposition privilege.

Sir, I am sure that these words cover the whole point: "or the Member who speaks next in reply". I am not saying anything more about a Shadow Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I am speaking, and I am not going to carry on. I want to hear sound, Parliamentary phrases, Sir. I am surprised to hear lawyers in the House using these unparliamentary phrases and things that do not have any application. There is not even a convention in Barbados yet so that one can say that the Shadow Ministry has been a convention and all of us can share this convention together. I am happy that one side has adopted it to suit its own convenience.

Let us be quite frank. You do not help people by calling them names. On this side we have had people who like calling Parliamentary names. I heard the hon. member for Christ Church West speaking about when you are on this side and you make Rules they are likely to apply to you when you are in the Opposition. I want to give him some solace. I sat on that side, too; I listened to members on the Government benches on this side, and I warned them that the power they had would not last forever. I did not have to warn them for long. It only lasted for one session of 5 years after which they were swept away from Parliament.

People should not get intoxicated with Parliamentary power, because it is too fragile. The point the hon. member made about Shadow Ministers is not a constitutional matter that you can write into Rules in the Standing Orders. What are you calling a Shadow Minister? A Shadow Minister is one who is practising to be a Minister. Are you saying that Parliamentary Secretaries are Shadow Ministers, too? They are shadowing the Ministers. They are more Shadow Ministers than members over there. They are in the shadow of the Ministers. On the other side the Leader of the Opposition or the Parliamentary Labour Party may be using these names for convenience. You have assigned names for everybody; you have given everybody a post in the army, and, as the father of the Leader of the Opposition used to say, in the Mexican Army they made everybody a general. You had no privates.

Now, let us be quite frank. In a Parliamentary situation where you have six members and you have nine Ministers, then every man over there is a Shadow Minister. It means now that by definition you will have to assign a speaking session to every member. I am not a Shadow Minister and I am not a shadow boxer. I am a member of Parliament. The five other members over there, other than the Leader of the Opposition, do not have any greater right to speak after the Leader of the Opposition than I have. Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let me emphasise that the Leader of the Opposition will not be speaking unlimited and then a member. That is not what the words mean. 5.30 p.m.

Read the words. The member must speak immediately after the Minister. It is only who speaks after the Minister. I cannot speak and then another member.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was dealing with the time. It does not give the Leader of the Opposition the only right to speak; we were talking in relation to the time a member is

going to have to speak, but it does not mean that other members cannot speak. It does not say that there is going to be one speech, and that after a Minister has spoken only one member from that side can speak. It is a question of the limitation so far as time is concerned. They are speaking about time, not the right to speak; so this does not preclude every member in the Opposition from speaking because the Leader has spoken.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Standing Order dealt with the limitation of time for each member to speak, but the Leader of the Opposition was accorded more time than any other member, and the only member other than the Leader of the Opposition who will be given the time of the Leader of the Opposition would be the one who gets up after the Minister has spoken; but it does not preclude any other member from speaking. What we are saying is that the office of Leader of the Opposition is the only one that is known constitutionally in Barbados to exist other than the Prime Minister and the Ministers; so constitutionally if you are going to write something in the Standing Orders, there is no such thing as a Shadow Minister or shadow boxer or anything like that that you can put in. You cannot therefore ask what you will do with a Shadow Minister. As the hon. member for Christ Church West knows, this would be going back to the original position. You have accorded the Leader of the Opposition constitutionally in Barbados certain rights and privileges, not the Shadow Ministers, so it is for them to make up their minds, and I will tell the Leader of the Opposition that if he has been elected to be Chairman of the Party, he must get on top of the Party and rule it. Whenever a man is made a Leader, he must get in front and lead. If you are Leader of the Opposition, you must tell your members that as Parliamentary Leader certain rights are vested in you and this is the position. (Mr. ADAMS: Come over to Macedonia!) I was over in Macedonia.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member stick to the matter under discussion.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, you did not hear the hon. member say to come over into Macedonia, but I heard him. I have listened to

Macedonia and it is because I have listened to the voices in Macedonia that I am over here. The Leader of the Opposition should tell his members that if you are dealing with a limitation of time, apart from the fifteen minutes, if it is half an hour, one hour or two hours, you must accord the Leader of the Opposition more time as a matter of identification. You must identify people in these matters. You cannot leave it vague. If the Leader of the Opposition is identified, this Clause has gone too far because it has put in a meaningless point, as it does not state to which side is referred when you say a member speaking after the Minister. Unless that is precisely stated I can get up and speak after the Minister. This will have to be clearly defined to say whom you mean, because if it is not, after a Minister or the Prime Minister has spoken, I or the hon. member for St. Lucy can get up and speak. I want to make it clear that I do not go for names such as backbencher, front bench or Shadow Cabinet. You are a member of Parliament, and as such you are going to be accorded the rights of a member and you have the right to speak. There is no question of my not having the right to speak over here and so too with hon. members over there, but there is no point the Leader of the Opposition getting up and speaking for his Party and then the five other members get up and speak on the same point. If the Leader of the Opposition is going to accord a member of his Party the privilege of making the leading speech on anything, that would have to be a conventional arrangement made between both leaders. Conventions are not always written into

Standing Orders. If he is running the Party with any sense, even the newspapers can know tomorrow if there is a debate of importance who is going to lead off and speak on behalf of the Opposition. If the Leader of the Opposition who is leader of the Party decides he is going to speak on behalf of the Party on any subject, this is parliamentary practice. The Leader of the Opposition has the equivalent position on his side as the Prime Minister on this side. Although you have other Ministers over here, the Prime Minister can decide he is going to deal with any matter that he brings down; so if the Leader of the Opposition decides that he is going to take up the debate on agriculture, fisheries or any other matter, that is a matter that they must decide within the Party, and you can only work rules on that basis. I would say that all the Leader of the Opposition needs to do is to have it so defined that it makes no mistake that it means a member for the Opposition so that we know what he is talking about.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of elucidation, can I interrupt the hon. member so that he can get back up? As the hon. member for St. Michael West pointed out, perhaps it would meet the objection of everybody if we used the words contained in paragraph (2) "or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition" because that would make it clear that it is an Opposition member, which is the point made by the hon. member for St. Michael West who has very kindly given way, and would also I think deal with the point made by the Leader of the House that it would have to be clear that it is the member who is making the Opposition's first reply and not the Leader of the Opposition in these particular circumstances. If it is the form of words "or the member speaking in reply next" that might refer to a member on that side and so on, the formula we used in the Budget reply might be a better formula to use throughout so that you use the same expression throughout. If we moved that, would it suit the hon. member?

Mr. WALCOTT:

So far as I am concerned, I am like the saying goes I am easy. I have no hard side on this. I only entered this debate to deal with the point made by the hon. member for Christ Church West. He made another point. He brought in other Parliaments, but the hon. member must be practical. This is not a principle you are dealing with; you have to relate to circumstances. There is no point of looking at a 24 member Parliament and treat it with the same kind of paraphernalia with which you treat the House of Commons in Ottawa or the House of Commons in the United Kingdom with 400 people, because the whole system is different. You are dealing with the whole membership over here. 5.40 p.m.

The Standing Orders must be related not only to Parliament as Parliament, they must be related to the circumstances where Parliaments are meeting everyday, people come from long distances and remain overnight, therefore you have to accord them these things in order that business might be dealt with. When we come to Private Members' time the hon. member for Christ Church West is an example, but they will know that Private Members' Business even here is not conducted on a rigid basis. I agree with the hon. member, but Private Members' Business should be dealt with in a more orderly fashion, but the private members do not themselves seem to be ready. Some members put things down for a political splash, and once they get it there it does not matter, they do not intend to deal with it, because the Standing Orders can apply to private members also. There is nothing in the rules of the House of Assembly that will permit a day to be set aside to deal with Private Members'

Business, so that the Standing Orders cannot be so amended that Private Members' Business can go on after half past four. There is no law of the land which states that if you continue Private Members' Business after the allotted time under the Standing Orders you will be doing something wrong, those can

be suspended, and if they are so suspended Private Members' Business will continue if the Government has no business to deal with, but it is only a matter for private members to make up their minds as to what they want to do.

I feel that sometimes in a 24 member Parliament we behave and act as if we were in the Congress in the United States of America or in the Parliament at Westminster, forgetting that we are only 24 people. I do not want to be facetious, but the hon. member knows as a fact that over there there are six members, but they debate matters in such a manner that they do not present a Parliamentary front, because you cannot find any six members anywhere in the world, unless you had six independent parties, that each man in a party will get up not on a major issue but on any matter and deal with every matter and make a speech. If everyone of us on this side got up to deal with every matter it would not make sense, so I feel that when the hon. member says you want to preclude private members from dealing with their business that is not true, there is no necessity, because apart from the other members in Parliament like the hon. member for Christ Church West, there are some of us who have Parliamentary experience, the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and many of us have seen too many ups and downs in politics. It is a question of the stability of the people. I was in and I was out but I am stronger than some of them who have always been in, because I do not have to beg anybody for any favours, it is a question of character. Parliament does not give a man character, you must have character before you come into Parliament. Some people come into Parliament for different reasons, all of us are not in Parliament for the same reason, so it is not the party to which you belong, there are certain basic principles you stand by, so when you are in the Opposition today you might be over here tomorrow, but it is only that some of us are more consistent in our politics and we feel that if we hold certain strong views in politics, Standing Orders or no Standing Orders we are going to stick by them, and I feel the Opposition should not be saying that we are passing something to preclude them from debating any matters. I am the last man to think that, and I would quite humbly withdraw from the House if I feel Your Honour is wrong rather than disrespect the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member deal with Standing Order 30.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to exercise the right that you asked the Governor-General for, that I must have freedom in debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Please stick to Standing

Order 30.

Mr. WALCOTT:

That Standing Order deals with the debates of this Assembly and I am going to exercise the freedom that you asked the Governor-General for, that I must have freedom in debate and freedom at all times to express views in this Chamber. I repeat that if I have to withdraw from this Chamber it is not a matter that I am going to disrespect the Chair, but I am going to withdraw from this House if I feel strongly about any ruling from the Chair rather than come in conflict with the Chair. I do not agree with everything that is done in Parliament, because I do not believe that Parliament is Paradise, it is not a

place where everything is done right, so let me make my position crystal clear about these matters. You have to be man enough to see that time wasted in Parliament is something we have to try to avoid. The members of the Opposition will have to realise that you cannot spend hours and hours debating matters, if the electorate gave you six members, you have to be satisfied, and unless we so misbehave ourselves, we are not here forever, then you know that the electorate will put you where they have put us because we have not conducted ourselves in a manner that we should be placed here. I feel that there is nothing in these Standing Orders that would preclude the hon. member from exercising his right and I would not be with anybody who would preclude any member from having his freedom to express his views on any matter.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I confess that I have a certain sympathy with the view of the members who have spoken on behalf of the Opposition on this matter. With my well known capacity for misunderstanding, which was so clearly explained by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, I have, I confess, misunderstood the purpose of eliminating the words which are proposed to be eliminated. I think this misunderstanding comes from the very wording of the phrase itself, because it appears to me that this time should not apply to the Prime Minister and the Minister moving a Government Order, the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking next in reply. This meant to me that it would not apply to one, two, three or four, which in effect meant that two persons might have unlimited speech on the Opposition side, which was not reasonable and is not indeed being asked for. If my misunderstanding was shared by any other members, and if there is any feeling on the matter, then I suggest that this could possibly be eliminated by the insertion of the word "and" after the words "a Minister moving a Government Order" to be followed by "or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition" as it appears in 30(2). I so move that it be amended in that fashion.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I had intended making such a motion so I now rise to second the motion because it makes it quite clear now that the privilege is the privilege of the Leader of the Opposition, that his speech is unlimited. However, should he so desire he may defer in favour of any member of his Party to speak on behalf of that side in any debate, so if we include the word "and" after the words "a Government Order" to be followed by "the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition" it makes it crystal clear that the Leader of the Opposition as well as another member have that privilege. Only one member has that privilege, but the Leader of the Opposition may give way to another member who is the chief spokesman on that side. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, it is so difficult to operate in Parliament in these days. The hon. member, who has just left the Chamber, spoke so much about the Leader of the Opposition not having control of his Party that he spoke for more than the 15 minutes which the relevant new Standing Order would have permitted him to speak. The members on the other side realise what we were asking for. He decries the system of Shadow Ministers. He has never heard of Shadow Ministries, but I heard about them when the D.L.P. first came into power. He looks at the Parliamentary Secretaries and says that they are the people who should be Shadow Ministers because they are shadowing the Ministers at all times. Having made a long tirade of nothing, he walks out of the Chamber.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. member for St. Michael West, and I was particularly touched when I heard him say that he was exercising his freedom to debate in this Honourable House - a freedom for which Your Honour had asked the Governor-General on our behalf. Those few words, I think, carry a lot of weight at this present moment. I cannot see why a Parliament as small as ours with 24 members - I cannot see why the necessity arises at all to impose any limitation whatsoever on the speeches of hon. members. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Michael West reminds me - after anybody has had the opportunity to read the debates with some of the speeches made by the hon. member during the years he has been in this Honourable House - I would say that when he was in his hey-day, I would like to hear the speech he would make if it were suggested that a limitation should be put on the time he had to speak. I appreciate the fact that some members feel that they are not physically fit to stand up to the stress and strain of all of this, and I would suggest to them that they should give it up.

We are a small Parliament. Let us look at our debates. You, Mr. Speaker, are in the Chair. We have Standing Orders which give you the authority to call on any member to desist from repeating himself. You also have the authority to call on him to take his seat, and to bring the debate to a halt if he does not comply with the Standing Orders. Mr. Speaker, why are we striving to impose this 15-minute or 30-minute limitation? We have debated the various Departments' Heads from time to time. Has anyone considered an hon. member's responsibility to his constituency and the nation as a whole? Must his contribution be limited to a 15-minute speech? Can every hon. member say what he wants to say in 15 minutes' time? If he cannot say everything in 15 minutes, must he be called upon to sit down? What is the reason for this? If it is now becoming necessary to impose a limitation.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is, apparently, under a misapprehension. It is 15 minutes for each Head, You can speak for 15 minutes on each Head in a Resolution. If there are six Heads, you can speak for 90 minutes.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not under any misapprehension. I understand that you can speak for 15 minutes on a Head, but I have found it necessary already to speak in this Honourable House for 5 hours on a Head without repeating myself. (Asides.) You are in the Chair, Sir, and you have the authority. If there are hon. members who do not want to spend time in Parliament - (Asides.) I do not believe that this Government is so corrupt that it has something to hide and is trying to silence the Opposition. We have had instances in this Honourable House, and I am sure that if hon. members on the other side had found themselves in the Opposition they would never want the debate to end. They now find themselves in the happy position of trying to impose their own will - that is what it amounts to - upon the members of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to you. Can this be fair? Can it be just? 6 p.m.

I have seen the Speaker sitting in the Chair with a tired feeling across his face. I have witnessed all this, but even then would that justify the placing of a fifteen minute limitation on the time that an hon.

member must speak on a measure no matter how much information, how good a contribution to the debate an hon. member finds himself able to make? All these things have got to be taken into consideration. If it is the wish of the majority to silence the minority of six..... I have been told in an aside to silence the minority of one.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have not heard your being told that.

Mr. HINDS:

I am telling you what I have been told. They have got to silence the people of St. Peter first. I tell them now that unless I fall very ill between now and the next election, do not play with the people of St. Peter.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, when the original motion to have a Select Committee was made, I was one of the members nominated to serve on that Committee, and a look at the records would clearly show that I attended one meeting only of that Committee. I make no apologies for this, but let me state here and now the reason for that. When I went to the Committee meeting I discovered that it was the intention of the Government to put a time limit on the speeches of members of Parliament, and I decided to take no further part in any such Committee. I share the views of the hon. member for St. Peter and I am going to vote against this particular Standing Order because I do not accept this idea of looking at rules made in other countries like Canada, Australia and other Commonwealth countries and deciding that they are applicable to Barbados. How can you take the rules made in Canada where there are over 300 members in Parliament and limit members here to thirty minutes?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if you look at the records, the hon. member attended the seventh meeting of this Committee. I would not worry to question whether he felt like that before he attended any meeting at all, but over and above that, the limitation of time is a spill over from the last Committee in the old Session and it was seconded by Senator St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You are making a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I took no further part in the Committee when I discovered that it was the intention to limit the speeches because I do not agree with limiting speeches in Parliament, and I make no apologies for that to anybody. I will not be voting for this Standing Order. You take a situation in a Canadian Parliament where there are over 300 members and for various reasons speeches must be limited and apply the same situation to a Parliament of 24 members and expect twenty-four members to deal in the same detail with a matter as would be dealt with by 300 members in the Canadian or some other Parliament, and it is for this reason that I will not support this. I wonder what would be the position of this present Government between 1956 and 1961 if either the late Sir Grantley Adams or the late Dr. Cummins had attempted to bring something like this before the House when the Prime Minister, the High Commissioner to Great Britain, the member for St. Michael West and members like Mr. Winter Crawford and such other people were in the Opposition, to limit the speeches of members of

Parliament.

Let us be realistic. This is not really designed to limit the speeches of the members of the Government; this has one purpose only, and that is to limit the speeches made on the part of the Opposition. It is a round-about method of trying to bridle the members of the Opposition. What would have been the stand of the member for St. Michael South Central when he was in Opposition and this had come before Parliament? I am certain that the then Government would not have had the gall to attempt to bring down this sort of legislation; but purely because they have eighteen seats they believe it is part of their function to bridle the Opposition. As far as I am concerned, this is the beginning of the end of democracy in this country. As the hon. member for St. Michael West had to remind Your Honour, Your Honour at the beginning of this Session claimed freedom of speeches for members of Parliament and now they want to decide that a member cannot speak for more than thirty minutes on any one subject. You do not limit a Minister who is given a brief, who has Civil Servants to look up all the work for him to come to Parliament, but the Ministers and the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition are placed in special categories as far as this Order is concerned. I will never support that. In here we are all members of Parliament as the hon. member for St. Michael West has said, and I do not see why any Prime Minister, Minister or Leader of the Opposition should have more right or more time to speak than any other person, and I make no apologies for saying this. When we go to face the electorate we have to give an account of our stewardship in here; we have to beg people for votes the same way as any Minister, and you tell me that a Minister is entitled to talk longer in here than any other member? This does not apply to back benchers of the Government because with the exception of the hon. member for St. Michael West, the hon. member for St. Lucy, and the hon. member for St. Michael South East, they do not have any back benchers; all the other members hold positions in here. 6.10 p.m.

Let us be realistic, this Standing Order has but one intention. This is not designed to help the back benchers, the back benchers of Government do not take part in any debate except on the passing of a Resolution of sympathy or something like that, they do not take part in debates regularly, so when you come and say that once you exempt Ministers the only people it will affect are the back benchers, in truth and in fact the only people it will affect are the members of the Opposition. It is quite clear that this is so designed, because as far as Government is concerned they do not give explanations sometimes. If you look at the Addenda to some Resolutions which come down here you will see there nothing but a pure insult to Parliament, and then you tell members on this side that they are limited to talk for 30 minutes. You have the numbers and you can use them, but I say this, today you are in charge and you do not know what will happen tomorrow.

The member for St. Michael West says that parliamentary democracy is a flimsy thing and you could never tell what will happen, but you are making rules to suit yourself because certain members of the Opposition may talk too long for your liking. The member for Christ Church North Central talks about legislation, but this is done because certain members of the Opposition talk too long and you do not like criticism. I wonder why it is when you had less members and the Opposition more you did not see fit to bring in this, but you have 18 members now, and you know the only rights the Opposition have in here is to get up and express themselves on the floor of this House and you want to take away that right. I will not under any circumstances whatsoever be supporting this amendment.

I go a step further. Take the question under Order (3) which deals with the Throne Speech and which is a broad aspect of the Government's policy. I heard a lot of talk about not recognizing shadow

Ministers and all this nonsense, but the whole system of parliamentary government and ministerial responsibility, Cabinet Government, does recognise the functions of shadow Ministers on this side of the House, even if you delegate to each member a particular topic to deal with on a question like the Throne Speech where you are dealing with all aspects of Government policy, or where you are dealing with the Five Year Development Plan, you are asking a member of the House to deal with aspects of Government policy contained in a Development Plan or in a Throne Speech, when the Minister himself has the right to talk for more than 30 minutes in moving it, but a member on this side in criticising it or speaking must only deal with it in 30 minutes. This sort of thing cannot be right. No person can deal with any Development Plan or any aspect of Government policy in 30 minutes, that is, if the Government has a proper policy.

If the Government had a proper policy on education, one member responsible for education on this side could not deal with that policy in 30 minutes. No member could deal adequately with health and welfare where you are spending \$20 million in 30 minutes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, what it boils down to is that the Leader of the Opposition can speak unlimitedly and then each member can speak for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order, point of explanation.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, is the hon. member who is speaking moving an amendment that Standing Order 30 be deleted?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not before the House, but the hon. member for Bridgetown is quite in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the reply of the Leader of the House is indicative of the type of parliamentary democracy or party politics in which he believes, that there must be one king at top and others beneath him. To tell me that on a Development Plan the Leader of the Opposition must talk unlimitedly, therefore he must deal with every aspect of the Development Plan, and the rest of us must deal with it in 30 minutes is not our idea of politics, that is what you are subjected to in your Party, not being able to stand up like men. We do not depend on politics for our living.

Our position, as far as I am concerned, is simply this. It is impossible to ask any member - and the members know this, members who sat in the Opposition previously, the Hon. Leader of the House, the member for St. Michael South

Central - to limit a speech on the Development Plan to 30 minutes, it is difficult to debate any Development Plan or Throne Speech in half hour if you are going to deal with it adequately, because the Minister himself cannot deal with it adequately, as far as I am concerned, what we are seeing here for the first time in the whole history of this Parliament in an attempt to limit the speeches of the members of Parliament. As I said, it is an attempt to limit the speeches of the Opposition, and it is the beginning

of the erosion of parliamentary democracy in this country. 6.20 p.m.

We saw an attempt made, during the last session when a Bill was introduced in this Parliament, to take away certain privileges granted under the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act, 1963. The Opposition opposed the matter and the Government backed down. Today we see the beginning of the end of Parliamentary democracy, if this is passed. I beg to move that Standing Order 30 be deleted.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, there is already a motion before this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

He will be moving an amendment. Let it be seconded.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is not an amended motion. This is a completely different motion. The other motion was that the draft should be amended. If he is now going to make a motion that it be deleted, that would not be an amendment to the motion. In my opinion it would be a completely different motion. We cannot have two motions before the Chamber at any one time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am much obliged to you, This amendment deals only with Section 30(1). Unless the member is going to restrict his amendment to Section 30(1), it would be all right. Perhaps the House might entertain any motion the hon. member might wish to move in different circumstances.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, let me first deny categorically that this particular Standing Order is any attempt to muzzle the Opposition. Even Government Ministers under this Standing Order are muzzled and enjoy no greater privilege than other members of this House, They have described me as the Minister of All Affairs; they have described me as the Minister of Everything. Under this Standing Order, unless I move a motion, I am also restricted to 15 minutes. This is no attempt to muzzle the Opposition. This is an attempt to bring order and stop repetition, because I am satisfied that any member of Parliament, who has any point to make, can make it within half an hour, and it is not discrimination against the Opposition.

This Standing Order presumes that the Opposition is going to organise itself along proper lines and, instead of having one Minister of AD Affairs for over here, you would not have six Parliamentarians of All Affairs and of All Subjects over there. I should assume that a properly-run Opposition would meet at some time to consider the Order Paper. I am all for Shadow Ministers.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. The Minister says he will presume that any properly-run Opposition will meet at some time to deal with an Order Paper. How can you meet when the Order Paper comes to you at 2.30 p.m. on a Monday for a meeting which will take place at 12 noon on a

Tuesday? You must know the facts.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about them, but the Democratic Labour Party, whether the Order Paper comes or not, meets on Monday evenings at six o'clock to consider Parliamentary Business. When I belonged to the Opposition Party and was a member of the Labour Party, we used to meet in Fairchild Street on the evening before Parliament to discuss what was on the Order Paper. This is not a new organisation. The Order Paper used to arrive late, too, but on the Monday afternoon there would be a meeting of the Parliamentary group. I do not care what anybody says, I am for Shadow Ministers. Even although they call me Mr. Know All, there are people whose interests, whose predilection, and whose desire and interests in a topic are very great.

I respect the member for St. Joseph for his agricultural knowledge. I respect the member for St. Peter for his knowledge of roads, water, lights, and certain aspects of the kitchen at the Hospital. I know that the hon. member for St. James also has certain interests in the Community which are dearer to him than other interests. He should be the Minister for Sports and so on. The Leader of the Opposition has a certain financial expertise, he is very knowledgeable, and he is well read on quite a few topics. The hon. member for the City, brought up under his father, knows about Housing and other matters pertaining thereto. I am all for assigning the members of the Opposition to specific areas in which the Leader of the Party thinks that they have a special expertise. What does this Standing Order do? If I move a motion for Communications and Works where I have unlimited time, then the Standing Order gives unlimited time to the member of St. Peter, if he is the Shadow Minister. What could be fairer than that? The other members can support him for 30 minutes as the case may be. I would expect, unless it was a matter of high policy, or a matter on which the Leader of the Opposition feels he should make some political point in the interests of his Party, he might take over from the hon. member for St. Peter.

Similarly, with Housing. The hon. member for the City got up. If the Minister moves the motion, then you have unlimited time in which to put the Opposition's point of view. This is based on organisation. You do not want to give unlimited time to everybody to repeat things. This will enable members of the Opposition to develop a certain degree of expertise, and it will enable them to organise their Party on certain lines that they can expose certain things to the public. They could show the people who put them in power what the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Communications and Works and so on have been doing.

Let us read the Order:

"In a debate on a Government Order a Member may speak for 30 minutes except on the third reading of a Bill when a Member may speak for 15 minutes, provided that these time limits should not apply to the Prime Minister."

A Government is run by the people. You cannot, in any Parliament in the world, limit the Prime Minister to any time. I do not care what the hon. member for the City tells me about the Prime Minister being the same as any member in Parliament. He is the Prime Minister of the country. In National Emergencies, there may be occasions when the Prime Minister may have to speak for hours. I hope that those situations do not arrive. You cannot tell a Prime Minister of a country, who the people have elected, that his time must be limited. You can tell me or members of the Opposition that. The Prime

Minister of any country must have an unlimited right to address Parliament on matters of National interests and National emergencies. This is clear and accepted in all Parliaments.

A Minister may move a Government Order on Housing in which he has to trace the history of a particular measure. You cannot limit him, if he is trying to give all the facts and present the matter properly. I am not talking about a small money Resolution with an Addendum. I am talking about where a Minister is developing a point changing the history of some aspect of Governmental change. He would have to show why the Government is taking certain drastic action in a particular situation. 6.30 p.m.

When you are reorganising some vital aspect of the country's affairs a Minister may be called upon to make a speech in which for the benefit of the members of the Opposition he has got to trace the history from its foundation right up to the existing moment when this fundamental change is coming about; so we exempt him. In respect to the Constitution we have given to the Leader of the Opposition who is recognised by the Constitution the right to speak like a Minister or the Prime Minister. What could be more democratic than that? The Constitution recognises the Leader of the Opposition. It says the man who can control the majority of the Opposition, the Governor General makes Leader of the Opposition. He has certain specific functions in which he must be consulted by the Prime Minister. We have not abridged his powers; we have given him the same power as the Prime Minister and specifically the Minister who may have to introduce a measure; or we say that if the Leader of the Opposition feels that any member of his party has expertise and is more knowledgeable that member shall have unlimited time too. How can you get up and say in this Chamber that this Government is out to muzzle the Opposition when we have given each and every one of the members with a particular expertise unlimited time, dependent on the allocation or the assignment by the Leader of the Opposition. If he is just leading where there are all generals, that is not the Government's fault, but where we accept that you have selected him as your leader and have given him the same unlimited time as a Government Minister or the Prime Minister, how can it be said that this Government is destroying free speech and the freedom of Parliament and stopping people from developing their points?

We have not abridged his powers at all. Can it be honestly said in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, that because a back bencher or other members cannot speak unlimited that they are suffering any loss of privilege? There is no privilege to talk and repeat yourself. You have no privilege to speak for hours saying nothing.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, if the Minister really means that there is no privilege to repeat himself, he should really sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I feel Mr. Speaker, that we have grown up in this country to believe that the longer we talk and the more we talk and every time we make a political point, that that is why they give us votes because we are representing the people. We are not representing people by talking long on every subject under the sun. I can speak with authority because when you see me speak, I am Chairman of the Estimates Committee and I know every estimate that comes for decision; so when you call me Minister of All

Affairs, it is not that I am interfering, but it is that I have a more intimate knowledge of what is passing in terms of budget preparation than other members.

Let us be fair to people and not mislead them. After all we are running as a Party and not as a bunch of wild boys. We are running as an organised political party with a Leader of the House and with members with portfolios assigned, and if one of them is given the privilege of speaking unlimited, do not blame us; if the Leader of the Opposition hogs up all the time, don't blame us. I would expect that the Party organised along proper lines would find this Standing Order perfectly agreeable because 5 x 30 are 150 minutes which are 2½ hours. The Leader of the Opposition can speak unlimited, or if the Member for the City is the member to deal with Housing, he can speak unlimited and still have two hours and thirty minutes with the other members' support as rear guard action; so anything you forgot to say, you can ask the member for St. James, the member for St. Peter and so on. You will get turns because you must have certain assignments by your leader. If it is Communications and Works the member for St. Peter can speak non-stop as long as he likes with two hours and thirty minutes backing up by his colleagues, so that. what is left of the ramparts when the particular member has destroyed them, the mopping up can be done by the Opposition in two hours and thirty minutes. Is that seriously saying, Mr. Speaker, that we are stifling the Opposition? Are they saying that after the member for Bridgetown has spoken without limit on a matter peculiar to his shadow portfolio that the other five members of the Opposition with their accumulated experience and knowledge cannot completely criticize and destroy the Government if we are doing something wrong in the remaining two hours and thirty minutes. If you cannot do it in that time you will never do it. if I were on that side and one of my members spoke unlimited and I had to bring up the rear and offer some little howitzer fire behind, I would only need thirty minutes. Do not tell the people that we are destroying democracy because we are trying to bring order to Parliamentary business. Some nights we stay here and you get members getting up a million times repeating themselves because they are filibustering. That is all right in the American Senate where they are getting millions of dollars for doing nothing, where there are prejudices and they want to filibuster against the Civil Rights Act.

The Leader of the Opposition is under pressure from the members of the Opposition because you have not accepted his contribution to this and this new ruling is not something fresh. When your former leader was in Parliament he was in favour of limiting the debates; so if the now Leader of the Opposition finds himself with a rebellious group of persons who are not accepting his leadership because each one wants to talk as long as he, that is your business. The Government is going to pass this Standing Order as it stands, because it means order in debate and it means better allocation of parliamentary time.

Mr. ADAMS:

I think I had better speak very shortly.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But you have already spoken.

Mr. ADAMS:

Is this not on the amendment to vote against Standing Order 30? Would the House give me leave to say a word or two? There is no motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is a motion which I will read if the Leader of the Opposition will follow carefully, from the fifth line, -

"a Minister moving a Government Order, and the Leader of the Opposition or the Member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition."

Mr. ADAMS:

This is to stop the Leader of the Opposition from speaking a second time. Sir, I would just like to lend my voice, whatever hon. member might think on the other side, to support the general theme that as an abstract principle I am not in favour of limitation of speeches. I think that if the Government, mistakenly as I view it, wish to limit speeches, I believe that this Standing Order is as good as we are going to get; but I would just like it to be clearly understood that as a general principle I am not in favour of limitation of speeches in a House of 24 members, and I do not believe that Senator St. John was either and we are forced with our backs against the wall, and therefore we have to find a formula that satisfies the wish of the eighteen oppressors and also the interest of the people of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You can treat that as a matter of personal explanation.

Mr. ADAMS:

It is a matter of personal explanation. Why are they putting in "and the Leader of the Opposition or the Member"? What is wrong with the comma? Both the Prime Minister and the Minister moving the Government Order can speak. With great respect, that is not the schemer of the Standing Order at all. The Standing Order shows that there has always been a Leader of the Opposition. If you want to limit me, I don't mind. These things happen. The schemer of the Canadian Order on which this has been based is that you treat the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister as sufficiently responsible persons not to misuse the right of unlimited speech, and the Minister or the member of the Opposition introducing also have unlimited time. You treat the Prime Minister's intervention and the Leader of the Opposition's intervention whatever it is as being matters of unlimited speech. 6.40 p.m.

Nobody is putting the Leader of the Opposition on the same level governmentally as the Prime Minister, because this was not moved when I was in the House. Nobody is putting the two of them on the same level governmentally, but this is Parliament and as the member for St. Andrew used to say, none of us came in here in dung baskets, we all had to go and beg for votes to come in, and the Prime Minister has had experiences which I have not had so far and which, God willing, I never will, namely of losing his seat, of begging and being rejected and so on. (Asides) I believe yours is in more danger than mine.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member confine himself to Standing Order 30(1).

Mr. ADAMS:

I believe that if you ran against me you could not get in.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, I think the hon. member for St. Michael North West is making a comment about

the amendment as it stands, and is saying that this is what they asked for.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, how can the hon. member rise on a point of order on something I said sotto voce? There cannot be any record of anything I said from my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us behave like mature men. Will you take your seat please? if it was said sotto voce, why carp and cavil? There is a limit to my tolerance, gentlemen, carry on.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That amendment was moved by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central and it was seconded by the hon. member who got up and said that was what he was about to say. I just want that clarified, it is not what we have put here, that amendment was made by the hon. member. The Leader of the Opposition is saying he was not in his place and we did not make that amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition is speaking on the amendment as moved by the I Hon. Minister of Tourism.

Mr. BOLDEN:

This is what he is saying now, that the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister are placed in a different category from the other members, but the Minister of Tourism put in the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am not the best person to speak on it because it affects me, but why the "and"? This is a new principle now that neither arose at the Standing Orders Committee nor arose on either side when I was bringing amendments to the House, but has come now from nowhere. I would like to hear if this is the purpose; if it is the purpose and the Government has taken a decision I can vote against it, but I would like to know. Do hon. members understand what they mean by the language they use as the courts ask? An Act of Parliament is construed not according to what the members thought they were doing but according to what they meant by the language which they used. I would just like to be assured of that so that I will know how to cast my vote.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In that case you must finish your speech and then somebody will reply.

Mr. ADAMS:

The other point I was going to make was that so many members have reminded the members of the Committee that the original drafts all contained permission for a speech to be extended if the whole House liked the way it was going on, and now it only appears in 30(6). I just cast this out to the hon. members as a possibility, that we should have a general discretion, perhaps even in Standing Order 1, that by leave of the House there can be an extension. It came from the Government so I will tell them on behalf of the Opposition we will have no objection if such a thing was moved by a Government member. The member for St. Michael South Central, I think, is familiar with what I mean.

The question that Standing Order 30(1) as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I made a motion, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Your motion was ruled out of order because it was completely inconsistent with the substance of Standing Order 30(1). It was a purportive amendment which was inconsistent with the Standing Order which was being done. I think the hon. member moved that Standing Order 30 be deleted, and as such I ruled perhaps the hon. member did not understand that it was out of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in so far as 30(2) is concerned, there is a tidying up we have to do in order to make it crystal clear.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir, what was the motion which was just passed? The first motion should be that the words proposed to be deleted stand part, and then the next motion should be that the Standing Order as amended stand part.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I understood it, this amendment which we have at the bottom of the paper was inferentially withdrawn and a different motion substituted for it moved by the Hon. Minister and seconded by the hon. member for St. Michael North West. The matter has already been decided that the words which appear at the bottom of this paper should be inferentially withdrawn and a new motion which was made on the floor of the House was put.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

We accepted the suggestion that in the case of the absence of the Leader of the Opposition another member would have that privilege, and then we tidied it up here and it was eventually agreed on.

Mr. ADAMS:

I still have not understood what motion has been put.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would respectfully ask the Leader of the Opposition to sit down. I am not responsible for the fact that members are in the habit of migrating from their seats and not following the proceedings carefully. As far as I am concerned, it has been decided on and I am not going to allow any more speeches on it.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am speaking, will the hon. member kindly take his seat. As far as I am concerned the amendment to Standing Order 30(1) as moved in substitution for the one on the sheet which was circulated and moved

on the floor of this House has been passed. Let the Leader of the House continue.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There is a very slight amendment in 30(2) which appears on the fourth line, the insertion of the word "and" before "the Leader of the Opposition".

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir, may I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the question of amendments of Standing Orders and the way they are put? As I understand it, the question is put that the words stand part of the amendment, and then what is put is that the Order as amended stand part.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am grateful for the hon. member's assistance. No point of order, let the Hon. Leader continue. 6.50 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

It is a simple amendment to 32 b the insertion of the word "and" in the fourth line before "the Leader of the Opposition" in order to clarify the situation and regularise it with what we have just done in 31. I beg to move that the word "and" be inserted before "the Leader of the Opposition" in line 4.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, we are suffering from the worst form of drafting on our feet at the moment. If only one person is intended, you do not want the words "Leader of the Opposition" at all. Let hon. members carefully contemplate what I have just said. If you intend that only one Opposition member should be allowed unlimited speech, then you do not need the word "and". All you have to do is to delete the words "Leader of the Opposition". This is what I was trying to say just now. (Asides.)

Mr. Speaker, hon. members in this House, almost worst than any members I have ever had to deal with, when they do not understand a point they will say it does not exist. If you put in "and the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition", you have said nothing. What you must do is to delete the words "Leader of the Opposition", and I would prefer you to do that. I am the Leader of the Opposition, and I would invite you to take out my name rather than put in the word "and". I would prefer you to take out my name, and do not tell anybody that you are giving the Leader of the Opposition the privilege of free speech in here. It means one member of the Opposition. I am not supporting anything which appears to give a privilege to the Leader of the Opposition when it gives no privilege.

Now if there is one thing in which the Leader of the Opposition normally expects in all Parliaments to claim a privilege for, it has to do with the reply to the Budget. In the United Kingdom the Leader of the Opposition, who is never the Chancellor of the Exchequer, always speaks first, then the Shadow Chancellor speaks. The Leader of the Opposition speaks as soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has sat down. In Canada, the Prime Minister speaks, the Minister of Finance speaks - because in those countries the Minister of Finance is never the Prime Minister - the Leader of the Opposition speaks, and

then the Shadow Minister of Finance speaks. Do not, I ask the House, try to define "or" as a disjunctive or by inserting a conjunctive before the earlier part of the clause and leave the two things there. If you say "and the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking first on behalf of the Opposition", you have said nothing. It is better to save the printer's time and say "and an Opposition member." Either leave the Leader of the Opposition to have a privilege of speech, or take him out altogether, and I would prefer to see that.

If people who do not know anything about Parliamentary drafting come in here and find a word which has the effect of changing what was conjunctive to making it disjunctive, again, I invite the House to be realistic. When you put in "and the Leader of the Opposition or the member speaking first", it means nothing. It just means an Opposition member, or the Opposition member speaking first. I implore the House, do not put in this "and", and believe that you are giving the Leader of the Opposition any privilege. Take my name away with the privilege. State what you are doing accurately, and do not try to give this impression.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give way, I should like to say a few words. We are not going to quibble over a matter like this. We intend that the Leader of the Opposition should enjoy all privileges of lengthy speeches and all the privileges that are embodied in the constitution. If the hon. member feels that by inserting the word "and" it will destroy his status or whatever privileges he is entitled to, we will withdraw the amendment. I beg to withdraw that. It is not our intention to destroy his privileged status.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted to the Hon. Minister to withdraw it, if there are no objections.

Mr. ADAMS:

I want you to recommit 31 and take my name out of it. I would move that 31 be recommitted, so that you can take out my name.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, we have already agreed to 31, and the Leader of the Opposition is out of order. He is merely trying to create confusion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder to that motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

The question that Standing Order No. 31 be recommitted was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. LOWE; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. MORRISON and Mr. WEEKES- 8.

AYES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 5.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment proposed to add Standing Order 31 stand part. This is the amendment proposed to create two Budget days, six hours each day, immediately after the Budget Speech.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Then the wording is as given here on this sheet.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this, too. Earlier in the evening we had a mockery of a debate on a motion in relation to the last Budget which was laid in this House - I will get the date of this Resolution for you, Sir. Notice was given on the 13th June, 1972. On the 30th June, 1972, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke, and on the 4th July, 1972 the Leader of the Opposition, with leave, moved that the Resolution do now pass. The hon. member for St. Peter seconded the motion, and was speaking when the time for Private Members' Business expired. This was on the 4th July, and this Resolution is still on the Order Paper when another Budget is about to come before the House. You can see the nonsensical idea of debating the one on the Order Paper, because it can have no relevance today to what was said by the Hon. Minister of Finance in June.

I am wholeheartedly in favour of any measure that will give the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement an early hearing in this Hon. Chamber. Today was a glorious waste of Parliamentary time. To debate on the 13th February, 1973 a Budget passed in June 1972 is a waste of time. I support this wholeheartedly.

The question that the new Standing Order No. 31 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now seven o'clock, and I declare the House duly suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7. p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

The question is that Standing Order No. 39(10) be deleted and Standing Order No. 39(11) be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I have made my point about this. It is unconstitutional, it subjects the salary of a minority to the will of a majority, it goes against two statutes of the realm, so why waste our time putting it in here? The correct way to deal with this is in the laws of Barbados. Why create a law suit and produce money for lawyers and produce difficulties for the Crown Law Officers? I am sure that any lawyer who reads this knows it is wrong. I am told that even the Clerk advised that there is some doubt about this. I have dealt with it already, but if hon. members on either side want to speak on it, they can.

Sir, the points can be summarised. Hon. members either are going to vote for something that is probably illegal, certainly unconstitutional and highly immoral, or they are going to delete it and see whether if they believe in it they will then amend the relevant Acts of Parliament. I do not think that the Administrative Officer of Parliament would administer this. I do not believe that the Administrative Officer would refuse to pay a man his salary based upon the Standing Orders. He would ask the Crown Law Officers for an opinion, they have already given an opinion informally anyhow that it is out of place, and I believe it would be paid; so it is up to hon. members.

I beg to move that it be deleted. Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, there is only one point I would like to deal with, and that is, I do not subscribe to the view that this particular Standing Order subjects the Opposition to any possible victimisation from the Government. I can see a situation in which that fear can arise. I don't know of any case in all my time. I know of members having been suspended and I know from my experience that very often it cannot be said that the members were suspended wrongly except perhaps in the bad old days when the father of the Leader of the Opposition was suspended. "Suspend" here I take it is for some period of time, because if you are just asked to withdraw for the day's sitting, then that is not a suspension. In my time it has happened to the member for St. James and the then Leader of the Opposition. The whole purpose of this is that if a member persistently misbehaves for one reason or another and the House as a whole feels that he should be suspended on several occasions, if the member is still going to get his salary and if he is strong in his constituency, then there is no sanction on that member to maintain decorum or order in the House, and that is the main purpose of a sanction. Whether you suspend a worker on three-quarter pay, or whether you dismiss him or suspend him on no pay, the whole purpose of this is that if a member knows that he is going to be suspended and not draw any emoluments and it means all that to him, then he is likely to obey the Chair, to conduct himself with decorum and not to flout the wishes of the House. If therefore there is no sanction, even if the Opposition agrees because I do not think the Opposition will agree with bad behaviour or deliberate flouting or rudeness to the Chair, or such matters as would lead to suspension, they would agree that if you do not impose a sanction the member can laugh at the Speaker. He can laugh at the House and say "you can suspend me till the cows come home, I am still drawing my coppers, and I do not care when you suspend me or for how long, short of expulsion." So what is the sanction? How are the wishes of the House going to be respected by members if they can get a thousand suspensions for rudeness, for bad behaviour, for indecency and not feel it where it should be made to hurt?

This is the whole purpose, not to victimise any Opposition. I would be the first to see that. The Speaker is there and I think he has so far shown respect for the minority. Mr. Speaker is the protector of

the rights of the House, and I think the members of this House have so far shown a sense of responsibility. There has been cut and thrust in the debate, but I do not subscribe to the Leader of the Opposition's view that this will subject you to the whims of the Government. The tables might turn tomorrow and I would be the last one to assume that if that side got into power that they are going to use this section to victimise the then Opposition.

My final point is that this is not an intention at all to penalise or punish the

Opposition by any Government majority because I would not vote for anything which I think was unfair or an attempt to quash the democratic right of members to speak. I feel that this safety valve is enough to make members realise that they must respect the House, the rulings of the House, and to let them know that any departure from what is right and decorous will not bring them any monetary reward, but they will suffer as a result. I can appreciate the fear and I would say that I would hope that my party with a majority would never use this section to deprive any member of this House of revenue, but that this section would only come into play if the wishes and the rulings of the Speaker were being constantly flouted by a member, because I think you will agree, Sir, that your right to ask a member to withdraw for the remainder of the day has a salutary effect, it allows tempers to cool, and I think you will agree that the use of a total suspension would scarcely arise if hon. members are conscious of their responsibility to this Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose like the hon. member who has just spoken we have had the experience of having been asked to leave the Chamber, perhaps I myself more often than the hon. member, but one thing does come to mind. The section speaks about no remuneration or allowance to which a member is entitled as a member of the House. I am very interested in the words "as a member of the House." I am sorry the Hon. Minister of Communications has left the House, because I think that as former Attorney General he would be able to shed some light on this. The reason why one would say that it is open for the Opposition to be victimised is the words "as a member of the House", because if a Minister of the Government were to be suspended, he is obviously going to claim that he is not being paid as a member of the House, but as a Minister of Government, and indeed this is an argument which I have heard already. This could not apply to Parliamentary Secretaries, to you, Mr. Speaker, or the officers of the House. If a Minister misbehaves - and there are cases on record where Ministers have been asked to leave the Chamber - what is the position as regards him? Can a Minister lose his remuneration during the period of time that he is suspended, or does it mean that a Minister can flout the wishes of the House? What sanctions are there against a Minister who wants to flout the Chair and indulges in the same conduct about which the hon. member was complaining? The Ministers are going to claim that if they are suspended they are not entitled to any remuneration as members of the House, but to a salary as Ministers of Government. It is for this reason that I intend to support the argument put forward by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I would like to hear the Minister of Communications on this or the Leader of the House, because as I said it is obviously hitting at one section, and I have been one who has suffered under these provisions more than anybody else, and I dare say even wrongfully.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, having listened attentively to the hon. member, I must say that hon. members attend meetings weekly. Apart from these meetings of the House a Minister has his duties to perform daily, and therefore I do not see why you should consider that Ministers should be mentioned in the Standing

Order. 7.55 p.m.

Ministers and back benchers come to this House once per week or as often as meetings are called, but regardless of the meetings of the House of Assembly Ministers have to perform duties daily. Consequently it is my opinion that you cannot include Ministers in this particular Standing Order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I look at this in conjunction with subsection 11. This has some very serious implications, because as the Leader of the Opposition has said, this is putting the rule of law into the hands of any Party which has the majority of members. The hon. member for St. Philip South said that this should not include Ministers, but you cannot blow hot and cold at one and the same time, he was present in this House when a Minister of Government, the last Minister of Communications and Works, had been suspended from this Chamber.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Under the Standing Order under which I was suspended.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am not speaking about the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, I was referring to a former Minister who wrote a letter in the Advocate-News later and said he was the first Minister to be suspended. If the hon. Member for St. Philip South wants one rule for Ministers and another for other members this will not be a democratic institution any longer.

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order, let us assume a Minister is suspended from the House of Assembly, he is not suspended from his duties as a Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order, a point of argument.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Some of us have been to school, many of us have never taken in what we were taught at school and many of us are shouting in ignorance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must warn the hon. member not to refer to other hon. Members.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I have not referred to him because the Ministers say that they come to do the people's business. They cannot do the people's business without first coming to the House, you have to be elected to the House before you come and do the people's business. Are they not subjected to the penalties as all the persons who have been elected in the same fashion?

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member to know that there are Ministers of the Government who are not Ministers of this House. Who will suspend them?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, some of us do not understand Parliamentary Government, that is why I say some of us are shouting in ignorance. I wonder if he can tell me of a Minister who does not belong to this House or the Other Chamber who will be affected?

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order, we are dealing with the Standing Orders of this House and not the Standing Orders of the Other Place.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Where is the point of order?

Mr. BOLDEN:

I do not know, Sir, I believe if I continue to answer the hon. member I will display the same amount of ignorance that he is pouring forth.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the Eon. member continue.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on the hon. member to withdraw those remarks Hat he would display the same amount of ignorance.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, I have never.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I want all hon. members to speak on the Standing Orders and to avoid all personal references.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, as I said this is a dangerous provision to be included here, because as it stands this is an Order of the House which cannot be challenged, because we are giving ourselves today the power to exercise control of powers contained in provisions of law which can be adjudicated by the Courts, and I would submit that any question which would deal with the members' salaries should be dealt with under the same law which deals with other salaries. What I am saying is that as it stands, since members are paid in different categories under different legal Orders, the hon. member is trying to say that we should treat the Opposition in one way and the members of the Government in another way. There are Ministers on the front bench, there are Parliamentary Secretaries on the back bench, and I believe there are only two members on that side who are paid in a similar way as the members of the Opposition are paid.

When you look back at Order 39(7) you will see that this is couched in such terms that on a vote of the House a member can be deprived of his seat, and when you look at subsection 11 you come back to the

dangerous position which sets itself up under subsection 10, and I will submit that Standing Order 39(10) should be deleted, but this is a bit too high for certain members to understand, and I would like the members on the other side to look at it carefully and see that this is in itself a discriminatory provision in the rules. If you count the years the hon. member for St. Philip South was a member of this House and the number of speeches he made you would still have some fingers left on one hand.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Avoid personal references, it does not add to the debate.

Mr. BOLDEN:

It is known that the Opposition has got to raise its voice loudly at some times. We have to take stands, but then we are left in the hands of orders (7) and (11). I submit that it is a dangerous provision to be included here. 8.05 p.m.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with those hon. members who asked for the deletion of 39(10) from the draft Standing Orders. I believe that where Rules are purported to be made in furtherance of a provision of Parliament they should, as closely as possible, mirror the substantive law, because I think it is well known that it is ultra vires to legislate by this way unless you have a particular power to do so.

Now, 39(7) purports to be made pursuant to the provisions of Section 64 of the Representation of the Peoples Act, 1971-15, I believe, and under that provision a member's seat can be declared vacant and he can be expelled where he persistently flouts the Standing Orders. It is within Parliament to make this provision in 7. What I am saying, however, is that 7 when read in conjunction is not in the same category with 10, and in any event, in 7 there should be some consequential amendment, because I am not sure that this makes it clear that the hon. member must have disobeyed on three occasions during the present session of Parliament. It does not say how long he should have disobeyed.

The other point I should like to make is that three occasions is really not enough to show persistency. When one comes to 10, 10 is not really made pursuant to the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act. The point taken by the Leader of the Opposition, I think, is a valid one. If we really want to amend the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, we should do so and then make a Standing Order pursuant to the amendment. It does not seem that this Standing Order is what was encompassed by Section 29 of the Act.

Now, Section 29 of the Act says that no salary or allowance payable to a member for his services as such shall be paid in respect of any period during which he is suspended under the provisions of this Act from the service of the Chamber to which he belongs. He can only be suspended for certain conduct set out in the substantive law, and it would seem to me that the law should first be amended to say that he should not be paid any salary where he is expelled from the House pursuant to flouting the Standing Orders or a contravention of the Representation of the Peoples Act. But I cannot find this provision anywhere in the legislation, and it seems to me that this law is really too wide, and is probably ultra vires to that extent.

It would be a pity if the House takes to itself this power without amending the substantive legislation. Just as the substantive legislation has laid down the conditions for expulsion in the Representation of the

People Act, and if we are entitled to interpret this under 7, we should likewise under 10 be able to look for the substantive legislation, if we are regulating the Standing Orders on this point.

I was not in here when the Representation of the People Act was discussed, otherwise I would have raised my voice and said that the Legislature should really show what is persistency. On three occasions do not seem to me to be right. On three occasions when? In any session? Suppose the member was suspended in any Parliament three times; what really do we mean? It seems to me that we should be quite clear on these points. I, honestly, cannot vote for 10, having regard to the provisions of the law. I know that the hon. member has said that it is not the intention, so far as the Government is concerned, to muzzle the Opposition.

I should like to say, as I have said before, that Standing Orders should be made to help this House to function efficiently so that each member can make a contribution, even if we do not agree with the views expressed by a member. It seems to me that if we are going to make a Standing Order because we think that there is a mischief at present before the House, and legislate only for limited circumstances, we do not have our eyes sufficiently on the future. I, seriously, mean that. I do not think it is a proper provision as it stands. To try to come in by Standing Orders for what should be a substantive law in the country is not good enough. I think the purpose of Standing Orders in this instance should be to give teeth where Regulations should be made as we do in normal Acts where we give the Minister powers to make Regulations, but those Regulations which he makes must not be ultra vires the Act under which he is making them.

Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the Schedule at the back, you will see that the draftsman and the Select Committee thought at the time that this provision was being made pursuant to Section 29 of the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act. In my view, if that is the feeling, it is too wide, and, as it stands, it is bad. I would urge, very seriously, on members of the House either to delete it, or to amend it so that it conforms with that provision.

Mr. MORRISON:

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the provision that you should be able to curtail a member's salary because he has been suspended on three occasions. On the first occasion we might give him 5 days suspension; on the second occasion you might give him 15 or 20 days, and on the third occasion until the House resolves that his suspension should be ended. I think that is sufficient punishment for any member of the House. I do not think we should attach his salary as part of the suspension.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, nobody else appears to be willing to speak, so I had better sum up. I am pleased to be able to go to the other extreme in respect of the speech made by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central - to an extreme of praise where, perhaps, I went to an extreme of censure earlier today. He immediately turned me back to the whole of Order 39 where we have the first suspension to last for two weeks; the second for one month, and for three months on any subsequent occasion. What he says is a sound point. I agree with him that we are being too severe in taking away a man's salary. This is on the assumption that the Standing Order proposed to be made has validity, which I argue it has not.

I want to draw the attention of members to one or two things that happened earlier. I do not think members are taking this matter seriously enough. Some of us - I can see four hon. members on that side

and two hon. members on this side - were present in the House when the hon. member for St. James was suspended. I have not heard anyone say that he was correctly suspended barring the Chairman. Not even Mr. Speaker, who had the unpleasant duty of putting the motion to name. I have never heard anyone say privately that the hon. member for St. James was properly suspended.

Now, Sir, how would the hon. member for St. James feel, who had his name called by the Chairman in a moment of great heat when he was saying nothing; he was not making a speech; he had not spoken; he was not shouting; he was not doing anything, but the Chairman turned and said "I name you" and called his name. 8.15 p.m.

That was all that was said. We were in here. The hon. member for St. George South can recall, although I am not going to call the hon. member as a witness because I do not want to put him in any position of embarrassment to his party or friends, but that is all the member for St. James did on that occasion, but his name was called in the House by the presiding officer, it was reported to the Speaker and he was suspended. Sir, in those days suspensions lasted for three sittings or whatever it was and it went on over a period of a month and a half. If I was the hon. member for St. James and I had been suspended under those circumstances by the Acting Chairman, I would have to get my \$1,000 back from the Chairman somehow, and I say that deliberately. He was wrongly suspended, I am saying it now, and hon. members know in their hearts.... you will notice I have not said Sir Grantley Adams, I am speaking about the hon. member for St. James; he was wrongly suspended and at least three hon. members who are in here voted for his suspension, and I do not believe they would feel good in their consciences to know that they had voted to put their hands in the hon. member's pocket and take out \$1,000 and I do not believe that they slept comfortably in their bed if they knew it either. That is what you have to guard against.

Now the best argument made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was persistency, that when people are persistent, they need punishment. I do not go the whole way with the hon. member for Christ Church West to say that you should amend the Act because that suggests that there is something good in the principle. What is good in the principle perhaps is subjecting a decision which can affect a man's pocket to the courts. I am sure I am speaking for everybody on this side. I am not willing to see my pocket affected by a majority of my political opponents. Hon. members must understand that they have eighteen now, but they may not always have eighteen. This is a deep and fundamental point. Upon that occasion where the Chairman was clearly wrong, there was no recourse to the courts to alter it. What happened? The hon. member went out of the House, there was a triumphant march down Roebuck Street with thousands of people accompanying the hon. member and the then Leader of the Opposition upon their return to the House of Assembly. Questions were raised about this unofficially and even semi-officially in many parts of the world about what sort of country is Barbados in that the Leader of the Opposition is named and put out of the House. This is something that never even happened in Guyana. Dr. Jagan was only put out when he was Prime Minister, not as Leader of the Opposition. What kind of situation are we going to put ourselves in? I have dealt with what I saw. I am sure there are hon. members like the Leader of the House who has been there for a long time who can speak of others which he saw in days gone by where members of a different party were on the receiving end. I really am amazed at the moderation of the speeches I hear in here. Nobody at all has dealt, except the member for Christ Church West, with my point that it is clearly outside the competence of the House to deal with matters of salaries. We are nothing to do with employees being reprovved. You do not employ us, Sir. There is no disrespect to you, but you do not employ me; so I cannot accept that there is any analogy

between discipline in the House of Assembly and the discipline an employer exercises over his employee. If a man is wicked in the House, he can be expelled under the provisions of the Representation of the People Act and the prospective Order 39 in which case it is a matter of a truism, because whether you are a member or a Minister you can get expelled; so you do not have to say that. If a man is expelled and his seat is vacant, nobody can get his salary. I am asking the House to pay no attention to whatever has been said outside the House and not been repeated in here, because it is being borne in overwhelmingly on me that hon. members could not really, with the very slight arguments which they have brought to bear on this, feel very strongly about this to vote for this section. There must be something else. They must have had some guidance obviously not from outside the House because no hon. member can have guidance from outside the House.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the hon. member for Christ Church East who has long acquaintance with the law and whom I hope to welcome soon to the ranks of Attorney-at-Law, would believe that this section is a lawful exercise of the powers of the House. I can't believe that you think so, Sir. Perhaps to call you a Barbados Scholar in the context of today's debate is to insult you, but I will take that risk, but I do not think that you, Sir, who have a mind that can be brought to bear on these things could think that this is a valid exercise of the authority to control the procedure of the House of Assembly, because the payment of members is never a part of the procedure. The Hon. Leader of the House has said nothing at all. I cannot believe that a man like the Leader of the House in here since 1944 with only one break, a man whom I remember first receiving the franchise of the electorate of Christ Church, a man for whom money is important, a man whom I do not believe would see hon. members of the House done down in their financial dealings, would without saying a word, of course I am trying to draw out the hon. member, vote for something like this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, my only comment is that the Leader of the Opposition made many valuable contributions to our proposed amendments to the Standing Orders, and as far as I remember, this Standing Order was agreed to by us all.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

It is for that reason that we have reported. The Report of the Standing Order Committee contained this Clause 30(10).

Mr. ADAMS:

If the Minister is under that misapprehension, if I assure him that I do not support it, will he withdraw the clause? If my support is the only point he can make in favour of the clause, can I call upon you, Sir the hon. member for Bridgetown and the Clerks of the House to say that it is in the Minutes.....

Hon. C E. TALMA:

I never said that is the only reason; I said I am making a simple comment and drawing that to his attention that this Clause was embodied in our Report.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, at the only meeting which I attended this point was raised and the Leader of the Opposition made the point which he is now making. The question of a minority report came up.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what more you can do in circumstances like these. Suppose you say the Leader of the Opposition is a politician and he does not know any law; suppose you accept the argument of the member for St. Philip South because he thinks it is a good thing that you should take away people's salary by vote of their political opponents; suppose you accept his argument and not take away a Minister's salary, then a Minister can behave as bad as he likes in here, he can go to his Ministry everyday and draw his salary. Suppose you accept all that, is there nobody in this House who can accept the contribution made by the hon. member for Christ Church West? Because he really spoke down the middle, you could say, and gave an honest, straightforward legal opinion. I am amazed truly, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael North West, I remember, was one of the loudest voices raised on this occasion. The hon. member for St. Michael West has many admirable qualities, consistency, indeed one may say, stubbornness being one of them, but he has not got up today to defend this. I will deal with him next. The last words I heard from him is that we will have to amend the Act. 8.25 p.m.

He was the one, most of all. Do you know the last word I heard from him, Sir? We have to amend the Act. He has not accepted that this should be the case, why are we going to make ourselves ridiculous in doing something which hon. members know is wrong and can only lead to trouble? There is not a Parliament in the world barring that of Sri Lanka that has that kind of ruling. I really have to presume that the Prime Minister has told hon. members what to do, and therefore they do not want to face the Prime Minister with the news that this was not passed. I am going to suggest that the Prime Minister is not even going to notice it, the House is not competent to control the payment of salaries. That is all there is to it. The notes to this particular section state that Standing Order 39(10) is a new provision directing that no remuneration shall be paid to a member under suspension, see the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, 1965-6, section 29.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I think that after further consultation with my colleagues it would seem as though we do not want to pass any legislation here to amend the Standing Orders as such to appear discriminatory in any respect, as pointed out by many members of the Opposition, that this Standing Order 39(10) will in truth and in fact in actual practice affect members of the Opposition and back benchers of our Party and not Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries as such. Like that it would appear to be discriminatory, and I am asking that this Standing Order 39(10) be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections leave will be granted to withdraw section 39(10) of the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, it may be a very frivolous point of order, but having saved the salaries of some hon. members one way I would not like them to go another. All of us in a sense have a pecuniary interest in this, and as one who has spoken, I would just like to say that I may or may not be affected by

this, because I am Leader of the Opposition and I do not believe my salary can be taken away once I am not expelled from the House, but I would just like to say that all members may care to take note that it has been held in courts before now that where you discussed the salary you had to let it be known. You are not allowed in the House to discuss any matter in which you have a pecuniary interest without stating it, and I state mine.

The question that Standing Order 39(10) be deleted and that Standing Order 39(11) be renumbered accordingly was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS:

The last amendment, although I moved it, I would ask that the seconder speak on it. This is Standing Order 61.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Standing Order 61 deals with the question of the Select Committee. After paragraph 4 I beg to add a new paragraph 5 which reads as follows

"A Select Committee to which a Bill has been committed shall report to the House not later than three calendar months after the committal of the Bill, provided also that such Select Committee shall have power upon motion made in the Committee to report progress to the House and ask for leave to sit again. Any period during which the House is in recess shall not be counted for this purpose."

The new paragraph 6 should read;

"Where a Select Committee does not report to the House in the period set out in paragraph 5 hereof the House may commit the Bill to a Committee of the whole House, and the powers of the Select Committee in relation to that Bill shall cease."

The reason for that is that there are several Select Committees which do not meet within the required time, and this is in order to bring the matter back to the House. If the Select Committee is having problems or is working but unable to complete the work in a relevant period, and they feel that with a little extra time they will complete the work, they can then come back to the House .

Mr. MOTTLEY:

There is just one point I want to make on the question of the reporting of the Select Committee, that is, that the question of the Speaker being Chairman of the Select Committee should be looked into. Your Honour will recall that with the Dental Registration Bill when the question arose as to whether something did not happen in Committee Your Honour was more or less placed in an embarrassing position. With all due respect to Your Honour, I think this should be changed so that Your Honour will not find yourself in any embarrassing position, and I throw this out to the Leader of the House for future reference in selecting a Chairman of a Select Committee.

The question that Standing Order 61, subsections 5 and 6 as proposed stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the revised Standing Orders as amended stand part.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very careful with this, stand part of what? Of the report of the Standing Orders Committee, because you still have to bring a resolution stating that these be the Standing Orders as of such and such a date. As I take it, the motion now is that we have amended the report in Committee, we are saying that what we have amended stand part of the report, and then a motion should be put that the report do now pass. 8.35 pan.

In any case, you will still have to bring a Resolution to say that these be the Standing Orders from such and such a day. As I see it, the position now is that we have amended the Report of the Committee, and we are saying that what we have amended stand part of the Report, and then a motion will be put that the Report be now passed. I would think that there will still have to be a Resolution to say that these be the Standing Orders of the House. You will have to give notice of such a Resolution. The Order Paper before the House is to adopt the Report of the Standing Orders Committee. (Asides.)

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Revised Standing Orders, as amended here, stand part of the original Report.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Report, as amended, be now adopted.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to| move that the present Revised Standing Orders, as adopted, be the Standing Orders of this House as from today.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, a Resolution of the House has to be given notice of; read a first time; read a second time; read a third time and passed with a title. (Asides.) With great respect, Sir, I hear a voice saying that it

has never happened.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Hon. members, who are not on their feet, will please observe Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, unless the Standing Orders otherwise direct, a notice shall be given of any motion which it is proposed to move with the exception of the following - there are then 10 motions, not one of which is embraced here. This is not a Committee; it is not an Adjournment motion; it is not a Petition; we have already moved a motion that the Report of the Select Committee be laid; it is not a motion for the removal of strangers, or of a member; it is not a privileged motion; it is not a notice for which notice has been dispensed with. (Asides)

This is a point of order, Sir. It is a very elaborate point of order, but it purely relates to order under Standing Order 25, and it is not a motion for the suspension of a Standing Order. Notice must be given. Notice must be given of any motion which it is proposed to move. There is no motion on the Order Paper to adopt new Standing Orders.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This House at the very first sitting, or in the early stages, appointed certain members comprised of Opposition and Government members to form a Standing Orders Committee to revise the Standing Orders of this House. The Committee sat for many long months; it has now reported, and the Report, with many amendments, has at last been adopted. That is the end of the position. In order to bring members up to date, I moved a motion that the Revised Standing Orders be now the Standing Orders for this Session. There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This raises several matters of importance. If you are saying that you are adopting the amended version and these be the Standing Orders as from today, then you would not have a proper copy of the Standing Orders that have just been adopted. We will then be faced with Standing Orders governing the House of which there is not a fair copy available to any person.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. I corrected myself and said "for this session". The hon. member will not listen, as usual.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, these are the Standing Orders for this Session, but we should, at least, give two weeks so that proper copies of the Standing Orders could be printed and circulated to hon. members. Let us assume that we have to come back here next Tuesday and a fair copy is not available, how would we be able to operate? We should have had the Order Paper early. This is something which is going on constantly, and it is not only affecting the Opposition. We had the same trouble with the Land Tax Bill. A Bill came into effect right away, and the people concerned were unable to obtain copies of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House refuses to let hon. members speak.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are reaching the end of Government Business, and we do not want any Standing Orders for tonight.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Where is the point of order?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am saying that we will have copies here next week. That is all.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem. Here you have Standing Orders and the Leader of the House, at this stage, refuses to allow anybody in the, Opposition to make a coherent point. He says that the Standing Orders will take effect from this Session. This Session begins now. According to him, the old Standing Orders have suddenly gone through the window. The new Standing Orders should be printed and circulated to members. The question of rushing things and rolling over everybody is not going to do anybody any good. (Asides.)

Mr. Speaker, some times you reach a point where you really have to hold your temper when dealing with certain people in this Chamber.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members' minds are not attuned to this matter. Why do you not regularise it? Put it on the Order Paper for next week, and we will certainly have new Standing Orders. We do not know that we are going to have the Standing Orders next week. As soon as it is set up and printed with a cover like this, we would be ready for them. There has to be a new Resolution. The Report of the Select Committee cannot in itself end matters. You still have to give a Bill a third reading so to speak. (Asides,) We did not start with a third reading, so it cannot be a third.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has had enough latitude. 8.45 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I have spoken already, Mr. Speaker, I am just asking the permission of the House to make a point.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I made a motion that the new Orders take effect from 1st March.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is what you want to do, you have not done it.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that, and I say that it would give a golden opportunity for the new revised Standing Orders to be read and prepared by the Government, and under 57(2) when we come back here with a Resolution the figure could be filled in as it stands and pass the Standing Orders in such a way that they become effective, because as it stands, there is a blank.

There could then be agreement between the Other Place and the Government members here as to the number they want to fill in.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, probably the hon. members will be glad to hear that in another two weeks' time - I cannot give an assurance for one week - we could definitely get the finished revised copy. We will adjourn until the 27th February at 12 noon.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I will withdraw my motion in favour of the motion of the Leader of the House. the question that these be the revised Standing Orders for the remainder of the session as from 27th February was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 27th February, at 12 o'clock noon.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.00 p.m.