

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 — 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 20th January, 1976.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, Esquire, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); 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); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A.(Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CLERK OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk announced the absence of His Honour the Speaker.

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am in possession of the Minutes of Tuesday the 16th December, 1975, Minutes of Tuesday 23rd December, 1975, Minutes for Tuesday, 30th December, 1975,

Minutes of Tuesday, 6th January, 1976 and the Minutes of Tuesday, 13th January, 1976.

These Minutes have been circulated and if there is no objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and duly confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now duly confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have received a letter from the Auditor General re the Statement of Account of Accountant General and the Appropriation and Revenue Account for the year 1974-75. I shall read that.

"Statement of Accounts of the Accountant General and the Appropriation and Revenue Account for the year 1974-75. In accordance with Section 28 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Chapter 5 I am required to report annually as soon as possible and not later than the last day of December following the close of each financial year, the results of my examination of the Accounts and any failure to observe the enactments or other laws of the Island. The same section provides that my report shall be addressed to the Speaker of the House of Assembly, and a copy thereof transmitted to the Senate for confirmation.

I received the relevant Accounts and Statements in respect of the Financial year 1974-75 from the Accountant General during the month of September, 1975, which according to the provisions of Section 12(2) of the Act were due to be submitted by him not later than the end of July 1975. Similar Accounts and Statements for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74 were only received during the months of May and June, 1975 respectively.

I therefore regret to inform you that it has not been possible to submit my report which

became due by the end of December, 1975 on the examination of the Accounts in as much as I am still in the process of preparing my report on the examination of the Accounts and Statements for the year 1971-72. Every effort will be made to have the examinations and Report of the above-mentioned accounts and statements completed and submitted as soon as possible.

I consider that you should be made aware of the position for the information of the House of Assembly.

Your obedient servant,

Auditor General."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have another announcement to make.

"SUPREME COURT
BARBADOS

17th December, 1975.

Sir,

NEVILLE GEORGE ANTHONY MAXWELL

In accordance with the provisions of Section 133 of the Bankruptcy Act, Chapter 303 of the Laws of Barbados, I have the honour to forward herewith the Court's Certificate that the abovenamed Debtor who was adjudged bankrupt on the 11th June, 1975, remains subject to the disqualifications arising under Section 132(1) of the Act.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. R. DOUGLAS,
Chief Justice.

BARBADOS.

I COLIN ANDREW ROCHEFORD, of the Law Courts in the City of Bridgetown and Island of Barbados aforesaid, Registrar of the Supreme Court of Judicature of the said Island of Barbados, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 133 of the Bankruptcy Act, Chapter 303 of the Laws of Barbados do hereby CERTIFY that MR. NEVILLE GEORGE ANTHONY MAXWELL, a member of the House of Assembly, was adjudged bankrupt in this Island on the eleventh day of June, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-five.

And I further CERTIFY that the disqualifications arising therefrom under Section 132 of the said Bankruptcy Act, Chapter 303 of, the Laws of Barbados have not been removed.

Dated this 17th Day of December, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-five.

By the Court.

C. A. ROCHEFORD,
Registrar of the Supreme Court."

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in pursuance of a letter written by me in my capacity as Leader of the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor-General on the 15th January, 1976, the Message from His Excellency the Governor General reads as follows:-

"Dear Mr. Minister,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter 4457/2/5 of 15th January, 1976 inviting me to give leave to the Honourable House of Assembly to proceed forthwith to choose a new Speaker consequent upon the disqualification of Mr. N. G. A. Maxwell, the Speaker, to be a Member of the said House.

I hereby give leave to the Honourable House of Assembly to proceed forthwith to the choice of a new Speaker, and I would be pleased if you would acquaint the Honourable House of Assembly accordingly.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,
A WINSTON SCOTT.
Governor-General."

It is addressed to me, Sir, Minister of State, House of Assembly. The date of this letter is 15th January, 1976.

Would Your Honour rule that I can pass this in to the Clerk and he can have the Message circulated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Permission has been granted.

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE RAISED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage since Your Honour is invested with all the

powers of the Speaker, I am asking Your Honour's leave to raise a number of matters of privilege of members, and if the Clerk would be kind enough to take them down so that Your Honour might consider them this is under Order 76, Rule 2, Sir, and give Your Honour's ruling, of course, in the fulness of time, I would be glad.

The first relates to the fact that on or about the hour of 9 o' clock on the morning of December 16, the House was counted out without a bell being rung as provided by Standing Order 9, Rule 3.

12.20 p.m.

I was present in the precincts of the House and had no opportunity to make up the quorum and proceed to hear the completion of the debate in which I had taken part.

On 30th December, 1975, as is revealed by the Minutes, the Clerk of the House, I have to say adjourned the House, Sir, without calling upon the members then present to elect a Presiding Officer, contrary to Standing Order 5 Rule 3.

On the same 30th December parts of the precincts of the House were locked against members and the Deputy Marshal on being requested to open them refused so to do indicating that he did not have the key, and took no steps to obtain the key or to direct members' attention to how they could get into their own House of Assembly, Sir.

On 6th January, 1976 the Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I want to draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order No. 2(1): "At the beginning of each Parliament, and before the House proceeds to the despatch of any other business, the Clerk, when so directed by His Excellency the Governor-General, shall inform the House of His Excellency's desire that the House shall elect a Speaker."

Rule 2 states: "If the office of Speaker becomes vacant during the continuance of a Parliament, the House, on being acquainted by a Minister of the Crown that His Excellency the Governor-General gives leave to the House to proceed forthwith to the choice of a new Speaker, shall then proceed to the election of a Speaker accordingly." There is no such thing as privilege after that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know the Standing Order. The Leader of the Opposition rose not to deal with privilege but to give notice of what he dealt with on privilege. I am of the opinion that it should be dealt with forthwith as is stated here in the Standing Order, but the Leader of the Opposition had only asked to give notice since the Leader of the House had taken his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, if Your Honour pleases, the reason why I rose was because the Clerk called a different Item of business. The Clerk actually called Notice of Motions so if the Speaker was not going to be elected forthwith I said to the hon. member for St. James who can testify to that, let them elect a Speaker and I will raise a matter of privilege. I contradicted myself because the Clerk called a different Item of business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk did proceed to call the Order of Business. I thought it would have been dealt with forthwith myself but as the Clerk proceeded

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, there is this, that privilege takes precedence over anything else, but I am nearly finished and if the House will grant me the indulgence for a moment I believe that we can go ahead.

On 30th December, parts of the House were locked against members, on 6th January, the Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition, an Officer of the House who is voted for in the Head of Parliament in the Estimates, was refused entry to the House by a Police Officer in my presence, and on 13th January.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, these are the Standing Orders. I have drawn to Your Honour's attention what Standing Order 2 unambiguously states.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have read the Standing Order and I am in agreement with what the hon. member has just said. At this point I am ruling that the business of the election of a Speaker be dealt with forthwith.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am privileged here this afternoon to nominate yourself, Sir, the Hon. Deputy Speaker, who has

served this Chamber so conscientiously and well not only in the capacity of Deputy Speaker, but from the time we entered this Chamber in 1966. Your Honour has served the constituency of St. George North from the time you came to this Chamber in 1966 and your consistency, reliability, dependability and your general charm and courtesy to both sides of the House equip you adequately for this post. When we consider the number of months which have elapsed when Your Honour single-handedly has been called on to perform his duties not only of Deputy Speaker but of Speaker, and when once considers the amount of work which you have accomplished during that tenure of office and the very good benefits which have been derived, I think in the interest of what is fair and right and equitable I feel that Your Honour is entitled to consideration for the high post of Speaker in this Chamber.

12.30 p.m.

You have been tested and you have performed your duties cordially and efficiently, and I think that I express the sentiments of the entire House when I say that His Honour, the Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for St. George North, is a fit and proper person to continue in this noble task.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in moving that the Honourable Member for Saint George North do take the chair of this House as Speaker. I wish you a very cordial and good term of office. I hope that your general demeanour and the manner in which you have acquitted yourself will not be perturbed too much on either side, and I hope that the standard of behaviour in this Chamber will improve; and that generations unborn will be proud of you as Speaker, and proud of the achievements of this Chamber in this day and year.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me very great pleasure to second the motion. You have been a Member of this Chamber even although you did not come into it before I did; but you have been in it longer than I have been and I have had every opportunity to observe the manner in which you have discharged your duties. It gives me great pleasure therefore as the representative of the parish in which I was born to second this nomination.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder when we are going to proceed with the election of a Speaker; because, if I understand, we have to address the Clerk of the House and not the Deputy Speaker — the Clerk who shall act as Presiding Officer. This shows quite clearly the ignorance of the present Deputy Speaker who now adorns the Chair. (*Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. Member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CRAIG: I said ignorance of the Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have requested the hon. Member to withdraw those remarks immediately.

Mr. CRAIG: I withdraw the remarks. As I understand it about the election of a Speaker, according to Rule 2(3), a Member having first ascertained that the member to be proposed is willing to serve if elected may, rising in his place and addressing himself to the Clerk, propose that any other Member "do take the Chair of this House as Speaker." If that proposal is seconded, and no other Member is proposed for the office, the Member proposed shall be called by the House to the Chair without any question being put.

This is a classic example of what is going on, Sir. It is my second term in here, and I recall very well that when we first came in the Clerk announced first that there shall be the election of a Speaker; and this is what I saw during the past 10 years that I was in here. No one single person sits in the Chair. That is what I saw, and I believe that you will agree with me on this.

I would like you to give some ruling, otherwise Standing Order 2(3) is wrong. Now, Sir, we come to Rule 2(7) which says that the Clerk shall declare the result of the election and thereupon the Speaker-elect shall take the Chair of the House, subject to His Excellency's approbation of his election.

It is really mysterious how the business in here is conducted. It is no reason why people say that it is a mockery of society, and all these things you can examine. I said here that the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague drew to my attention exactly what the Member for St. Michael South West drew to your attention, Sir.

We sat here calmly to see what was going to happen; and then the Leader of the House with all of his years in here got up and gave notice, and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, allowed the business of the House to go on; and the Member for St. Michael West drew to your attention that the Leader of the Opposition was out of order. I am only asking for a ruling. I do not know if the Clerk has to give the ruling, if you are to give it, or who. That is what I do not understand so I would suggest at this stage that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, leave the Chair and go and sit down in the Government benches, and let the Clerk proceed in the right way. That is my suggestion,

because as far as I am concerned at this very moment you have no power.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am Deputy Speaker in here *(Pause)(Aside)*. Order please!

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I respectfully submit that the correct course to have been followed was for the Leader of the House to stand in his place while he notified his Excellency's pleasure for Your Honour to have taken your seat.

If the Standing Orders say that a member has to address himself to the Clerk, how can you say that the Standing Orders do not mean the Clerk, and that the Deputy Speaker is the Clerk?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that I am the presiding Officer. That is my ruling and I am going to abide by that. I am in the Chair, and I am going to remain here. *(Asides)*. Order please!

Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams, Mr. W. C. B. Hinds and Mr. C. L. Bolden rose.

When I am standing, all other members will sit. There was ample time for other motions. There being no other nominations, the hon. Member for St. George North is duly elected Speaker of this Chamber. *(Cheers)*

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Are we to take it that Rule 7 which says that the Clerk shall declare the result of the election is out of it too, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is out of the question. There being no further nominations, there is only one nomination.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will we forget the tradition of the sponsors of the Speaker lifting him and putting him in the Chair? All of that? Would you not feel proud to know that you are placed in the Chair by your sponsors? You are the only Speaker in the House in Barbados who has not been led to the Chair by his sponsors and put in it. Do you realise that you are only regarded as a "play play" Speaker by your supporters? The only Speaker for 339 years.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am saying that there will be no "play play" Speaker in here. Take the warning now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next item that we must deal with immediately is the election of a Deputy Speaker by virtue of the fact that Your Honour has just been duly elected Speaker.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Your election is subject to the approbation of the Governor-General.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Governor-General aware that you are the Speaker of the House? I would like your ruling on that. Can you tell me if the Governor-General is aware of the fact that a new Speaker has been elected to Parliament? I should like your ruling on that before we go on to the election of a Deputy Speaker.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all know that the election of a Speaker is subject to the approval of the Governor-General, but, as there is only one person nominated and duly elected, representing the wishes of all sides of the House, as we know, we are now going to move at this stage — *(Asides)*. I beg to move that the Sitting be suspended for one hour and, during that time, the Speaker elect will be accompanied by the Mover and Seconder of the Motion to wait on His Excellency the Governor-General at Government House so that His Excellency's approbation of the election of the Honourable Member for Saint George North as Speaker may be obtained.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

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

AYES: Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Mr. E. E. GREAVES; Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES — 14.

NOES: Mr. ADAMS —

Mr. GRAIG *(Seated and Covered)*: Sir, I am going to vote according to the dictates of my conscience.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not permitted to do that.

Mr. CRAIG: To cover my head and speak, Sir, according to the dictates of my conscience?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am not saying that. You go ahead.

Mr. CRAIG: It is regrettable that I have to take my seat.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, will you take a vote from the hon. member, Aye or No, and move on.

Mr. CRAIG: It is a sad day. This is all I have to say at this stage. My vote is "No."

Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN; and Mr. FORDE
— 5.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is now suspended for one hour.
12.45 p.m.

On resumption at 1.45 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CLERK OF PARLIAMENT

The CLERK announced the presence of His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER was conducted to the Chair by Hon. C. E. TALMA and Hon. F. G. SMITH.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take this opportunity to thank those who have nominated me to this high office, and I shall do my best to uphold the dignity and traditions of the House and to make sure that the integrity of this House is kept up. There will be impartiality and justice for both sides of the House during my term as Speaker. *(Applause.)*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the next Order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I correct the hon. Member. He should address.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I said "Mr. Speaker". I would like to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that His Excellency the Governor-General has duly approved of your nomination as Speaker of this Honourable Chamber, in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House, Standing Order 2, and we will now proceed, under Standing Order No. 3, with the election of the Deputy Speaker. I am asking for leave to proceed, at this stage, with the election of a Member as the Deputy Speaker of the House.

ELECTION OF THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

Hon. P. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. Member for St. Andrew be

nominated for election as Deputy Speaker of this House. The hon. Member for St. Andrew has been a Member of this House for many years; he has served in Government in many capacities, and I have no hesitation in recommending him to this House as the Deputy Speaker of this Chamber.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the nomination for the election of the honourable Member for Saint Andrew as Deputy Speaker. I would like to say that it is, indeed, a pleasure and privilege for me to do so. The hon. Member for St. Andrew has served in this House for three consecutive terms, and he has also served as a Minister. Consequently, I am confident that he is fully knowledgeable of the Standing Orders of this House, and I have no doubt that he will uphold the high traditions of this noble office when called upon to perform the duties of Deputy Speaker. I have great pleasure in seconding the nomination.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no other nominations, I declare the hon. Member for St. Andrew to be duly elected as the Deputy Speaker of this House. *(Applause.)*
1.50 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the proposer and seconder of the motion for my election as Deputy Speaker of this House. I promise that I will carry out my functions with impartiality, to be fair to both sides of the House, and during the time that I have to preside over this Chamber, I will be a "no-nonsense" Deputy Speaker.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

- (1) The Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Auditor General's Department for the year ended 31st March, 1975.
- (2) The Registration Office (Second Schedule Amendment) Rules, 1975.
- (3) The Rules of the Supreme Court (Amendment) Rules, 1976.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Annual Report of the Barbados National Stadium Corporation for the years 1973-74 and 1974-75.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

- (1) The Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of payment of the principal sum of \$5 million to be borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank by the issue of National Development Bonds.
- (2) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$10,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (3) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$202,514 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 30, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (4) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$468,665 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 31, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (5) A Bill to amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulation) Act.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

- (1) The Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of parcels of land at Dunlow Lane, St. Michael, for purposes of road improvement.
- (2) The Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, for purposes of development of Harrison Cave.
- (3) A Bill for the preservation and protection of the marine life in certain submarine areas of Barbados and for

the establishment of underwater parks and art centres in connection therewith.

- (4) A Bill to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act.
- (5) A Bill to regulate the holding of certain property by aliens and companies under alien control.
- (6) A Bill to amend the Companies Act.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to give notice of an Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor-General relating to the question that His Excellency issue a writ for the election to fill the vacancy created in the St. Philip North constituency.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

RESOLUTION RE LEAVE TO ELECT A NEW SPEAKER WITHDRAWN

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am seeking leave to withdraw the Resolution, with stands in my name. It craves the leave of His Excellency the Governor-General to elect a new Speaker. The Order is No. 10 under Private Members' Business.

Leave was granted.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour being 2 p.m., this sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: Business now resumes.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a Question which I observe to be on the Order Paper. I am asking Your Honour's guidance in that regard. Do I need to give further notice of it, Sir? A question relating to Cuban Aircraft passing through Seawell Airport. It is printed on the Order Paper. The Clerk advises that it may be best to do it, so in case there was any irregularity, I really do not know, Sir, but in case there was, I would seek to give it even though it is printed, just to make sure. The question reads as follows:-

To ask of the Appropriate Minister: 1. On what date did the Government and which

department thereof first become aware that Cuban military forces were passing through Seawell Airport on their way to a destination in Africa; how many aircraft movements were involved and what were the first and last dates of such movements known to the Government?

2. What is the total number of personnel comprised in the foregoing military force movements? 3. How many aircraft of Cuban registration or Cuban port of origin have passed through Seawell Airport in a direction outward from Havana in 1975? 4. Have any instructions been issued by any public officer or member of the Royal Barbados Police Force and by which and on what date or dates that any of these aircraft were not to be boarded or otherwise inspected by Customs, Port Health or other officials of the Government of Barbados or by persons employed at Seawell Airport in connection with the movement, control, cleaning, servicing or refuelling of aircraft landing at the Airport?

Mr. Speaker, I have another question which reads:

To ask the Minister of Finance:—

1. Have exemptions from paying the 5 per cent sales tax in Barbados be issued.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, I can probably answer whatever question he asks without even leaving the Chamber, but I am not really concerned about that now. I do not know what the Question is but the Standing Orders have not been suspended, and if we look at Standing Orders we should not now be dealing with the Notice Paper. (*Aside.*) It is now Question Time so technically speaking, Sir, when you adjourned and we came back we should be dealing with Questions.

The hon. Member automatically assumed that we would continue with Order No. 10 which is Order of Business. I do not know how we will get back to this as a technicality but I think we should have a little enlightenment on that before we proceed, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was quite aware that when we resumed it was 2.45 p.m. and that was Question Time, but I realise that the Clerk continued with the Orders of the Day. That is where the technical error arose.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, with great respect, Question Time can take place only if Notices of Answers to

Questions have been given by Ministers. None have been so given, therefore until 3.15 p.m. presumably there is no Question Time to interrupt the Orders of the Day; and at 3.15 p.m. we take Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are well aware of what the Standing Orders say but I am sure, as I said, that the Clerk continued, knowing that the Orders of the Day have not been completed in accordance with Standing Order No. 10.

Mr. ADAMS: I was interrupted in the middle of doing that part of the Business which was called by the Clerk. The Clerk has called for Notices of Questions and I am interrupted in the middle of one. I can only do what the Clerk says, and if we know the correct procedure, how is it that the Clerk is calling incorrect items and ignoring the Standing Orders. This morning Your Honour ruled, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will only remind the hon. member that to err is human.

Mr. ADAMS: There can be no Question Time if there is no notice given of Questions. (*Aside.*) Well, I would sit down and let the Government answer questions then. Let them answer all the questions of which they have given notice.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The argument of the hon. member for St. Thomas is a self-defeating argument, because he has asked how can there be Question Time if there are no Notices of Questions when he is asking a Question when there has been no notice. We have not completed Order No. 10.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the point I made also today.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They were not completed, but at 2.45 p.m. we should be doing Questions.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Reply to Questions.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It appears to me that mechanically or mechanistically or legistically or whichever way you wish to put it, Sir, that we could only proceed now from a commonsense point of view if we move that something be the next Order of the Day, or that we continue with Order No. 10. There is no other way out of this impasse.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it says unless the House otherwise directs, the business of each Sitting Day shall be transacted in the following order and there are also Oral Replies to Questions, and it can only be transacted after Petitions, Papers, Government Notices, Private Members' Notices, Notices of Questions, First Readings of Bills, Statements by Ministers; and under this Standing Order No. 10, Oral Replies to Questions cannot be transacted until all the others have been transacted; and therefore there must be a conflict between the Standing Order which says that Question Times shall be taken at 2.45 p.m. and Standing Order No. 10, and in the event of any ambiguity Your Honour is in a position to rule which shall continue.

Standing Order No. 10 says you cannot have Oral Replies to Questions until you have had what the Clerk is calling; and therefore I am submitting that the hour of 2.45 p.m. must be disregarded because that is the only way of getting out of the two Rules. Standing Order No. 10 says there is a certain order in which things must be done.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The next thing the hon. member is going to disregard is the Meridian of Greenwich and Greenwich Mean Time. How are you going to disregard 2.45 p.m.? As a matter of fact, I remember one hon. member for St. Joseph who was told that he was wrong and he would have to sit down, and he said that even a clock that had stopped is right twice a day, because it is a fact of life that 2.45 p.m. must occur twice within 24 hours every day; and he says that you must disregard 2.45 p.m. Even a clock which had stopped has to regard 2.45 p.m. twice every day. That is a fact of life. The former hon. member for St. Joseph said that. Even a clock that has stopped is right twice a day, and he was wrong all the time. (*Aside.*) Order No. 6 says:

"At 2 p.m. Mr. Speaker shall suspend the Sitting until 2.45 p.m., and at 7 p.m. he shall suspend the Sitting until 8 p.m. provided that if, in his opinion, the business of the House could be concluded by a short postponement of the suspension, he may suspend the Sitting at 2.10 p.m. or 7.10 p.m. respectively."

Then dealing with Questions, Sir. Questions shall be taken at 2.45 p.m. under Order No. 16, "Manner of Asking and Answering Questions;" this is under Standing Order No. 16 Rule 4. Questions to Ministers shall be taken at 2.45 p.m. and shall not continue after 3.15 p.m.

Now we have not suspended Standing Orders and the hon. member inadvertently gave the way in which we can deal with it, unless the House otherwise directs, and I am suggesting that the way we should proceed now is that the House direct that we continue with Order No. 10 and take Question Time afterwards, otherwise we are out of court.

We ordinarily suspend Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44. We are not asking for the suspension of those Standing Orders because the hon. member himself would get up and say that we are not doing Private Members' Business, which we intend to do today.

Mr. ADAMS: We will hear Your Honour's ruling, Sir, because the beginning of Standing Order No. 16 says:—

"If an oral answer is required the Minister shall, when Replies to Questions is reached in the Order of Business, inform the Speaker that the Reply to the Question is ready", making it clear that Standing Order No. 16 is subsidiary to Standing Order No. 10; that Standing Order No. 16 must be read in the light of Standing Order No. 10 because it says in Standing Order No. 16(1) — which is a different page from the Prime Minister's; we know he is getting old, he can only look at one page at a time — the simple expedient of turning over the page has not occurred to him yet, although since he was turning back the page I would have thought that that would be more familiar with him. He likes talking about clocks; well, he would like to turn the clock back in this country. 2.55 p.m.

Since he is talking about the clock being right twice a day, I recall that it was he to whom the remarks were being addressed. He was right on one occasion and he was told that like a clock which had stopped he might be right twice a day, if he remembers. Nowhere does it say that Question Time is taken at 2.45, it sets out a procedure for Question Time, for Oral Replies to be given.

Sir, can we finish with these trivialities and get on with the people's business anyhow? How is it that everybody is so nice and precise about the Standing Orders when in the face of massive flouting of the Standing Orders a steam roller is being used — they are steam rolling you too, Sir, into thinking that you are giving the correct ruling — the steam roller is used to override the rights of members? Why can nobody's voice be

raised to say that the Clerk should not have behaved the way he did on December 30?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not before the House now. Will you continue to give notice of your question? I have given you that permission so to do.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To ask the Minister of Finance: 1. Have exemptions from paying the 5 per cent Sales Tax in Barbados been issued to any persons or class of persons and if so to whom or to which class and how many persons have been granted such exemptions? 2. What is the amount of tax remitted as a result of purchases made by such persons, if any? 3. What precautions are being taken to prevent resale of articles bought thus tax-exempted to Barbadians who would otherwise have to pay the tax?

To ask the Minister of Housing: 1. Is the Minister aware that letters demanding payment are being sent in the name of the Manager of the National Housing Corporation to persons who may have been Debtors of the Corporation, but may now have valid defences at law to any actions for recovery of the former debts? 2. Has the Minister or the Manager, and if so which of them, authorised the use of the phrase, "This is the last chance you have got to save your house" in such letters demanding payment? 3. Is any one by the name "C. Tudor, J.P." authorised to sign such letters?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, do I understand that Your Honour is giving the member for St. Lucy leave to ask a question?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When he has asked this question I will be raising another point of order. I just want to see what the Clerk is doing.

Mr. GREAVES:

(1) To ask the Minister of Health: Is the Minister aware that the Hannay's garbage dump in St. Lucy has been burning incessantly for many months now? And is the Minister aware that the smoke, stench and flies from this dump pose a serious threat to the health of the residents in the area and is a constant source of worry to them? Will the Minister take the

necessary steps immediately to put an end to this inconvenience and health hazard?

(2) To ask the Minister of Communications and Works: Is the Minister aware that the heavy rains in November, 1975 caused damage to roads in St. Lucy in the following areas:— The Army Hall Hill, Northumberland and Pie Corner? Is the Minister aware of the threat which this damage poses to the residents specifically and to the users of the abovementioned roads generally? Will the Minister take the necessary steps to have the above areas surveyed and have repairs effected immediately so as to remove this danger?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to know now what the Clerk is doing with the House because Your Honour gave leave to two Members to ask questions. I have already pointed out to Your Honour that Order No. 10 is not properly before the House because at 2.45 Question Time should have been taken. It means that we can do any kind of business that the Clerk feels like calling. He can even short circuit Private Members' Business, call Government Business, call anything at all, just because he has some unfinished business left over before the luncheon adjournment. I do not agree with that. I do not know what the reluctance of the Clerk is in advising Your Honour that the House should decide to continue with Order No. 10 and then get on to Question Time. He has had so much in his head that he wants — to borrow an expression from the hon. member for St. Thomas — to use the steam roller through his wrongdoings that he is going to go on calling orders that had not properly been before the House.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to say anything, but it worries me that we seem to be bringing this House to a state whereby nobody will be able to tell from day to day what is going to happen, and this started back from the fiasco in December. It shows a complete lack of discussion between the two sides and I must admit that the Clerk is primarily to blame, for this reason. We came in here today, in my humble opinion you were wrongly advised as to the procedure which should have been followed for your election as Speaker. I thought that we had a Clerk who was qualified in law for this specific reason to put all of us right because when we come in here we come in here as ordinary members, not lawyers or anything else. Because of somebody believing that he has an inherent right to direct us what to do when he feels like, we are in a situation that in my humble opinion the whole procedure for today is absolutely wrong.

It started off in December when he bluntly refused to follow the Standing Orders and call on those present to elect from among themselves an Acting Speaker for the day, and when challenged and asked to follow the rules, he stood up and kept his mouth shut, and until something is done, we are going to make ourselves the mockery of the entire Commonwealth. A Parliament 300 odd years old at this stage to be running into the byways not even being able to follow the Standing Orders which we sat down on a special Select Committee and drafted to guide us. That is why we are in this situation today. How are we going to get out of it? Can anybody after today take any advice which you seek from the Clerk at the Table? It is time that somebody says what is wrong in this House. It is time that at least the rules be adhered to. If you do not want the Opposition let us go outside, but I say I do not think any Clerk has any authority or any right to seek to corrupt the proceedings in this House, I have seen it done from December, and it is going to reflect on each and every one of us in here, because we should be men enough with guts enough to say that what is going on is wrong. The two sides should have gone outside in the luncheon break, discussed our difficult position, come back in here and agreed on a course to follow. Instead of that we have come back and are following something which is completely outside the rules which we set down. Break the rules once and it is the lee-way for breaking them all the time. That is what I have to say.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is really our fault. The big problem is that the post has been vacant too long and means should have been taken to fill it. That is the real problem here. We have made the Standing Orders. I am not quibbling, I am not speaking as a lawyer, I have not practised law for 15 years but I have been in here 25 years, I helped to make these rules. The logical outcome of what we are doing now is that we can go out to lunch and the Clerk can call Private Members' Business, Public Members' Business, he can decide not to take Question Time, he can say we had something left over before lunch, Mr. So-and-so was speaking before lunch, and although it is Question Time I want to hear him talk, and direct you that we should continue from what was going on before lunch. That does not make sense, Sir, because that is what we are doing. We are continuing from what was going on before the luncheon adjournment and just because we were doing that before the luncheon adjournment, and that Standing Order says that at 2.45 Question Time should be taken right after that Private Members' Business should be taken. We are intruding on Private Members' Business through his misdirection. I regret that I

have to speak this way but he forces me into that invidious position of having to speak that way. The post has been vacant too long.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words. It surprises me that the Clerk who is a servant of this House and not an authority by himself finds himself in this unfortunate position. It seems more to be a lack of the House to be able to direct or decide what is the procedure it wants to follow, and in the absence of that anything can happen.
3.05 p.m.

I feel quite strongly that you should rule on the matter and let us make a decision one way or the other on how we intend to proceed rather than heaping all this criticism on the Clerk.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, we have found ourselves in a very unenviable position today through no fault of anyone in this Chamber. It is a situation for which the Standing Orders do not provide or guide us. In truth and in fact the Clerk with the best of intentions has advised you this way; but in reality we are now in Question Time in view of the fact that the Standing Orders have not been suspended, as the Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, said. To get out of this dilemma — which is nobody's fault on either side — Sir, it might have been that leave to proceed with Order No. 10 should be sought. That being the case, in order to attempt to regularise matters even at this stage, I beg to move that Order No. 10 be now proceeded with in order to carry through in the normal way.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Order No. 10 be now proceeded with. Hon. members in favour will please say "aye".....

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, how can you have leave to proceed with Order No. 10? A Standing Order is a Standing Order. We have to move that the House proceed in a particular form; not a Standing Order. What is surprising is that the Press knew that there was going to be the election of a Speaker today. I did not know as a Member of the House. I would have thought that if the Press knew, somebody knew that the Orders would have been in trouble. You cannot move that Standing Order No. 10 be proceeded with. We have to move that we proceed in a particular manner now and not on a Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I inform the hon. member that the Standing Orders deal with the ordinary business of debate. I would tell the hon.

member for St. Joseph that if he wants to speak, he must speak inside here and not behind me.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I really did not want to get up again because I think that all this messing about is a waste of time; but really and truly if there is one Order of the House that you cannot move be proceeded with, it is Standing Order No. 10; because Standing Order No. 10 lays down the proper business of the House, and it is meaningless to say that you proceed with Order No. 10. Under Order No. 10 you do not reach Oral Replies to Question until you have consumed Government Notices, Private Members' Notices and so on.

Now, as you will know, Sir, when on an ordinary day you reach 2.45 p.m. and Standing Orders have not been suspended and there are no Replies to Questions, the House does not rise until 3.15 p.m. and start again. You ignore Standing Order 16 because the conditions under which Standing Order No. 16 come into operation are set out in Standing Order 16(1), and Standing Order No. 16 cannot be part of the business of the House until Standing Order No. 16(1) has been satisfied.

Standing Order No. 16(1) says nothing about Question Time. That is a phrase that you use. Standing Order 16(4) says that Questions shall be taken at 2.45 p.m.; but it makes it clear that you cannot reach the stage of taking questions unless sub-rules 1, 2 and 3 have been observed.

Sub-rule 1 of Standing Order 16 says that if an oral answer to a question is required, the Minister shall, when "Replies to Questions" is reached in the Order of Business, inform the Speaker that the Reply to the Question asked by a Member is ready.

Now, the Order of Business comes under Standing Order 10. Therefore no matter what the Standing Orders say, if we have not reached Replies to Questions under Standing Order No. 10, the operation of the remaining rules of Standing Order No. 16 cannot come into effect. This is a simple matter. It just requires a little thought free of party faction and free of the prestige of those of us who have been in here for 25 years and have seen the rules changed twice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt now, but it is 3.15 p.m. and I rule that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Obviously I do not mind, Sir. I am here fighting for the

right of the hon. Member for St. Lucy, a member of the Governing Party, to give notice of a question. I am here fighting for the right of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to call the First Readings of Bills, for the Leader of the House to make his Statement and for the Minister of Housing to call for the First Reading of his Bill to amend various Acts.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled. I want it to be understood that the time now being 3.15 p.m. if the Standing Orders have not been put into force then they are to be put into force now. It is now time for Private Members' Business. Let us have some order in the Gallery. Strangers must realise that they are here on sufferance. The instant Order of the Day is Private Members' Business. Let us have some order please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I gather that the Leader of the Opposition said that there were three embarrassing questions that the Government could not answer. He can...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to withdraw my motion. (Leave Granted) In order to regularise this difficult situation over which, we have no control, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43, and 44 be suspended on the usual undertaking that the Leader of the Opposition will be able to exercise his right to deal with any urgent or important business as has been done in the past.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, that Motion is seconded. I am agreeing to the Standing Orders being suspended so that the time-table does not prevent us from obeying Standing Order No. 10. We will take Question Time, and Private Members' Business after this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we will take the Orders in the correct sequence, and we will be taking Government Business before Private Members' Business.

The Question that the Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill for the preservation and

protection of the marine life in certain submarine areas of Barbados and for the establishment of underwater parks and art centres in connection therewith, be now read a first time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act be now read a first time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to regulate the holding of certain property by aliens and companies under alien control be now read a first time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Companies Act be now read a first time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulation) Act be read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, earlier I asked for leave to give notice of an Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor-General. I am now asking for leave to give notice of the terms of the Address and to ask for leave that it should now be dealt with through all its stages to the end of the sitting today.

Leave was granted.

ADDRESS FROM THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Address reads as follows:

"The Honourable House of Assembly has the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Deputy Speaker has received from the Chief Justice a letter dated 17th December 1975 addressed to His Honour the Speaker of the House of Assembly forwarding in accordance with the provisions of section 133 of the Bankruptcy Act, Chapter 303 of the Laws of Barbados, the Certificate of the Registrar of the Supreme Court which certifies that Mr. Neville George Anthony Maxwell, a member of the House of Assembly, was adjudged bankrupt in this Island on the 11th June 1975 and remains subject to the disqualifications arising under section 132(1) of the said Act.

Consequently by virtue of section 45 of the Constitution the Seat of the said Mr. Neville George Anthony Maxwell member for the Constituency of St. Philip North has become vacant.

Now therefore the Honourable House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of section 5(2) of the Representation of the People Act (Cap.12) humbly requests Your Excellency to issue a Writ for an election to fill the said vacancy."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned, this is a matter that can be dealt with now. If the seat is vacant, the Governor-General has a constitutional duty to see that the Writ for an election be issued in such manner as to enable the seat to be filled within 90 days. As far as I am concerned, the Leader of the House can announce the election date. The House can pass the Address and the Opposition will support it here and now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, that being the case, I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question that the Address do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the following Statement:

"In my capacity as Leader of the House of Assembly I deem it my duty to make the following statement.

The Government of Barbados — concerned with the attempts to bring into disrepute the Parliamentary Institutions in this country and determined to preserve the democratic principles and the rule of Law now obtaining in Barbados — both for the public benefit and for posterity — must have set down in the records of this Honourable House the facts surrounding certain events which have arisen since December 16, 1975, the last occasion on which the House of Assembly duly met and conducted business."

3.25 p.m.

"It must be pointed out that there are three traditional recesses of Parliament during the year, which are at Christmas, at Easter, and in the Mid-Summer. Between 14th October 1971 when this House had its first session after the last General Election and January 1975 the Christmas Recesses taken over that period, were —

14th December 1971 until 18th January 1972
19th December 1972 until 16th January 1973
18th December 1973 until 15th January 1974
10th December 1974 until 14th January 1975

Business was pending on each of the above-mentioned occasions of adjournment as follows:

December 1971:

Government Business

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishments (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1971;

Two (2) items of Private Members' Business and ten (10) Parliamentary Questions unanswered.

December 1972:

Government Business

1. The Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the raising or guaranteeing of loans from the Inter-American Development Bank by the Government of Barbados for the purpose of financing development projects in Barbados and for connected purposes.

2. The adoption of the Report of the Standing Orders Committee.
3. The Third Reading of a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act 1904.
4. The Third Reading of a Bill to repeal the Dental Registration Act 1923, and make new provision for the registration in Barbados of dental practitioners, dental auxiliaries, dental hygienists and of persons licensed to perform specified dental services and for related purposes.

Eight (8) items of Private Members' Business and six (6) Parliamentary Questions out of fifty (50) unanswered.

December 1973:

Government Business

1. The passing of a Resolution for \$244,030 as Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 30.
2. The Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the licensing of persons who wire buildings for the supply of electricity and for connected purposes.
3. The passing of a Resolution to approve the lease of the property at "Bradfield", Country Road, St. Michael, to the Young Women's Christian Association.
4. The Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act 1971.

Ten (10) items of Private Members' Business and sixty-nine (69) Parliamentary Questions out of 202 unanswered.

It must be noted that among the items under Private Members' Business at the time of this adjournment were two Resolutions by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the following effect:

- (1) To move the passing of the Resolution calling on the Government to introduce legislation providing that all Members of Parliament, Senators and holders of public offices be compelled to disclose their assets.

Notice of this Resolution was given on the 16th October, 1973.

- (2) To move the passing of the Resolution calling on the Government to

modernise and bring up to date the law relating to the prevention of corruption.

Notice of this Resolution was given on the 16th October, 1973."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I have never before seen or had to interrupt a Ministerial Statement, but I must rise on a point of order at this stage. This Session began on 19th February, 1975, therefore the Minister is patently wrong in citing notice dates prior to 19th February, 1975.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: "Yet there was no outcry or objection by the Leader or his Party to the adjournment although these Resolutions of which notice was given on 16th October 1973 were being carried over the Christmas recess.

December 1974:
Government Business

1. The passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Trents Plantation, St. James.
2. The passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Maxwell Hill, Christ Church.

Seven (7) items of Private Members' Business and thirty-three (33) Parliamentary Questions out of 283 were unanswered."

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt. He has twice repeated something that is false. There is only one Resolution in my name and notice of it was given on 24th March, 1975. No member is entitled under cloak of any ministerial privilege or personal explanation privilege to say things that are not true. Notice was given on 24th March, 1975.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Minister continue.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: "The above facts clearly show that throughout the life of this House of Assembly up to the Meeting of the 16th December 1975 — The House of Assembly has gone on Christmas recess as part and parcel of the political life of this country.

It is inevitable, therefore, that at the time of any such adjournment there is always some

unfinished business, both of Government and Private Members, which has to await the recall of Parliament.

On 16th December, 1975 Parliament met at 12 noon. On the Order Paper for consideration were —

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: To move the Honourable the House of Assembly into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of certain sums of money for the service of the Island.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To move the passing of the following Resolution:—

The Resolution to grant the sum of \$5,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975–76 Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975–76 No. 24, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: To move the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal the Shops Act and make new provisions relating to shops.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Holidays with Pay Act.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: To move the Third Reading of a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to marriage.

Included under *Private Members' Business* was a Resolution by the Leader of the Opposition to the following effect:—

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To move the resumption of consideration of the Resolution requesting the Government to introduce legislation providing that all Members of Parliament, Senators and holders of public offices be compelled to disclose their assets when taking office, or a seat in Parliament and thereafter, periodically until they cease to hold such office or seat in Parliament.

A similar Resolution was first tabled on 16th October 1973 and at prorogation in February, 1975 all matters, including that Resolution, died with that session of Parliament."

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, I wonder if the Leader of the House would be kind

enough as to have the statement run off and circulated rather than reading out a big bogus statement and wasting people's time.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not wasting time.

Mr. CRAIG: He is reading a lot of nonsense. The Prime Minister is sleeping; the Minister of Agriculture is sleeping. It is a lot of bogus trash he is reading all the time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is in his opinion bogus stuff, but when I get through it will not be bogus; it will be a lasting document on record.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister continue?
3.35 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, he said that it is a document which will be a lasting document on record. I hope that that document will contain statements that are worthwhile.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. Will the Minister carry on?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker.

"Nothing on the Order Paper dealt either with Cuban Planes landing in Barbados — nor was there anything dealing with the vacancy of the seat of the Hon. Speaker the Hon. Neville Maxwell. In fact up to the meeting of December 16, 1975 — the Honourable House had not received any letter or communication from the Courts with respect to this matter.

Indeed at the meeting of the Honourable House of Assembly on the 16th among other notices given were notices of two money resolutions for vast sums of money introduced by the Minister of Education, Hon. Frederick Smith.

One resolution was for the sum of \$197,000 under Head 20(2) Primary, Adult and Special Education and the other resolution was for the sum of \$499,622 under Head 120 — Ministry of Education — Item 14 — School Meals Service \$404,622 and Item 21 — Prefabricated Buildings \$75,000.

When notice was given of the Resolutions — The Hon. Minister of

Education sought and obtained leave to deal with those two resolutions in all their stages at the sitting.

The Hon. R. B. Caddle also gave notice of a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Law for the first time and he too sought and obtained leave to deal with the Bill in all its stages at the sitting.

The Minutes of the meeting of the 16th reveal that there was no objection from the opposition dealing with these important matters all on the same day on which notice was given and from the records of the meeting — present for the opposition were: Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams, Leader of the Opposition, Mr. C. L. Bolden, Mr. H. deB. Forde, Mr. W. C. B. Hinds."

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, he must not call me merely by my name.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Sir, the document shows that his name is there.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Honourable Minister sought and obtained leave from the House because.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir, this shows the inconsistency of that document. He starts off by saying Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams and Mr. C. L. Bolden, but now it comes back and refers to the others on that side as 'the Honourable.' That just goes to show the inconsistency.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, you cannot say in the document that Mr. Barrow was there or "Dipper", but.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Very well, your point is taken.

Mr. ADAMS: We are all honourable members in here, and I rise to support what the hon. member for St. Joseph has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with what is being done here.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I was merely referring to the meeting of the 16th December. I could not read anything different, but there is no disrespect in any way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: After all, if the hon. member is objecting to his name being

called in this way, then when a division is called for, the Clerk of the House has no right calling me Mr. Barrow or saying Dr. Caddle or calling the hon. member for St. James, Mr. Craig.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I will continue, Sir.

"The Honourable Ministers sought and obtained leave from the House because it was clearly understood that it would be the last sitting before the Christmas recess and any delay in passing the resolutions would put back the work of Government for at least three to four weeks.

3.45 p.m.

The Minutes show that the House having met at 12 noon, resumed at 3.15 p.m. after a suspension for lunch. The Minutes do not show for how long the suspension was. After the suspension — the House continued its business.

It would be interesting for the public to know that when leave was sought and obtained by the Hon. Ministers the Opposition had not even seen the resolutions for which leave to deal with them in all their stages was sought.

On the 16th December, 1975 the House did not adjourn for dinner. However, after all of the Government business (including three money Resolutions) had been concluded about 8.35 p.m., I extended Seasons Greetings to the Deputy Speaker and Members of the House including the Opposition and moved the adjournment of the House to Tuesday, 20th January 1976, which was duly seconded. In so doing I intimated to the Leader of the Opposition that owing to lateness of the hour, as the House was in session from 12 noon on that day, and the fact that most of the Members and including the staff appeared tired and hungry, that he might not be willing to exercise his right to embark on Private Members Business, pursuant to the usual undertaking which was given by me at the commencement of the day's sitting..."

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, a ministerial statement should not be debated but it should be truthful. I challenge the Leader of the House to produce the record of the debate showing that he informed me of those things. I had no personal conversation with him, I learned my lesson about that long ago. I know that on these occasions the Minister will produce witnesses to support it. I challenge the Minister

to show where he told me that the staff was tired. That is an outright lie. (Hon. C. E. TALMA: I said it was my impression.)

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw those remarks including the statement that it is an outright lie to say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to use better language in here to express himself.

Mr. ADAMS: I know it is not the Minister who wrote that, Sir, therefore I can safely say that I am not saying that something said by a member is a lie. I have said that that statement that somebody told me that the staff was tired is a lie. Nobody told me that the staff was tired.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: "...pursuant to the usual undertaking which was given by me at the commencement of the day's sitting when suspending certain Standing Orders of the House of Assembly and more especially having regard to the fact that on no less than two occasions within the last few weeks, the Opposition were not prepared and in fact did not utilise Private Members' time, though given an opportunity to do so.

The Minutes now show that after the motion was moved by the Leader of the House and seconded by the Hon. G. G. Fergusson for the adjournment of the House until Tuesday the 20th January, 1976, at 12 noon, Mr. Adams spoke and moved that the motion be amended by deleting the words "Tuesday 20th January, 1976" and substituting therefor the words "Friday 19th December, 1975".

Mr. C. L. Bolden seconded the motion and was speaking.

Mr. C. E. Talma spoke on a point of order.

Mr. C. L. Bolden resumed his speech.

The Deputy Speaker spoke.

Hon. F. G. Smith spoke on a point of order.

Mr. C. L. Bolden resumed his speech.

Mr. H. deB. Forde spoke on a point of order.

At this stage there was no quorum present. The Deputy Speaker then adjourned

the House until Tuesday the 23rd December, 1975 at 12 noon without question put. Time 9.27 p.m.

From this recital of the facts — two things are of significance — one is that the House since resumption at 3.15 p.m. had not adjourned for dinner and (2) that the Leader of the House himself — in his amendment to the motion for the adjournment of the House to the 20th January 1976 — moved an amendment for 19th December 1975 and not 23rd December 1975.

The reasonable inference of this being from the foregoing facts and from his own experience — that the 19th would be a better date to enable members of Parliament to go off for Christmas recess without having to come back during the week of Christmas.

The Standing Orders clearly state that if there is no quorum at any meeting, then the House is adjourned to the following Tuesday at 12 noon.

The Government states that it is the Government's duty in Parliament as in every other. Parliament in the British Commonwealth to set the time-table of work for Parliament. The Government has a right in the system of democracy which we operate to decide when Parliament should meet. This right has been exercised throughout the history of the Parliament of Barbados. The Government is satisfied that at the time of the motion for the adjournment to the 20th January there was no urgent or pressing business requiring it to break the custom of a Christmas recess — bearing in mind (1) that on the Order Paper there was no resolution dealing with the vacancy of the seat of the Hon. Speaker nor was the House notified of any communication from the courts or elsewhere to that effect (2) that there was not any resolution or notice about any Cuban matter (3) that the resolution on Integrity legislation so called was tabled on 24th March, 1975 and that debate had started on it. Further that if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition view this legislation with such urgency and of such importance — then they were countless opportunities since 24th March 1975 to have the matter debated and the debate concluded.

3.55 p.m.

"The Government is not in breach of any Standing Orders and the Government now views with utmost concern the happenings in Parliament on the 30th December, 1975. From the facts available to the Government the following incident took place — In the absence of the Deputy Speaker and in the absence of a quorum a member of the public jumped over the rails from the Public Gallery and took his seat in the Speaker's chair and also in the chair usually occupied by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

When an attempt was being made by an Officer of the House — a policeman in uniform — that officer was warned by the Leader of the Opposition not to touch the said member of the public who by his action attempted to bring the House of Assembly into disrepute and whose action has never been recorded in the entire history of the Honourable House.

The Government is most concerned that the Leader of the Opposition should permit the dignity of the House to be so tarnished in his presence and should warn an officer of the House to refrain from ejecting a member of the public who had desecrated this ancient and august Chamber."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Are all these facts available to the Government? Is it realised that there would be nobody who could keep order in the House unless a Presiding Officer was present?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

"The Government is even more alarmed that the Leader of the Opposition, an executive member of CPA should be seen marching with the very person who had so desecrated the House in an illegal march to Government House to present a petition to Her Majesty's representative, the Governor-General. For the said member of the public had not only brought disgrace to the House but had stated publicly....."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a Standing Order which says that Members should not read newspapers in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That will have to be enforced. It is regrettable that the person breaking

the rule should be a Member of the Government. I hope that the Minister will observe the Standing Order. I have spoken to a Member of the Government. Please let us stick to the Standing Orders. I am the Speaker here looking after the rights of the minority. Please observe the Standing Orders.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As I was saying, Sir, "for the said Member of the public had not only brought disgrace to the House but had stated publicly....."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Did the Minister say that I was leading an illegal march? He cannot ascribe an illegality to me. If he has said that I was leading an illegal march, he has to withdraw that. He cannot say that anybody was leading an illegal march whether an executive of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association or not. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a Standing Order that if members of this Chamber intend to debate issues or call the names of persons they should give notice to the Chamber; but it would appear from the statement which the Leader of the House is reading that he has put together a lot of hearsay evidence — a hearsay statement read in here as a ministerial statement.

Now, Sir, he was not here on any of these days; therefore, as I said earlier today, if we keep on flouting the Rules of the House it is going to end up that we or anyone who comes to this Parliament hereafter will be making all kinds of legal statements or any statements and you will not be able to ask them to justify it; because we have the precedent of the Leader of the House reading a document with numerous inaccuracies as a ministerial statement which goes into Hansard; and so it gives everybody leeway after now.

I would have thought that a Minister would be more careful if he intended to read a statement of that nature to the House; that he would make sure that he is quite accurate, and that it bears a true reflection of what took place on the day. I say that because he left the Chamber. I was speaking when I saw the Leader of the House motion to members on that side and everyone of them went outside. He picked up his books and papers and went outside and left me on my feet; so he cannot now relate anything in here with any accuracy.

He is trying to justify his position before the Prime Minister; but I will tell the Prime Minister that he is the cause of the walk out.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Leader of the House to withdraw the remarks that I led an illegal march. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I did not say "led".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Or took part in one. The words "illegal march" and "Leader of the Opposition" marching to Government House are placed in propinquity, and I am asking that it be withdrawn. It would only lead to a new campaign of character assassination in here, Sir. Believe me, Sir, I can stand it but.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It was an illegal march.

Mr. SPEAKER: There was a march that you referred to?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. What has a march to do with the statement made by the Leader of the House? If we march that is our business.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot question the Minister's statement.

Mr. CRAIG: Let him prosecute us. You can bring it in the form of a resolution and let us debate it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is taking objection to the remarks used by the Leader of the House I think it is highly improper to call on the Leader of the House to commit the same offence again that the Leader of the Opposition is complaining against. 4.05 p.m.

Do not give the Leader of the House an opportunity to repeat the offence that the Leader of the House is complaining about.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I never said he was leading the march.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is the reporter who should give us what he said.

Mr. Speaker, I do not trust the Leader of the House to read out what he said before. He will read out something different. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education tells me that I am Sealy's brother chip. He is the brother chip of a lot of people who ought to be in Glendairy today for the wrong they have done. I will take my seat. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have some order! May I get.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has as much right to be in Glendairy Prison as anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. Member risen?

Mr. HINDS: On a question of privilege, which comes before anything else in this Honourable House.

(*At this stage there was an interruption from the Public Gallery by Mr. Eric. Sealy.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Officer, will you have him removed from the precinct of the House immediately! (*Interruption from the Public Gallery.*) Let us have some order, please, in the gallery. You are here on sufferance.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Statement continues:

"The Government is even more alarmed that the Leader of the Opposition, an executive member of CPA, should be seen marching with the very person who had so desecrated the House in an illegal march to Government House to present a petition to Her Majesty's representative, the Governor-General."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Marching with a desecrator in an illegal march? (*Asides.*) Sir, do not mind the Prime Minister giving instructions as to what it says. Does that not say I was taking part in an illegal march, Sir? I am trying to be calm because I am not taking on this foolishness of a Government in the last days of its life. But does that not say I was taking part in an illegal march with a desecrator of the House, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The person desecrating the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The illegal march is what I am dealing with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister continue.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to talk about the Minister of Education receiving bribes. I want to discuss it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, none of that in here. I do not know anything about the Minister of Education or any other Minister receiving bribes! We are hearing a Statement and there will be no interruptions, unless on a point of order from Members.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is my colleague referring to the former Minister of Education, or to the present one?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not interested. Will the Hon. Minister continue.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker —

".....to present the Petition to Her Majesty's representative, the Governor-General. For the said member of the public had not only....."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have not presented any Petition to Her Majesty's Governor-General. The Minister must not say things that are not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that there can be no debate, and he knows how to deal with a Statement from the Minister.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am putting myself in your hands. I have never before known a Ministerial Statement to contain the depths of character assassination to which this one has descended. I really do not know how to deal with it, apart from denying these things.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, on a point of order, that I have read this Statement very carefully. I am satisfied, and I give the hon. Member the opportunity to satisfy himself, that the references to that particular paragraph are not to the hon. Member. I agree that the phrasing could have been more elegant. As a draftsman, I would have done it more neatly. There is a slight ambiguity, but it is not a patent or latent ambiguity, for which I am sure the hon. Member apologizes. I hasten to reassure the hon. Member that no legally trained person could read into that the reference to him, and nobody on this side would take that particular paragraph to refer to the hon. Member. We know that he did not present the Petition.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, we were referring to a person,

"For the said member of the public had not only brought disgrace to the House but had stated publicly that he would bring greater dishonour by taking up his position in the Honourable Chamber and playing dominoes and cards and eating food in the said Chamber even before the march to the Governor-General.

The Government is satisfied that the Leader of the Opposition has access to Her Majesty's representative, the Governor-General, at any time on matters affecting the welfare of the state — but the Government would expect that that right would be scrupulously guarded and would not be exercised in the presence of a person who had attempted to bring into contempt the ancient House of Parliament and who had shown....."

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has the right to carry to Government House whoever he feels to carry — even the Prime Minister. That is his delegation. He had an audience with the Governor-General; the Governor-General accepted it, and he went up there. Do not worry to talk about who he carried. (*Asides.*) He carried the same person who is always in your house.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not under discussion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I will continue:

".....who has shown utter disrespect by his behaviour on the 30th December, 1975, but had openly indicated his further intention to tarnish the ancient reputation of the House of Assembly.

Further it may be of interest to note that the resolution of the Leader of the Opposition on the need to elect the new Speaker for the House of Assembly was given notice of on the 6th January, 1976 in documents circulated to Members by the Clerk of the House of Assembly.

The media has quoted the Leader of the Opposition as deploring the non-attendance of Government Members at meetings of the House to form a quorum and transact the people's business.

The Opposition's attitude generally towards forming a quorum to do the

people's business should be a matter of public record. Almost without exception, whenever this Chamber meets, the Opposition refuse to take their seats until it is certain that there is a sufficient number of Government Members present to form a quorum, and if the required number of Government Members is not present, the Opposition has consistently refused to co-operate in order to carry on the people's business. That is a true demonstration of the kind of respect that the Opposition has for this Chamber and the people of Barbados."

4.15 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, we understand this is a statement but you cannot stand here and lie, lie all the time. The Leader of the House ought to be decent enough to say that I have often come in here with hon. members over there to help form a quorum and get the House going. It is unfair to the Opposition for the Leader of the House to say what he is now saying. Is he doting in his old age?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: "The Government would like to place on record its appreciation to the Commissioner of the Royal Barbados Police and all members of the Force for the very able and competent manner in which they dealt with the entire situation and is proud to know that in the Royal Barbados Police we have such worthy upholders of the rule of Law.

Finally, Sir, Honourable Members are well aware....."

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order...(A VOICE: The Minister is making a statement, and there cannot be a point of order.) Let the Leader of the House ask the Prime Minister to make a statement and declare a one party state.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member expects that you can permit that, there is no one way street; it can be dealt with over here too. If you want a harangue you can get a harangue. You cannot permit any member to rise on a point of interruption and abuse a point of order when a person is reading a statement and not debating anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister continue?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: "Finally, Honourable Members are well aware of the ancient and noble traditions of this House and I invite all members not to sully them

when you wish to smear a man you do anything to smear a man. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order.

(Hon. F. G. SMITH: Let us hear about the march now.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wonder, Sir, if with the indulgence of the House we could revert to congratulatory speeches. I would like to congratulate the hon. member on his most congenious explanation. I must call it so, Sir.

Mr. ADAMS: The Prime Minister is not with the rest of the Government in all this. The Prime Minister well feels that the matter has been handled badly. He and I know this.

If you want a comment as far as a march is concerned, Sir, on a point of personal explanation. (*Asides*) I just want to say this, Sir. There was no march on December 30, and I am just stating quite clearly that I took part in no illegal march. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I went down stairs very dissatisfied and decided to walk to Government House, and we walked to Government House and waited there in the hot sun for a couple of hours until His Excellency could see us.

I would just like to wind up very shortly, Sir, by saying that this House of Assembly as far as I am concerned, I believe I have more respect for the tradition of the House of Assembly than a lot of Members in here, and I really do resent the implication placed upon Press reports and upon the smears that so readily circulate in this rumour-ridden society of ours. I really must resent that all those things should have taken place.

There are hon. Members who have been in here a long time who will readily confess that outside election year you will probably tag a man for perhaps controlling things so that the House of Assembly was not burnt down or broken down; but this is election year and I believe that we have to be expectant if not tolerant of some of the smears that are put into circulation.

As far as I am concerned, the next time there is any confusion in here I am going to go out through the door and let them turn down the table, tear down the chairs, rip up the microphones, burn up the place, do as they did in Dominica, do as they have done in other countries, fight on the floor and let them do whatever they like. Let the police and the public fight a pitched battle in here, because if a man's

motives are to be so misrepresented and his actions so maligned as has happened in this case, when the Opposition, seeking to uphold the best traditions of this Parliament yet finds itself under attack in the manner in which we have been subjected, then the best thing for decent people to do is to go along and leave it and see what happens if they wash their hands of the whole affair.

4.35 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 43 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is ready.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 56 is now ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 51 asked by the hon. member for St. James is ready; that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 61 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph is ready, and that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 62 asked by the same hon. member for St. Joseph is ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 64 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph is ready.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 59 is ready, and that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46 is also ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to state that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 47 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is now ready.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

QUESTION RE CEMENT PLANT IN ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 43, on page 8, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: To ask the appropriate Minister: Now that a decision has been taken to build a Cement Plant at Maycock's area, St. Lucy, can the Minister state what provisions are being made to compensate those persons in St. Lucy whose properties will be affected by the construction of the Cement Plant? And can the Minister state precisely what provisions are being made to protect the health of persons living near to the Cement Plant?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the reply to that question is as follows:

"There has been no decision to build a Cement Plant at Maycocks area, St. Lucy.

There are no buildings on the land purchased by Government at Checker Hall, St. Lucy. There are no houses in the Checker Hall area which are likely to be downwind of the plant or quarry sites.

It is not anticipated that health problems will arise to local residents.

The health of workers will be protected by humidifiers, dust arrestors, and electrostatic precipitators of the most modern design."

QUESTION RE FLOODING IN ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 46 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. GREAVES: To ask the Minister of Communications and Works: 1. Is the Minister aware that there is a serious problem of flooding in Crab Hill (near Stroud Bay Road), Grape Hall Corner and in Pie Corner, St. Lucy? 2. Is the Minister also aware that when there is a downpour of rain these areas are flooded to the extent that residents experience considerable difficulty in getting to and from their homes? 3. Will the Minister investigate the foregoing and ensure that proper drainage for these areas is provided without delay?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

"Drainage at Crab Hill and Grape Hall Corner will be improved shortly.

Plans have been approved for improvement to Pie Corner, St. Lucy,

and acquisition of lands for this project is being pursued."

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question on this. I wonder if the Minister could give the exact location as to where the land that he has indicated will be acquired for this improvement is situated in the Pie Corner area.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to indicate exactly where ... Pie Corner going through the file, I will have to get that information from the Ministry.

QUESTION RE SALE OF DRUGS AFTER EXPIRY DATE FIXED BY MANUFACTURERS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 47 standing in the same hon. member's name.

Mr. GREAVES: To ask the Minister of Health and Welfare: 1. Can the Minister state whether or not Government has a policy on the sale and use of drugs after the expiry date fixed by the manufacturers has elapsed? 2. Is the Minister aware of the complaints to the effect that at St. Joseph's Hospital, St. Peter the practice exists of administering to patients drugs the expiry date of which has elapsed? 3. Will the Minister take appropriate steps to investigate these complaints and take such other action as is necessary to put an end to such practice if they are found to exist?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 47 is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir. The policy in respect of expiring drugs in general is that they be neither used nor sold. They may, however, be used, including being sold, on prescription if a registered medical practitioner authorises their use. This policy can be found in the following legislation:

(a) The Health Services (Control of Drugs) Regulations, 1970; and

(b) The Therapeutic Substances Act, Cap. 330.

2. No, Sir.

3. It is not necessary to do so in view of the answer to part 2.

QUESTION RE STREET LIGHTING IN
CATTLEWASH AND ANDREW'S
TENANTRY AREAS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 59 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, page 11.

Mr. BOLDEN: To ask the appropriate Minister: Since Government has restarted its street lighting programme, would the Minister consider the provision of street lights in the Cattlewash and Andrew's Tenantry areas?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, the provision of street lighting at Cattlewash and Andrew's Tenantry, St. Joseph has been included for consideration in the Ministry's street lighting programme for the current year.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state whether that consideration has been put into effect and how soon, if so, lights will be installed in these two areas?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: At the moment the Barbados Light and Power has started a programme of erecting lights in various parts of the island. However, I am not in a position to state at what precise time they will be in the St. Joseph area.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 51 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG: To ask the appropriate Minister: Will the Minister state the cost to the taxpayers and Government of Barbados re bringing the Barbados Permanent Representative to the United Nations to Barbados between the 1st November, 1975 and 4th November, 1975?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:—

The total cost of bringing the Permanent Representative to the United Nations to Barbados from the 1st to the 4th November, 1975, was (Barbados) \$1,335.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that up to last week Mr. Waldo Ramsey was still living in a Barbados Government house at Pelham, and still driving a car with diplomatic plates?

Mr. SPEAKER: That supplementary has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. ADAMS: Is the Minister aware that representatives of the "New York Times" have questioned the Minister for External Affairs, Senator Moe, and Mr. Waldo Ramsey about his return to Barbados subsequent on his dismissal from the post, and that Mr. Ramsey's answer was "are the Arabs paying you to ask these questions"?

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no reply, the next question is Question No. 61, Page 12, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker,

To ask the appropriate Minister: Will the Minister state: (1) the last date that driving licence books had been issued by the Police Department to persons who passed their driving test and required such books; (2) the number of policemen employed in supervising driving tests; (3) the number of driving tests completed during the period January 1975 to October 1975; (4) the total number of successful applicants and the number of failures; Is the Minister aware that applicants for driving tests are now being given a seven (7) months' waiting period? Would the Minister consider: (a) increasing the number of personnel employed in the supervision of the driving tests; (b) setting up other testing centres outside of Bridgetown and the St. Michael area; (c) issuing five (5) year licences so as to reduce the cost and yearly renewal of driving licences?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Replies to Parliamentary Question No. 61 are as follows:—

(1) at the date of the question and on every subsequent working day. (2) Six. (3) 6,277. (4) 3,927 successful and 2,350 failed. (2) No. Sir. (3) (a) No, Sir. (b) No, Sir. (c) No, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state why the Government does not think it appropriate under (a) to increase the number of personnel employed for the driving tests and (b) setting up testing centres outside of St. Michael? *(Pause)*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I am not in a position to answer that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that the lack of the necessary personnel to carry out driving tests is the reason for the long delay in getting tests at the present moment?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In connection with that query, Sir, the hon. member is suggesting that the

long wait with regard to the matter of a seven month period of waiting for driving tests — it has been agreed that there are periods in the past when such a period was necessary due to the unusually large number of applications to be processed. The present position is, however, that the average waiting period has been reduced to six weeks, so that applicants passing the regulation test on the 24th November, 1975, were given appointments for a driving test on the 12th, 13th and 14th January, 1976.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 62 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker,

To ask the appropriate Minister: Would the Minister state: 1. the number of applications for work permits received by the Ministry of Legal Affairs during the year 1974 from German nationals who are seeking to be employed in Barbados as tour guides; 2. the number of such work permits granted or refused; 3. the number of German nationals employed as guides in Barbados; 4. Whether or not work permit has been recently refused in the first instance in respect of a German national on the grounds that (a) there are Barbadians in Barbados qualified to do the said job; (b) that the applicant's medical certificate indicates that he was mentally disturbed? 5. Whether or not a work permit has been subsequently granted to the same person. If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state what new considerations caused the issuing of this work permit? 6. What steps are being taken to ensure that Barbadian nationals who are qualified are not deprived of these lucrative jobs by non-nationals? Is the Minister aware that there is at least one Barbadian in Barbados, who is regarded as being able to speak German fluently, who has been employed in all aspects of the hotel and tourist industry and has applied for the said job, but has been overlooked in favour of this non-national?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows:—

(1) one. (3) one, according to the Ministry's records. (4) No, Sir. (5) Does not arise in view of the Reply to (4) of the question. (6) Employers are required to demonstrate by advertisement and statement on all applications from Barbadian nationals that a suitable and interested Barbadian

is not available before approval is granted for the recruitment of a non-national. (7) No, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the answer to (3) is the Minister stating that there may be nationals employed in Barbados as tour guides who are not recorded with the Ministry? 4.55 p.m.

Would the Hon. Minister give an assurance to this House that he will investigate the number of German Nationals who are working as tour guides in Barbados and report back to the House at a subsequent date?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Minister will investigate the number of tour guides, if the hon. member for St. James will give the Ministry the names, if he knows them.

Mr. FORDE: Will Your Honour give us some guidance. I would expect that normal courtesy demands that, if a Minister is not answering a question, he should rise on his feet, say so, and give the reason why he is not answering. As I understand it, that is the procedure followed in all recognised Houses of Parliament. Are we to understand that only when the Government wishes to attack the Opposition in personal statements that are nasty and vicious they are willing to stand on their feet? That is what I want to know.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a statement and it has nothing to do with the matter before the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I had no opportunity to say anything. I was trying to find the information and, being thus courteous, I was trying to accommodate the hon. member. People were on their feet all the time. I am not in a position to answer the question, but I will make the necessary investigation and see that the information is given to the hon. member.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister was searching his file to find out whether he could give an answer or not, he should have told us something. He should have risen and said so. It appeared as though he had no intention of answering, and then the Minister of Education, who seeks to perpetrate wrong-doings in this House, jumps on his feet to usurp the position of the Minister who has to answer the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree with what the hon. member for St. Joseph has said. The hon. member is a Minister of the Government and he has the right, as anybody else, to answer any

question, if he feels like doing so. He got up, using his right as a Minister of the Government.

Question No. 64 which stands in the name of the same hon. member.

COVERAGE OF YOUNGSTERS UNDER THE NATIONAL INSURANCE SCHEME

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, to ask the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that (1) There are many young persons leaving school at the age of fourteen (14); (2) Many of these young persons must seek work and are quite prepared to work if they find employment; (3) Many employers are reluctant to employ these persons because they cannot be covered under the National Insurance Scheme; (4) Would the Minister state what steps are being taken to allow these persons to be covered under the National Insurance Scheme?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the question is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.
2. Yes, Sir.
3. No, Sir.
4. Persons under age 16 years, who are engaged in employment under a contract of service or apprenticeship, are insurable by virtue of section 14 of the National Insurance and Social Security Act in respect of employment injury benefits. No amendment to this legislation is proposed in respect of such persons.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that that section does not give to such persons the same rights, privileges and benefits as it gives to persons over the age of 16?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The answer to that question is found in the laws of the country.

Mr. BOLDEN: Would the Minister state whether or not those persons who have worked for a number of years, which would not be taken into account if and when they reach the age when they would receive a normal pension under the National Insurance Scheme?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the question. I presume the member is asking this question and I will try to simplify it for him: If persons are employed before they reach the age of 16 years, when the time comes for the pensions to be computed, will

the service rendered before the age of 16, be taken into consideration? If that is the question, then let me say no.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that, if the Act was amended so that the services rendered during those period would be counted, those persons would be better off than under the present system?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Laws of this country offer coverage for persons between the ages of 16 and 65. There is no proposal, at this state, to amend the Act in respect of those ages.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of Question Time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Are you by-passing me so, Sir? I gave notice of a reply to a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Question No. 56 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

REPAIRS TO WEST ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, to ask the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware (1) that the West St. Joseph School is badly in need of repairs, (2) that whenever it rains, the many children and teachers are unable to use their classrooms because of the water pouring through the roof? Would the Minister cause an immediate survey to be done at the said school and have the necessary repairs effected so that children will not be deprived of their teaching during rainy seasons?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the needs of West St. Joseph School are urgent and I have, therefore, had a survey carried out. As a result, plans were started, long before the question was asked, and have now been finalised for the construction of a new 3-storey classroom block representing the first phase of a planned reconstruction of the school. It is anticipated that construction will begin in another few weeks. In addition remedial work has been carried out to correct the blockage of water which cause flooding of some classrooms.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state when was he aware that classrooms were flooded each time it rains?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not a meteorologist, and I do not know when the rain is coming. Every time the rain has come the Headmaster has drawn it to our attention. This matter of building the classrooms started with my

predecessor, and I am not even claiming credit for it. The planning of this extension was done by the Minister of Health who was the then Minister of Education. It has been going on for some time. As the building is a very old building under a lot of trees, the dry leaves fall in the gutters and cause the flooding. We have done remedial work, and we hope to minimise the inconvenience caused to the students and to the teachers.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state when was the first operation started in blocking the holes which caused the leakage in the school?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not understand the Question. Blocking the holes? I cannot tell you that. As soon as the matter was reported to the Ministry, we tried to take remedial action. We know that the children and teachers have been suffering inconvenience and that the building needs extensive repairs.

5.05 p.m.

The new expansion is going to cost the Government nearly \$1 million to put up.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further supplementaries, that brings us to the end of Question Time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

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. A. MORRISON: 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.

THE RESOLUTION FOR THE SUM OF \$22,328
WAS CALLED

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 NO. 25

Head 2 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 2 - Parliament, there are Item 2, Other Personal Emoluments in the sum of \$2,220 and Item 4 - Other Personal Emoluments for the sum of \$833. I think the explanatory note is quite appropriate. It is a question of paying the difference in the salary between the Deputy Speaker and that of the Speaker and Personal Allowance to the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 2 - Parliament - stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think it is almost four years now since I have been in this Honourable House of Assembly, because we must still call it that, and I have on many occasions sat in this House with great restraint when matters brought before this House and this Committee are to be debated.

I am asked in this Resolution to vote a sum of money so that the business of Parliament may be carried on. I seriously wish that I could accept the sincerity of the Government in having the Opposition participate in this Resolution. I am satisfied that as one gets nearer to elections in this country partisan politics overtake proper parliamentary procedure, and the Government intent on using its parliamentary numbers and intent on using the control of the media including the Advocate-News which they are about to buy into, will ensure more and more that when we come to debate parliamentary matters, the Opposition has as much say as they want to allow it.

I am going to try to examine the role that Parliament should genuinely have when we are dealing with the Speaker. I respectfully submit that when it comes to the question of electing someone to the high office of Speaker of this House that the proper parliamentary conventions demand that the Leader of the House, if he is not being partisan, should have discussed this matter with the Opposition and see whether we could have come into this Parliament to maintain the conventions and have elected a Speaker with no one objecting to it. In the best parliamentary traditions that have been followed in all of the recognised Parliamentary systems, this has been the procedure. The first time that we knew that the Government was putting up the hon. member for St. George North as Speaker is when the Address was passed.

Now there has been a lot of talk about the procedures we follow in this Parliament, and there has been a series of rulings given in this Parliament that I believe Parliamentary members themselves do not seem to be cognisant of as consistent in the application of the Rules of Parliament. The time has certainly come when we should have a course for all members of Parliament; we should not be just voting money for the Speaker. This should be the position, but we are getting to the stage when Parliament is beginning to be misused by ourselves and as a result people outside are having less respect for it.

Now what do we demand of the Speaker? Although this is a small Island and I suppose the political lines are strictly drawn and you do not expect too much give and take, I would wish to see a Speaker who when he occupies the chair sees neither the Government nor the Opposition, but sees all hon. members as equal. I would like to see the Government having respect for the office of Speaker that when the Speaker gives his ruling he is never told "the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh". I would like to see a Speaker that has not got to look over his shoulder to find out whether he has a job or not. The longer I sit in this House, I do not know for how long it will be, the more I regret very much that our Parliament is not being bespoiled by the so-called mob outside; it is we ourselves who use it as a playground and a plaything and that is the tragedy of it.

5.15 p.m.

I will refute most strongly any speech from the Leader of the House which says members of the Opposition have not cooperated with the Government on many occasions to do the business of this House. Indeed on the last motion for the adjournment — you are talking about the youth of Parliament — the Opposition allowed various measures to go through that day without having been given any adequate notice; but you know what is going to happen? Members will use the position of personal statements which cannot be debated at the very moment, hand it out to the information media, to give the public the impression that the Opposition has no respect for Parliament.

I challenge the Government to show that any of them on the other side have any more respect for Parliament than anybody out here, no matter how long they have been in here; and I believe the hon. member for Christ Church East, the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for St. Michael West have been the longest members to have been in this Parliament from time to time, and I do not for one minute

believe, outside of partisan, political lines that they say they have drawn, that they have shown any greater respect for Parliament than any of the members of the Opposition out here.

I have seen challenges to the Chair made by the hon. Member for St. John, the hon. member for St. Andrew, the hon. member for St. Michael West when they feel they have a point that is right, and standing up sometimes and not sitting down. That is not a lack of respect, but we are going to hear now when we are debating Parliament, that the Opposition has no respect for Parliament, on partisan political lines.

It hurts me very much that I have to get up and speak in this manner in this debate but I think that the time has come when somebody has got to put the record straight.

Today, in my view, we have seen Parliament being misused on several occasions for the day. We accept rulings, Sir. I have always gracefully accepted the ruling from the Chair, I have been quick to withdraw any remark, and that has been very seldom that Your Honour or His Honour the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker have found me unparliamentary, but I refuse to sit down on this side of the House and hear statements being made that I, a member of the Opposition have no respect for Parliament, and this is being put out over the airwaves. I challenge the Leader of the House to repeat it outside where he does not have privilege. I challenge him to repeat it outside. That is the sort of thing that we are having and I now am asked for a vote; to sit down carefully and vote for His Honour the Speaker on the great pretence that this Parliament really has any respect for itself. That is what I am asked to come and sit down and keep quiet about.

Well I regret very much that when the seat of His ex Honour the Speaker became vacant the Government was not aware of the provisions of the Constitution, and have dealt expeditiously with filling the seat in Parliament as they knew what would have been the outcome. That is showing respect for Parliament. This hypocrisy in Barbados must stop at some time or the other.

I have stood quiet in here but I challenge any hon. member to get outside of Parliament and say they have any greater respect for Parliament than any member for the Opposition has. Now what are we all in here trying to do? We do not always agree with the Government on points of view but that does not mean that we are any less constitutionalists than the Government are or that we have any less respect

for Parliamentary procedures than the Government, or that we are breaking the laws of the land.

There are times that we feel we have better ideas than the Government. Sometimes the Government will take them, sometimes they do not, but they have gone through a Parliamentary election and they have won the elections, and we have got to concede that within the Rules of the game they are entitled to have the final decision, but the Government must learn to appreciate that the Opposition are not pariahs, they are not lepers, they are not people begging for a living.

Mr. FORDE: But let me make it quite clear, Sir....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had completed his speech.

Mr. FORDE: No, I had not, Sir. If I had completed my speech, — the hon. member stood up, and in accordance with the Rules of Parliament I sat down. The hon. member for St. John stood up.
5.25 p.m.

I wanted to say, Sir, that it is incorrect and untrue to give the public the idea that the Opposition in this Parliament has been an unco-operative Opposition. If you look through the records you will see on many occasions where the Hon. Leader of the House has congratulated members of the Opposition for taking time off to co-operate with Government in getting through the business of the House. Let us go through and see that. If you look through the debates in the last five years of Parliament you will see on numerous occasions the Hon. Leader has congratulated individual members of the House for the contributions they have made to the debate. (*Aside.*) I do not know that, on numerous occasions we have formed a quorum to keep the Government going, we have on numerous occasions drawn this to their attention. I can only recall myself on two occasions when the Opposition did not form a quorum with the Government because the Government had called a hard line on the Opposition and refused to stay in to discuss Private Members' Business. That is what I understood that happened, but I have also seen the Government not remain to do Private Members' Business on many occasions in the four years I have been in this Parliament, so when we are discussing Parliament let us understand where the rules are being called. Because you are the Government of the day does not give you any greater sense than

anybody else about parliamentary decorum, parliamentary rules, parliamentary order or anything, and it is possible for you to abuse the rules as well.

I am hoping that His Honour the Speaker who has just been elected for the balance of this Parliament which threatens apparently to be a very personal period.... (*Asides.*) The Prime Minister *sotto voce* asked me if I am threatening him. I do not have to threaten the Prime Minister, I have neither fear nor anyth. else for him, nothing! Get that straight. Fear or favour is out, so I do not have to threaten. I think this must be clearly understood. I do not want to have any personal row with anybody, if the Prime Minister does something good and I feel it is good I will say so, so he does not have to come to tell me about fear or favour. I do not like violence but if violence is threatened to me I will return it. Get that straight.

I am emotional about this debate, I am very emotional about this debate, because I care for our parliamentary institution and I cared for it from the time that I understood what Parliament was about. I believe that each one of us has a sacred trust to future generations of Barbadians to set a very high standard. I know that it is difficult always to do it. I have seen debates in here when I was a student that sometimes were narrowly drawn and I have seen members leave and go outside and be the friendliest of persons, and I sometimes wonder why we could not continue in that way, but sometimes we are allowing personal animosities to cut across the necessity to use Parliament properly. I would like to see a proper order of business, discussions with the Opposition on what they are going to do, what they are going to take objections to, what are non-contentious, that sort of standard set between us. We have not been able to achieve that very often during this four years. I would respectfully like to ask hon. members for the balance of the life of the Parliament to see whether instead of finding ourselves in the position of having to excuse ourselves by criticisms of the officers of the House, like the Clerk, that we begin by regulating and taking our business in a much more business-like fashion.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am surprised that the hon. member for Christ Church West seems to be in a very emotional mood on this resolution to vote money for the Deputy Speaker who acted as Speaker. The hon. member must be aware of the business of the House and the cut and thrust that goes on in here. The hon. member has said that

we have crossed with Speakers and Chairmen and so forth. Yes, we are not sacrosanct. Today there was an example when the Speaker was allowing by his softness a member to ride past the rules and if it were not drawn to his attention you could see what would have happened, that your side would have abused the privilege and talk the whole thing up. The hon. member must understand that if you use a strategy to win a debate and on our side we use the opposite position, do not cry out if you lose. This is a hard game you are playing, this is no Sunday School affair. I have not come in here to make love to anybody, and even in love you have to get some hard knocks sometimes. They say everything is fair in love and war and sometimes there is warfare in here.

The hon. member said they help to make up a quorum but the hon. member has forgotten that I have seen the members of the Opposition ducking out there, peeping behind and waiting to see if there is a quorum and if they hear the bell ring then they slip in. They do not play it easy when they feel that they have the side to play and therefore we have to play our business tight also. Why should they form a quorum if we cannot make up a quorum? I do not play it like how the Government plays it, I would tell them they are right. If the Government cannot make up a quorum and you find yourself outside making up a quorum, duck out, unless you want something done. That is your business to play it hard, but do not get the idea that when we play it tight too you are crying out "why are you playing it so tight?" This will teach you a lesson, never again you play you are talking out people on the basis that you are going to talk out a motion and you are not sure where you stand. If you want to talk out a motion, have the numbers, know what you are doing, plan it first, but do not come in a planned game and when you are beaten in your own game then you are crying out hoping that we will come back here to suit you, and then when we do not come back here to suit you you are telling people we did not come back to do the people's business. We were not coming back here to suit you, do you hear now? Do you hear what I tell you from here? Do you think I am telling you from under my arm? We were not coming back here until today, this is the day we were coming back. You understand this is a tough game you are playing? You cannot expect that if you are not running a Government that you are going to run how an adjournment is going to be worked out. Mrs. Thatcher in England cannot determine an adjournment, the Government must.

By the very fact that you are the Government you must make the decisions. This has nothing to do with the respect of Parliament, absolutely nothing. The question that I do not come in to debate a motion you want to discuss does not arise, you have some bogus parish pump motion to discuss and I must come in here and sit down to wait on you? No, my son. I did not come in here on any wheelbarrow, you did not help me, you told the people not to send me, so I am not here by your good wishes, I am here to fight you. We are here as enemies, not as friends. 5.35 p.m.

We are here as enemies, and not as friends. I never promised anybody, that I was going to be his friend when I came here. You were my enemy when you were opposing me outside, and you are my enemy now. The only mistake that the Government made was to put you on Committees and Boards. I would not put you on any. You are in the Opposition and there you shall be forever. That is your place. Do you think that anyone of you could get a CPA seat from me? You would see the plane going but you would never sit down in one of them.

I play politics the hard way. Politics is a tough business. Politics is not a Sunday School game. Do not expect that after fighting me in an election, that after the election I am going to put my hands around you like if I am some sweetheart. We are no sweethearts in here. We are bitter opponents, and we will fight you down to the last straw.

Do not expect me to come here and pass your resolutions. If I vote for a Resolution it will have to be at my own behest, and not at yours. You are only sitting down to pass mine because I am in power. (*Asides*). You only get power because the people give it to you. If we do not hold it, you will get it. We do not want to loose it.

That is where the hon. member has made the mistake, if something has backfired on you and your group. Some of you thought that bringing people in here to play dominoes, and sell salt fish and play dice that you were riding on a very popular wave.

Mr. ADAMS: Do I understand the hon. member to say that some of us brought people in here to play dominoes?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I understood him to say was that no hon. member has brought any person in here to play dominoes.

Mr. ADAMS: All right, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member spoke about Parliament being brought into disrepute because there was not a quorum in the House. The hon. member is a lawyer. You know that they say that I give these lawyers a hard time. I understand that the hon. member was not in it. If he repudiates it — and from his speech he must be repudiating it — because hon. members who are in Parliament should not give licence to any person to come in here, jumping into the Speaker's Chair and jumping into other members' chairs. How could any hon. member associate himself with that sort of behaviour and conduct?

Now it begins to backfire on you. When you take people and use them in this fashion, you find people who respect institutions like Parliament to which they have sent you with your parliamentary equals saying that you are bringing the whole of Parliament into disrepute.

The hon. member is not going to the Chief Justice's Chamber or any of the Courts and because the judges do not appear, allow people who have appeared in Court to jump on the judges benches and pretend that they are going to carry on the Court. The ridiculousness went so far as to suggest that this Chamber is just another open parade ground; that any person can come into this place and behave as he pleases.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation the hon. member must be aware that by situation he is insinuating that somebody — and apparently the words are being addressed to me — that I encouraged persons to come to this Chamber and jump up in the Speaker's Chair. If the hon. member looks at the Minutes of the House he will see that I was not even present in Parliament; so I do not want the hon. member to get up making a statement about this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has not accused the hon. member for Christ Church West.

Mr. WALCOTT: Precisely. That is what I said at the beginning; but he became so emotional that he accused us on this side of disrespect for Parliament although he was not in Parliament himself and his colleagues were in here when the most rumbunctious and disorderly behaviour that has ever taken place in 300 years of Parliament took place in this House of Assembly. His colleagues were here. When he made his speech today I heard one of his followers telling him *sotto voce* violence for violence. Some people believe that marching is violence. Some people only have mouth; but

when the time really comes they do not have these measures to enter into. What battles have they ever fought?

I think that the hon. member should be telling his colleagues that they should have disassociated themselves and they should have made a public statement denouncing that kind of conduct; but they added to it by going on a street parade to try to amplify it, and saying that it is not the first time that you have seen a crowd in an outburst against you because on the constitutional question did you not see that crowds were against you?

Some of you will talk about crowds. If you get 100 people, some with bread carts and some selling sweepstake tickets you call it a crowd; but you get people pretending in one breath to be respectable people, and yet you read debates in here showing the derogatory remarks that they have made about the same people that they want to encourage in this kind of conduct.

They feel that anything they can do like that as long as it is against the Government, they can have an unholy alliance. It does not matter whom the alliance is with. I feel that you are getting a reaction, not from the Government, but from the people. The people of Barbados are telling you that you should be ashamed of yourselves. If you want to be respectable leaders of a nation, who is going to entrust you with the responsibility of Government when you do not even know how to conduct the affairs of the place to which they will send you?

What have they done it for? It was not in the thrust of any debate, not in any anger; but you have this unprovoked hooliganism being exercised in the highest seat of Parliament on the basis that the Opposition used tactics in a debate. They have lost and they did not have the courage or the guts to realise that in a debate you can lose, that your tactics can fail; but it does not mean that you have to resort to this disreputable behaviour.

All of those who took part in this disgraceful behaviour will regret it sooner or later, and it will be sooner rather than later.

Mr. FORDE: The hon. member has used the words "disreputable conduct" and I respectfully submit that in reference to members on this side that is unparliamentary, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I said that all those who took part, because any member of this Parliament who is going to stand in

Parliament and see his chamber being over-run, not by members of Parliament, but by strangers and who did nothing to uphold the dignity of the Chamber, not only encouraged but acquiesced.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have only heard a little bit of the speech of the hon. member. This is a point of personal explanation. I will not take issue with him on that. I would not even take issue with him on the use of the words "disreputable" and "tactics". There is nobody who can condemn sin more vigorously and with such force as a reformed sinner.
5.45 p.m.

Every word of the hon. member, who has just sat down, would make you believe that never in his life has he associated with Mr. Eric Sealy when it was not to his political advantage so to do; that he never used Ulric Foster, a man who threw dynamite at our platform at a political meeting, as one of his canvassers, well knowing the sort of man Ulric Foster was. This is Parliament, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In what way?

Mr. ADAMS: We are talking about a Mr. Eric Sealy who came into Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Up to now I have not heard that.

Mr. ADAMS: Very well, Sir. We are hearing now from the reformed sinners all the old conservative platitudes. He is not in a position, but I dare say if he was in a position he would say it. He is not in a position to look at us and say "Now you let these Niggers get into Parliament that is all you can expect of them." That is exactly what they used to say. A former President of the Senate said that he was retiring from Parliament because he did not want to sit down next to a lot of sweaty Negroes, and he is the darling of that Party over there for many years. That is exactly what the sentiments of the hon. member, who has just sat down, amount to. We are a lot of idiots on this side with no respect; we have just come in here to mix with decent people like him who have been in here all of these years!

Why did he not condemn Mr. Cameron Tudor when he snatched up the Mace; when Parliament had seen some really indecorous things in here; when the Prime Minister told Mr. St. John he did not know who his father was; that he was born in a gutter in a Plantation in St. John?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, honestly, I live and I hear new things every day. I do not know which Mr. St. John he is talking about, but I have never told anybody in my life that he did not know who his father was. You can ask Mr. St. John personally, but I have never had any such conversation with anybody in my life.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. If I remember well, you can look for the debate on the Amendment to the Representation of the People Act, 1971, when the Prime Minister spoke. I believe it was a Monday morning. We were debating the Amendment to the Representation of the People Act and the cutting up of the St. Philip boundary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think you had better tell hon. members they had better leave this who-is-whose father out of this debate. A lot of us will know our father when we get big.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, sometimes a deliberate provocation is a useful thing to do because it causes a man to show himself in his own nasty colours — his own stinking, disreputable colours. Those whom the cap fits, let them wear it. The Prime Minister, I believe, remembers a little bit of the incident. I am not provoking him, but he is correct in saying that the particular incident to which I refer was not in the debate because in those days we had a Clerk, who, whatever his faults were, this is Mr. Cumberbatch, had a certain sense of dignity and he deleted the Prime Minister's remarks and also Mr. St. John's answer. You will remember the occasion. Mr. St. John said that he was no abandoned child. His father was taken from him by the visitation of God, and he did not run away and leave him to face the world without a father. Both of those remarks were deleted.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I categorically deny on Mr. St. John's part that Mr. St. John ever made such a statement to me or I to him. I do not understand where this debate is going because if there are two families, who have known each other for 150 years, it is the St. Johns and the O'Neales. (*Asides.*) That is my family, so you do not get into that at all.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, on a point of order, I am going to say that the Prime Minister has not in any way contributed to the low tone of certain events in here today or over the last four weeks, as far as I am concerned. He will not often hear

praise from me, and I should not have mentioned that incident because that came at a time when the former Member for St. Peter, whoever his father was or my father was — at least I was in here and he was not. He would not be able to contribute to that. I refer to the member for St. Michael West.

Sir, it is a perfectly simple situation, this question of the behaviour of Parliament that we are discussing under this vote. A lot of it has, undoubtedly, arisen, I think, because of the very bad standard set by the former Speaker. The former Speaker — I do not want to dwell on him at length. We made a mistake in putting an inexperienced man in the Chair. I said in my speech it was the first time a man had ever been elected straight into Parliament straight into the Chair. It was a mistake. He had faults of character and judgement that had been exposed to all of us. All Leaders make mistakes; they dictate things to their colleagues; their colleagues accept them, and in that case even the Opposition accepted it and a genuine mistake was made.

However, I believe we have fallen into the worst era over the last few weeks, because I believe that standards have gone down in here. Nobody can possibly say that the Government contributed nothing to Eric Sealy's going into the Speaker's Chair. Is that what the Government is trying to make the public believe? Never in the history of the Parliament of Barbados has a majority of the House, large enough to frustrate a quorum, boycotted lawfully constituted meetings of the House. A notice went out for every meeting of the House between December 16 and now. The Chaplain appeared, the Clerks appeared, the Reporters appeared, Mr. Deputy Speaker appeared except for one day when the bad behaviour took place. It would never have taken place if he was here. If the Deputy Speaker had not harkened to the telephone call from the Secretary of the Leader of the House, nobody would have climbed over that rail and got into the Chair. If the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair, Eric Sealy could not have got into it. If the members of the Government had come here and formed a quorum Eric Sealy would not have gone over the barrier. Public temper would not have filled the Gallery. It was a march of protest and not anything we did. A march of protest against hon. members opposite. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. ADAMS: I heard somebody shouting who should be put out, who is worst than Eric Sealy, as far as I am concerned.

5.55 p.m.

The same Standing Orders say you must sit in your seat and be quiet as say, that when you are admitted as a stranger you must not make noise. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Who is worse than Eric Sealy?) You, I do not mean you, Mr. Chairman. You, because you are better educated and know better. You have had more opportunities in life and yet you behave no better than that man, and that man loves the people more than you. (*A VOICE:*) I do not have to defend Eric Sealy because he likes me and I like him. He is no friend of mine. I do not believe he has said a good word for me in his life. He is a friend of hon. members over there. He has never been to my house; he has never been on any social terms with me. I do not believe the Prime Minister can say the same thing. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: But he was hugging up Lionel Craig going up Belmont Road.)

Mr. CRAIG: I am very proud. I am not going to hug up you because you may have a knife in your pocket.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question, "that the Question be now put", was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Question that Head 2 — Parliament, stand part was put.

A division was called for.

The question that Head 2 — Parliament, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C.E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Mr. E. E. GREAVES; His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mrs. G.L. EASTMOND; Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES — 13.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L.S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 5.

Head 9 — Ministry of Finance and Planning (5) Rates and Taxes — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are three items here; Item 3 — Other Personal

Allowances, for the sum of \$72; Item 4 – Travel and Subsistence for the sum of \$5,905, and Item 6 – Utilities for the sum of \$3,518. The notes in each case are quite explicit. There is only one bit of information which I think hon. members may wish to know and that is in relation to this Department. As far as the Tax Relief Board is concerned, I have been asked questions on previous occasions in connection with this matter. The number of cases of old age pensioners was \$4,343; the amount due per tax bills was \$241,471.23, and the amount remitted was \$241,471.23. In the case of hardship cases the number was 1,756. The amount due per tax bills was \$126,755.75, and the amount to be paid is \$49,776.88, and the amount remitted is \$76,978.87. Then there are other cases under Section 19. Section 19 provides for poor relief in cases where the land is valued for one purpose but is being used for another purpose. In this case the number was 18 and the amount due per tax bills was \$1,488,490. The amount to be paid is \$33,768 and the amount remitted is \$1,454,722. That shows that millions of dollars are remitted and there are three means of getting tax relief. This question has been raised in here and I did give an undertaking that I would give the information as far as the Tax Relief Board and its functions are concerned and what relief has been granted over the period.

I beg to move that Head 9 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (5) – Rates and Taxes – stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Head 13 – Cabinet Office (2) Printing Department – was called.

Hon. C.E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 13(2), Item 2, Other Personal Emoluments, the position is that arrangements are now being made for keeping revised editions of the Laws of Barbados up to date, and like that we have to provide extra staff in the Government Printing section on a full time basis because the revision of the Laws of Barbados have to be kept up to date on a day to day basis in order to provide for the regulations under them. This is to provide staff up to the end of this financial year.

I beg to move that Head 13 – Cabinet Office (2) Printing Department, stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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 \$22,328 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

The Resolution for the sum of \$206,500 was called.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975–76 No. 26

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned just now, Sir, there have been meetings between the Ministry of Legal Affairs and the Government Printery and the Cabinet Office in connection with the work required to be done by the Printing Department to maintain the revised edition of the Laws of Barbados in an up-to-date manner.
6.05 p.m.

The Ministry is advised that 1,400 sets of the Revised Laws of Barbados will be required to be serviced by the Printing Department. Bills, and subsequent Acts will continue to be printed throughout the year and this is currently being done, except that as from 1st January, 1976, the Acts will be published in the Official Gazette in a form and style similar to that used in the Revised Edition.

In addition, when the Acts are enacted in a calendar year they should have been examined by the Law Revision Division of the Ministry of Legal Affairs.

Then, Sir, we need about 2,000 square feet of space in order to accommodate this new equipment to be set down, and the object of this supplementary is to secure this amount of money in the sum of \$206,500 for the provision of the additional machinery equipment in order that the work may be carried out efficiently.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, while we are on the question of printing, it is well known that printing as far as the Government is concerned, has been the subject of a great deal of talk recently. We have heard the Prime Minister in

here indicate that in order to get the Official Gazette a good deal of the work is now given to the Advocate and efforts should be made to give it a wider circulation in Barbados.

I therefore welcome this particular aspect in the light of recently reported statements by information to the Press, and I would like to ask the Government to deny a rumour; a rumour that is causing concern in Barbados to the effect that the Government through one of its agencies is considering going into the newspaper business. I am more sure that the remarks by the hon. member for St. Michael South East were meant to be taken seriously, and I am not in agreement with Government buying the Advocate or in any way putting Government money behind the Advocate of this country. I would not want to see the Official Gazette become an organ of news. Let it be an organ of announcements. Let the printing office do this very useful work of keeping the Laws up to date, let the Official Gazette be sold so it makes a little profit for the taxpayers rather than be a drain on the taxpayers; but whether it be the Industrial Development Corporation or the Barbados Development Bank that money can be better spent in creative enterprise giving jobs to the people of Barbados. I could hardly credit the news, Sir, when I first heard the rumours that the Government had blocked the efforts of the Nation Newspaper to buy the Advocate. (*Asides*)
.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. ADAMS: I could hardly credit the news that the Government had itself decided to pursue its own prospects of going into the newspaper business.
6.15 p.m.

There are a lot of things that cause amusement in Barbados, and some of them have a bad taste. I can hardly think of the taste in the mouths of the people of Barbados if Carlton Brathwaite turns out to be a Manager of the Advocate. I can hardly imagine what state the Government would be putting Barbados into if it did us that. I cannot imagine it. If the Government's money in addition to this is also going to be spent on acquiring the Advocate, I could legitimately ask why spend the money in the Printing Office, why not wait and see if the IDC is buying the Advocate and do the Government Business there and then. All of these are legitimate enquiries. You cannot close this question to the Resolution now before the House, they are all

interrelated. That is a question which may not even have occurred to some members on the opposite side. If the Government really is going into the business of acquiring the Advocate it should consider the wisdom of spending money on the Government Printery at this time. That is a serious question which I pose.

I just give a pledge here. I have no idea that this news is true or not but the Barbados Labour Party solemnly pledges that if any organ of Government before the next general election finds itself a shareholder in a newspaper business, that should the Barbados Labour Party be returned to power those shares will be sold to members of the public with the employees of the newspaper having the first option to buy them, and the Government will regard itself as a trustee for those shares until such time as they could be sold. Our Party wants to be in the newspaper business for a newspaper called the Beacon when it is published again. We will not be using Government's money to support the Beacon or anything like that, we do not want to take the people's money to buy a newspaper to put out our views, we would be ashamed to do it. That is not a proper expenditure of the people's money and it would be hypocrisy to bring this Resolution for \$200,000 to expand the Government Printery if really there is a plan afoot to purchase the Advocate.

I would like to be wrong, but we have in the House the Prime Minister who is Minister of Finance and therefore responsible for the funding of the Barbados Development Bank and the Industrial Development Corporation. I want the Prime Minister to get up as other hon. members have tried to get up and I want him to contradict me, to tell me I am wrong, to tell me I am talking foolishness, to tell me I should not be repeating such rumours, to tell me that the Government has no intention of going into the newspaper business, that the IDC is not buying the Advocate, the Barbados Development Bank is not funding it nor is any other arm of Government engaged in negotiations with the Thomson Group or with any individual, nor does the Government have any plans, or any arm of it, to back notes at the bank, to guarantee loans or any such for the purchase of the Advocate. Only then will I feel safe in voting for this Resolution as it stands now. I want the Prime Minister to wipe the floor with me on this. I will sit down and take all the licks in the world because my back will represent the backs of the people of Barbados at an earlier stage. I do not mind taking the licks to take the blows off their backs, let me take it and they not suffer, do not put upon the people — my goodness — you are going to put the Advocate in the hands of that man in the sand coloured shirt over there? That hon.

member who made all those wise remarks, who so many journalists were wrong in saying that he made a highly inappropriate speech at the opening of the Caribbean News Agency? Are you going to put the Advocate in his hands? Do not do us that, please Prime Minister, do not do us that, and this is a plea to you, not in his hands.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked the Prime Minister to wipe the floor of the House with him. The back of the hon. member is like an old wife, very hard. If you get some old boots, like the old football boots we used to have, even if you rub one of the brads on his back the skin will not come off. After the last election with the kind of talk that the hon. member put down I thought that he had really put up that mouth and had a different kind of serious talk when it came to discussion. Today he talked about Yugoslavia and even went to the ridiculous length as if I were looking for a job. I will tell the hon. member this if he does not know, it is people like me who have been able to create a situation in Barbados that people like him could talk with the freedom they have in a society like this. People like the hon. member never made life easy for us, so if he wants to know I do not have to go to Yugoslavia, people like him love to run from their own country. Barbados is mine and will always be mine, I do not have anywhere to go, I will be here for ever.

If you talk about a socialist country and those who are afraid of socialism, I am a socialist and I have absolutely no apology to make. I am not one of these water-washed socialists and afraid of my political identity. If he does not know anything about Yugoslavia he had better not say anything about it. Do not think that all communist countries are the same. I am not a communist in my own political philosophy but I can analyse the cultures and I will only be a fool if I do not see that there has been vast changes in some of the communist countries for the good. I will be a fool if I cannot see that there is a better Cuba since the takeover of Castro than it was with Batista. I will be a fool, only an idiot will say because it is a communist country it is not as good as under Batista, so do not let us think that we are sending out the old time stupidity that you want to go and use people's freedom. I hear this talk about taking over, I heard this talk too when Lord Thomson was taking over.

I am not in the argument now about who is taking over the Press, but you cannot be making any big deal about when Lord Thomson's Group is taking over any paper, Lord Thomson's Group is richer than the Government of Barbados.

6.25 p.m.

You do not talk about democracy when the Thomson Group takes over anything. As I told some members in here, the Thomson Group took over the Daily News and they told all of them that they had to go, and the Advocate could not employ any of them who worked at the Daily News. The only one that the Advocate could employ was one of the owners, Jimmy Cozier, the one who still writes. He was the fortunate one. Some of them who write foolishness now sometimes are still living with the Thomson Group.

All of this talk about democracy and the Thomson Group and the newspapers in the Caribbean — when it comes to the newspapers and the other media, let us be frank. There is no democracy in the media. There is no democracy in the Trinidad Guardian, the Advocate-News or the Gleaner. These people write what they feel like writing, and they print what they feel like printing. If somebody is hounding you down they hound you down also. If they want to put something in the newspaper they put it.

They have made a big song and dance about the Speaker. The Speaker as a politician went bankrupt. There are other people who fell from grace and cleared out but they have not put their pictures in the paper.

There is all this talk going along about freedom of the Press. The hon. member for Christ Church West knows that if you have a little half cent divorce case they will send around a hungry reporter to try to get information.

I do not think that the hon. member should talk about democracy in newspapers. Those of us who lived here long enough know that we have had to fight like hell against newspapers in this country. It is not that I am pressing the Government to buy a newspaper, because a newspaper means spending a lot of money. Running a newspaper is a very expensive affair. The Labour Party in the U.K. used to run a newspaper, the Daily Herald; but you have to examine a media in the context of your own situation. You examine it in relation to what you are dealing with in Barbados.

The hon. member will throw barbs at the Minister of Information. He cannot throw them at me. I am from here. You cannot tell me to go back anywhere. I will have to tell you to send back yours first before you can tell me anything. I do not have anywhere to go. I do not go to Yugoslavia even if there are Socialists or Communists up there. Let me deal with the Socialist and the Communists here. When I begin

to talk I am talking on my home ground, on my territory.

I do not think that the hon. member could accuse a Government seriously in these parts for looking at the media in a comprehensive light when it is their policy. If a Government can see that running a newspaper or taking over a newspaper is a viable economic proposition you cannot say that it is something undemocratic when Lord Thomson is running newspapers.

Can you really believe that you can deal with some of these multi-nationals? Have you heard, have you read what is happening to the Gulf Oil Company? It is unfortunate that the hon. member likes to name people. He spoke about a Mr. Brathwaite. Sometime ago he was talking about Mr. Sealy. He was saying that Mr. Sealy is his friend. I would know that he will never have Mr. Sealy home at him. I know that he is using him. People always like to use people like that, and when they are finished with them they leave them like an old shoe. It is only people like Mr. Sealy who has not lived long enough to realise that. When one person is trying to use another one you do not know who will out-use the other one first. When you have two guys and one tries to out smart the other, I do not enter into that kind of business.

I do not think you should make a personal attack on people because in small communities you know people by name. Russia has a newspaper. Let us stop this foolishness about Russia. Whether you like Russia or not, you have to make up your mind that you will have to live with Russia in the world. That is a fact of life. You will have to live with China. Do not feel that you are going to live without 800 million people, that 249,000 people can pretend that those 800 million people can go their own way.

You talk about industrial development. To sell to whom? When you develop Barbados, what can you sell to Barbados? Sweet bread, biscuits and mauby? As soon as you make a couple of shirts you are finished with Barbados. You have to live with reality. So you are not going to sell to communist countries? If Czechoslovakia can buy, if Yugoslavia can buy, it is time that we make up our minds. As I have been telling the Prime Minister for years Japan has a different concept about trade and economics from the British and it is time that people should learn to understand that they have something to teach us and we should find out what we can learn from them and do not get the idea that the only people we can learn from are the British and the Americans

who do not have the same attitude towards us in a general context as some of the others.

There is no point looking at different economic systems and saying that they are communist systems. The ones we have to be afraid of are like the one they had in Spain under Franco and you will see what trouble he has left. Those are the ones that you have to be shy of – like the one you had in Portugal, and you can see the trouble they have left in Angola and Mozambique.

Mr. Chairman, I do not work up myself on this one party state issue that people talk about. For practical purposes I believe that people should have a right to say what they want to say; but the public has nearly liquidated the Opposition. The gentleman who spoke about a one party state is leaving Parliament, so you cannot say that he put it up as a platform; but the Opposition is nearly liquidated already and it would look better for them to join something if they are to survive because they cannot find a platform and they cannot find a policy. They have to wait for something that the Government has done wrong to get a kick off. Unless you kick the ball outside they cannot get a throw. I will give you an example. They were talking all the time that they wanted an election. Today I do not know if it was a no ball, but they got elections right in their laps. I bet you now that when the bell rings they will get lapped like some people whom you believe have won a race, but you do not know that they got lapped.
6.35 p.m.

There was a fellow who went up to the Race Course – I do not go up there. A fellow went to the Race Course at a place in St. Philip called Bushy Park to take part in a race. A lot of people thought that the man had won the race, but they were told that he had been lapped by the field already. The people did not realise that he was behind the others. I do not want to cause any division in the Party, but leadership is a quality that you either have it or you do not have it and, therefore, political leadership is a special quality that you must possess and it is lacking over the other side. That is one of your problems. (*Asides.*) Somebody told me *sotto voce* that you do not inherit it. You can inherit property, but not political sagacity.

The Question that the Resolution in the sum of \$206,500 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the

passing of two Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, each seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the two Money Resolutions were read a first and second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the two Money Resolutions for the sums of \$22,328 and \$206,500 be now agreed to.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Mr. E. E. GREAVES; His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Mr. R. StC. WEEKES, and Hon. F. G. SMITH – 14.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. GRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN – 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's Sitting. It is now for the Opposition to proceed with Private Members' Business in accordance with the undertaking given earlier on, if they so desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business is the instant Order of the Day.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE THE DECLARATION OF ASSETS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1, according to the Order Paper the 2nd December, 1975, Mr. F. L. Walcott spoke; Mr. J. B. Springer spoke. On the motion of Hon. C. E. Talma, seconded by Hon. P. G. Morgan, further consideration of the Resolution was then postponed. If no other member wishes to speak, Sir, I will wind up now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a motion that this matter be sent to a Select Committee. There are several Reports from several Parliaments within the Commonwealth and outside of the Commonwealth. There are some which appear in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Journal, some of which I have been collecting. I myself will be willing to serve on the Committee. I have discussed the matter with my colleagues, and I, therefore, beg to move that it be sent to a Select Committee.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is not really as simple as that. As I understand it, you will have to pass the Resolution first and then set up a Select Committee to deal with it. I have never heard of a Resolution being sent to a Select Committee in the middle of a debate. I suppose that is true, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It can be sent before it is even debated.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: A Select Committee may be appointed by the House to consider or inquire into and take evidence in some matters and report their opinion or observations thereon for the information of the House. We would ask that the Resolution be passed, and then appoint a Select Committee to consider how to give it effect.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken on the matter because I do not think that we can really investigate the pros and cons of a Resolution of this nature, which can be very emotional and votecatching. I do not suggest that it should go to one of these Committees which sit interminably and do not report to the House. I am seriously suggesting that it should go to a Select Committee comprising members of both sides, and not necessarily the legal people, or exclusively insisting on legal people, legally trained people, or people who have been exposed to legal education. The Select Committee could report back to the House and then the discussion on the Resolution could continue. I have not spoken yet; I have made a motion. At this stage, Sir, I am reserving the right to speak on the Resolution when the matter comes back before the House.

There are certain aspects and Reports and so on which I think we can discuss across a table in a Committee room on the experiences of other Parliaments in this matter. For instance, there is the Commonwealth Parliamentary Journal which

we could not very well pass backwards and forwards in this Chamber, and that is my reason for suggesting that. I have given the matter very careful consideration. I should like to state, Sir, that we on this side of the House are not opposed to the idea. We are concerned that the mechanics of how this thing is going to work should not be sidetracked or overtaken.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry to strike a jarring note in respect to such sweet reason, Sir. It is not often that you see the Prime Minister in a mood of sweet reason — in a mood where he stands above, perhaps, the pettiness of some other members of his Party. I do not think of anybody like the hon. member for St. Michael South Central or anybody like that.

6.45 p.m.

As I say, I hate to strike a jarring note, but it does seem to me with the best respect in the world for the views of the Prime Minister, carefully considered views after three years that this concept has been knocking around, that with an election coming up, the words which he uttered in commending the idea to a Select Committee of the House that this issue can raise a lot of emotion and so on, sending it to a Select Committee is to sidetrack this Resolution so that nobody would be pinned down at election time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would just give way, I want to expose the fallacy of his statement. If you read the Resolution carefully, it requests the Government to introduce legislation. Now we can sit down here today and vote "aye" in favour of this Resolution, and we can go with the best of intentions to the Crown Law Officers and tell them to draft legislation, and with the work-load that they have it could take two years to draft legislation if they give it ordinary priority, but if they do it special priority it might take one year, whereas I was suggesting that if we are the custodians of our own conduct and so on, we could go into Select Committee with the plethora or legal talent that we have here and look at all the comparative legislation, and we could probably produce our own draft Bill, and then the Crown Law Officers would have no excuse for non-production of a Bill; but if he wants it that way, he is passing a Resolution which asks the Government to do something. If the Government did not want to do anything about it we would not have to send it to Select Committee at all. We would say pass the legislation and leave it to us and that is the last you would hear about it, because all I would

have to do then would be to give it to the Attorney General, he would pass it on to the Crown Law Officers with instructions to draft as soon as possible — A.S.A.P. — and that means 1979 by the normal process in the Civil Service.

It took me seven years to get the Central Bank legislation on the Statute Book; so if you want it that way and you question my *bona fides* about the Select Committee, let us vote for it here and leave it to them to do what we should be doing for ourselves. It is O.K. with me, so whichever way you want to go I am going; go there or go there, it is all right with me.

Mr. ADAMS: Sweet reason prevails upon this occasion, Sir. I am glad for the admission that the Attorney General is not able even with the letters "A.S.A.P." to get work out of the Crown Law Officers in less than two years. I hear what is said, and based upon the experience of all of us in here, I don't think it can be gainsaid; but I would ask that the Clerk be instructed or one of the Clerks be given a special assignment by you, Mr. Speaker, to collect together the legislation, Jamaica, Zambia, and so on and have it available for an early meeting, the first meeting of the Select Committee so that we can get to work. I intend to serve on the Select Committee myself if selected by the House, and I would just say this: many years have passed since the Prime Minister and I last sat on a Select Committee together and just for the benefit of hon. members of the House, I would say I do not know if it was the Prime Minister's presence that caused all the officers to have respect for the urgency of the Select Committee, but that Select Committee worked extremely well and quickly without all the keep backs and the delays. People did not behave as lawyers in there, they got on with what they had to do. If it takes the Prime Minister's presence on a Committee to get other people to work properly then let us have a Committee constituted as he has suggested, and perhaps not with the plethora of legal talent to which he is referring, because sometimes lawyers get bogged down with full stops and commas and the wordings and so on. We are prepared to support this under those conditions.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I thought we were debating this matter, and I thought a Minister had said they could go no further on the matter because Cabinet has not taken a decision. I believe this is a matter which we dealt with before.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has just been moved by the Hon. Prime Minister asking that this matter be sent to Select Committee. The hon. member probably did not hear, and it was seconded.

The Question "that the Resolution be sent to Select Committee" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, a Committee should be appointed to consider this Resolution with power to take evidence and so on. Anyhow I do not want to be too legalistic. (Noise) Everybody is falling out of the chairs, and we are trying to get on with the business of how many people are to be on this Committee. I am only going to suggest that it should be three people from each side of the House and Your Honour in the Chair. (A VOICE: Five and three.) What sort of Committee is that? The Income Tax Committee was two and two and one. Sir, I would appeal not to have too big a Select Committee. The Committee to which I referred which is the Committee on Income Tax which really was a major Bill had five people and everybody used to attend. The Deputy Speaker and two from each side of the House; a more important Bill really if you do not mind my saying so. That was a really major piece of legislation. (A VOICE: It should be five people in order to get a quorum.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Leader of the Opposition nominate Members for the Committee?

Mr. ADAMS: To how many, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: You name your side.

Mr. ADAMS: I name the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. member for St. James and the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned, we wish to appoint the hon. member for St. John, the hon. member for St. Michael North West, the hon. member for St. Michael West, the hon. member for St. Michael South, and myself, with Your Honour as Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. members so named form the Select Committee on this Resolution.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF BRIDGE-TOWN-KINGSTOWN (INCORPORATION)
BILL, 1975

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Item No. 2 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, when Order No. 2 came up on the last occasion you will recall that I had moved that it be referred to a Select Committee as it is Private Members' Business, and at that stage a motion was moved to postpone debate; but I had wound up the debate on the matter. I believe at that stage the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central wanted to consider what is Government's approach on matters of this nature. I can assure him I have done a bit of research on the Law Revision Act, and the Law Revision Commissioner has the discretion to exclude from the revised Laws private Acts such as this, although they are printed in the laws during the year in which they are passed by Parliament, and there should be no serious objection any further to this Bill being referred to a Select Committee.

I therefore beg to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for St. Joseph brought in a similar Bill to incorporate a religious organisation, it was pointed out that when the Law Revision was undertaken, a decision had been made of which hon. members of the house who had been on the Advisory Committee were aware, that we should not encourage inflating the printing of the laws by incorporation of these organisations by statute, but should encourage them to be registered under the Companies Act, 1910, or as amended from time to time. I do not know what special sanctity or authority these religious organisations feel they are invested with by getting on the Statute Book of Barbados. It is an expensive procedure as far as the Government is concerned.

6.55 p.m.

It is an expensive procedure as far as the Government is concerned.

The point which the hon. member for Christ Church West just made is a very valuable one. After the first year they do not have to be included in these new volumes of the Laws but only in the annual volume for, let us say, the year 1976. But we are going to do this for the Roman Catholic Church.

Then I would have to ask the hon. member for St. Joseph to bring back in his Bill because it would not be fair to discriminate against a small non-conformist organisation which had a prior bill in here; and then we have the A.M.E. Church

which is one of the oldest organisations and whose Bishop for the area is the High Commissioner for Barbados from Guyana and was former Ambassador to the United States, Bishop Talbot who has been making representations for a very long time, and I think that perhaps if we could appoint a small Committee to look into this and the other similar applications comprising the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. member for St. Joseph or the hon. member for St. Philip South; the Methodist Lay Cardinal – I do not know what part of St. Michael he is supposed to come from – South Central – the Minister of Education to perhaps look at all of them, and what I think we could do is to bring all of them together. I do not know whether they would accept one omnibus enabling Bill. Maybe we could do it that way, and I would not like to use the expression 'get rid of them' in this way but I would say dispose of the applications that we have had.

We would not like them to feel that we discount them in any way, but it is a practical and economic problem. For instance, Sir, if we have a very pressing problem – which one of the officers of the House, the marshal, can tell you about – but there are certain other little organisations up Roebuck Street and up Bay Street of which we are well aware, which perform yeomen service in Forestry and other departments, and which also want to be incorporated. Maybe we can do something for them as well, but I think that if we set up this Committee to go into this matter and we postpone consideration of this Bill, we can have a special Committee as we did in the last Resolution, comprised in the way I have said.

So I nominate those members; and we will supply them all the background information that we have from the law Revision Officers, and all the applications which we know are outstanding not only from the religious bodies but from the fraternal organisations.

Mr. FORDE: I am quite willing to accept the suggestion, Sir, but I would just draw the hon. member's attention in this particular case that this Bill is really repealing an existing Bill under which they were incorporated, but I am quite willing to accept that because I am glad the hon. member mentioned the A.M.E. Church, and I know that that church is very desirous of getting some treatment by this Honourable House. I am willing to accept the suggestion.

The Question "that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee and that those members form the Committee as suggested by the hon. member for St. John" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUGAR WORKERS (PROVIDENT FUND) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1975

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, at the moment I am unable to find all the relevant copies of the Acts, as I understand that relate to this Act. The House passed at the end of 1974 certain legislation which deprived sugar workers of the right to get provident fund monies if they were born after a certain date. As from that date, whether or not they have contributed to the Provident Fund they can only draw national insurance monies. That is the purpose of this Act but neither the hon. member for St. James in whose name it stands nor ourselves, can find copies of the legislation.

They are in the Laws of Barbados because the printed edition that we have here has the state of affairs to which we wish to refer the House; but since the printed edition there is an amendment which none of us can put our hands on, and therefore I would ask the House to have further consideration postponed, because we have not got the Act which we wish to repeal.

I move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the Ministers concerned know that that is the purpose of the Bill.

The Question "that further consideration of Item No. 3 be postponed" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

DEFAMATION BILL 1975

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Order No. 4 is before a Select Committee for three more weeks.

RESOLUTION RE INTRODUCTION OF SAFETY EQUIPMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as regards Order No. 5, I believe that that time has expired, with great respect. *(Pause)*

The Resolution was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

RESOLUTION RE INTRODUCTION OF NON- FAULT INSURANCE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we are not pursuing No. 6 at this stage, but Order No. 7 really embraces the thinking of the hon. Members

on this side in respect of what amendments would be appropriate at this stage in respect to motor vehicle insurance.

THE BILL TO AMEND THE MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE ACT

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill would be to amend the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act, Chapter 292 of the existing laws. That Act was passed in 1952 and it was amended in 1971. The 1971 amendment made it compulsory to ensure property damaged by motor vehicles on the road up to the extent of \$10,000; but it kept in being in the position where other public service vehicles, that is, vehicles in which persons are carried for hire or for reward. Other than in respect to such vehicles it is not necessary to insure compulsorily for passengers being carried in vehicles.

7.05 p.m.

My experience in 16 years in this country has shown that perhaps as much as 30% of the accidents which occur affect passengers in motor vehicles. In some cases the passengers are well covered by insurance because persons have voluntarily insured them, in other cases another vehicle is involved and is at fault and the passenger is able to claim against the other vehicle, but there are some cases in which the passenger is damaged — in one or two cases that I have known, seriously damaged — and because there is no compulsory insurance covering the vehicle the passenger, even if he or she recovered damages, finds himself in great difficulty in collecting the damages.

Without trying to discuss in this House a matter which is *sub judice*, it is my experience of one girl who was a passenger in a vehicle and who suffered very serious injuries indeed. She found herself recovering judgement and not being able to enforce that judgement. She had a degree of mental retardation as a result of the accident and the damages which were awarded to her have been quite substantial. After this the insurance company has taken one or two legal points, one of which says that of course there was no obligation for her to be covered by compulsory insurance so she cannot get the benefit under the Act, and secondly they have argued that in any event it was a soft top rather than a hard top vehicle, so there was a misrepresentation in the policy. That is one instance.

I am aware of another sad case where the son of a lady, the only bread winner for this old lady, was damaged in a vehicle and judgement obtained by consent against the driver of the

vehicle. He ran off the road, overturned and the man was killed, and the insurance company has taken the attitude that under the law the person representing the estate has no direct action against them because they are not a party to the suit, and there has had to be a long legal rigmarole to get around this. She cannot even afford the expense of doing this and it is being done for her on a free basis, but her position is almost a very unsatisfactory one as the law stands. It seems that in consonant with developments all over the world where vehicular traffic has now become an accepted pattern, and looking at the statistics in Barbados, there is no doubt that people here to a large extent own a vehicle as a necessity rather than a luxury, and it seems that we have a responsibility to ensure that persons who are damaged whilst they are innocently in a vehicle, regardless of whether they are paying to be in that vehicle or not, should have some proper insurance cover, and the major proposal of this Bill is to seek to remove the provision of the Act which does not make it compulsory for voluntary passengers to be covered for damage who suffer whilst travelling in vehicles.

Assuming that the Hon. House accepts the suggestion contained in this Bill, the other proposal will be that where such persons recover judgement that they have a direct right against the insurance as other persons who are at present covered by a compulsory insurance for that direct right. That is what really the later sections of this Bill, and section 5 in particular seeks to make sure that they can bring their case against the person covered.

There is another bother that we have had dealing with insurance companies. A lot of name policies started off to be on the Statute Book. I am told by people in the insurance company that there is no extra premium regardless of whether you have a named or unnamed policy, but there are one or two companies who do not explain to people that there is not necessarily an extra premium involved but ask them in the proposal form to state who is going to drive and they say A and B, and that person unwittingly finds himself with an insurance policy with only a named driver. Then of course, unwittingly again, they may have their brother or sister, even in an emergency, driving the vehicle and an accident occurs and the insurance company says no responsibility.

Recently we had a very sad case in the court in which a businessman that I know had a very serious injury which has permanently disabled him to some extent as far as his knee is

concerned, and he is confronted all of a sudden with this named policy clause. In my view there is no reason why named policies should be permitted to exist in Barbados. If a person has qualified for a driving licence he should be permitted to drive a motor car, and if I choose to allow him to drive my motor car there should be some obligation on an insurance company in those circumstances to honour the risk, and I really cannot see why we should perpetuate the provision in the Act which allows insurance companies to get out of liability on the basis of named policies, and that is why you see, Mr. Speaker, in section 6 of the Bill I am suggesting that the principal Act be amended so that before the word "age" we insert the word "name" making it illegal for policies to be based on name policy clauses.

Another problem we have had in this country with insurance companies concerns the failure of insurance companies to give information to persons who have been damaged. Mr. Speaker, under the existing legislation if a person is damaged and wants to sue the person who has damaged him he must give the insurance company notice, because if he does not give the insurance company notice within seven days of the commencement writ he will find himself not being able to rely on the existing legislation, and yet there are some insurance companies — I do not want to call their names — who have taken the attitude that they do not have to give this information at all, and when you write to the man whom you are supposed to be suing he sometimes says he has lost his policy or has not got it, and I suggest that all the simple amendment which section 8 of this Bill will introduce would be beneficial to the public at large and would create no undue hardship in the insurance companies in this island.

The final part of the Bill that I have sought to bring in is section 3. I think I ought to say a word on this for hon. members. At present if I am employed by a firm and part of my duty is to drive their vehicle, and I drive their vehicle on the road, assuming in all good faith that they have paid the insurance and that it is properly licensed and insured, and I get into an accident in which I am not at fault and it turns out that the employer had not paid the insurance premium I would not have been covered by insurance but the police can under section 3 of the Act legally prosecute me for driving without being covered by Third Party insurance. In those circumstances I am liable to a fine of something like \$2,500 as well as to be disqualified from driving for a year compulsorily unless I can show special reasons.

7.15 p.m.

So that innocent workers in this context have found themselves before the Court not properly covered by insurance and assuming that they have been, and being liable to conviction.

Now the amendment to Section 3, Mr. Speaker, seeks to alter this position and to give such a person a defence provided that he can prove that he was in possession of the vehicle by virtue of his employment only, and that he neither knew nor had reason to believe that there was not in force in relation to the vehicle a policy of insurance such as the Act calls for. That is a very reasonable defence, and it is one that I commend very strongly to this Hon. House. It is humane and based on commonsense and based on proper legislation that one finds in the world at large.

Before sitting down I want finally to say that this Act, even the amendment which I have brought, does not go far enough. As Your Honour will know I have had to cut out one part of the amendments since it may have appeared that it was a charge on the public treasury. I am hoping that if this Bill goes to Select Committee, assuming that the Government agrees that it should go to Select Committee, that the Government will, as has happened in other cases, accept various amendments even if it might mean a charge on the treasury and come into the House with a much improved Bill.

I throw out that suggestion to the Government because no member on this side can move the type of legislation that will make it compulsory to have an Insurance Bureau in Barbados. Even if we update the compulsory legislation by passing this Bill, there will still be a large category of persons who are damaged on the streets of Barbados through no fault of their own for life, sometimes permanently and sometimes not so tragically and who still have no recourse for compensation for themselves. This is because some people despite the existing legislation carry no insurance at all; and that is why I believe that it is necessary that we should have something in the nature of the Motor Insurance Bureau. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot get so far, but I wonder whether the Government is aware of the fact that some of the legislation in various Canadian provinces, including places like Ontario should commend itself readily to this House. There is a forward looking body of legislation which is called the Unsatisfied Judgment Act and that places an obligation on every citizen when they pay their motor vehicles licence to pay an extra few dollars — \$4 or \$5 if you like — into the Treasury which goes into pool that is managed by the Supervisors of

Insurance and certain persons from the Government — not using the word “government” in the political sense, and people in the insurance industry.

It seems to me that road users should have some responsibility for the public at large. I have witnessed many households deprived of their sole bread winner and children left bereft without any provision being made for them for the future. Although charity is given and it is a good thing for us to practise, there are many people who do not like to depend all their life on charity or indeed on the welfare services of the Government; and it seems to me in order that this Bill should be used as an opportunity for bringing in forward looking legislation on this particular point.

I have much pleasure in commending the Bill to the House and I look forward that if the Bill is accepted by the House and goes to a Select Committee, to the Government contributing by improving the legislation. I do not believe that we should delay this legislation by waiting for the Supervisor of Insurance to come up with something on it. There are existing cases that I know of in which people have suffered. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central referred to me for instance, the case of a lady who really had been the victim of this type of case and she is really in difficult circumstances.

Now, some of the Insurance Companies — let us be fair to them — take the attitude that they make *ex gratia* payments; but there are others who practise insurance in the way that the hon. member for St. Michael West would have us practise politics — that it is no Sunday School; that it is a hard line business. I think that a Sunday School is quite a good thing. We learn a lot of things about God and I would like to see more attitudes of the Sunday School coming into the business of politics as well as into the business of insurance; but there are some who practise it in a way which, in my view, is detrimental to the whole public weal.

That is why it is necessary whenever we see business or politics being practised in this way that we have a duty to mollify these ugly aspects of it so that the public at large will have a better system and a better state of welfare. I hope that the House will support me in having this Bill passed.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I must join with my colleague in urging the House to accept the various amendments put forward. I hope that we will have an even more far reaching Bill than the one which is now being proposed.

You can see now, Mr. Speaker, why I have not proceeded with my Resolution calling on the Government for non-fault insurance; but there are certain things which practitioners of the law know can occur to the public at large in connection with insurance and which make each and everyone of us want to see more humane and practicable legislation covering not only persons, but property in this community.

Now, as my friend has said, many insurance companies have resorted quite recently to something that annoys me very much. It is the question of discrimination exercised by practically each and every insurance company in this country, that they are reluctant to ensure any driver under the age of 25. I call this a form of discrimination, because if you are going to look around, particularly in the Caribbean, you will find that 50 per cent of the community is in the age bracket of 18 to 23; and if a person is expected to earn his daily bread and has passed his driving test I do not see why insurance companies should refuse him as a competent driver and calling it a special insurance risk. I would like to see something in the Bill which would make it compulsory for all persons who pass the appropriate driving test to be offered insurance, and any refusal by an insurance company should be dealt with most harshly.

Another point which I would like to comment on is that in cases where persons who are insured find it impossible to get in touch with the correct insurance agent. I say that because within the last two years you will find that most of the insurance companies in Barbados or their agents are now covered by one single principal although there are some five or six agents all carrying the same name of the particular insurers. So if you ring Rates and Taxes and ask what insurance company covers vehicle X they will tell you XS motor insurance or Henry Head & Son or somebody of that nature; but there are five and six agents dealing with that same insurance company.

If you send a letter to that insurance company they will write you back and say that they have checked their records and they have no connection with that particular vehicle. So you are going around in circles, and if you have to file a writ you do not know whom to notify as the insurers of the vehicle.

These are things which the Government should take careful note of and bring in legislation covering this particular aspect of insurance in Barbados.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division
7.25 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Sir, I do not know who the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to suggest, but I would suggest a small Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest from our side the hon. members for St. Joseph, Christ Church West, and St. Thomas.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, from our side I suggest the Hon. Minister of Education.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to decline. I am not sitting on any Committee with the Leader of the Opposition. If I am worse than Eric Sealy, I am not sitting with him at all.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance; the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, the hon. member for St. Andrew, the Deputy Speaker, and, of course, Your Honour as Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those hon. Members who have been mentioned will form the Select Committee for this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I do not observe the hon. members for St. James and St. Lucy are in their places. I had leave to withdraw Resolution

No. 10. I would move, in respect of both Items 8 and 9, that further consideration of these Resolutions be postponed.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for leave to give notice of a Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave has been granted.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. FORDE: *Be it resolved* that this House takes note of the Statement read by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East, the Leader of the House, to the Honourable the House of Assembly on the twentieth day of January, 1976, and views with contempt the attempt made therein to smear the Leader and other Members of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing else under Private Members' Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business for today.

I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th January, 1976, at twelve o'clock noon.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.33 p.m.

