THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th December, 1980.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met on Tuesday, 16th December, 1980 at 12.15 p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.); and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, 9th December, 1980.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations as to errors by any hon. member, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations as to errors by any hon. member, those Minutes stand confirmed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. SANDIFORD, Dr. HAYNES and Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Friday, 12th December, 1980.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations as to errors by any hon. member, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations as to errors by any hon. member, let the Minutes of the 12th December, 1980, stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to lay the following:

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for seven months ended 31st October 1979.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to lay the following:

The Defence (Rate of Pay) Regulations 1980.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:

Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the National Insurance Fund for the year ended 31st December 1979.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Fitts Village, St. James, for the provision of an Open Window to the Sea.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to grant the sum of $138,744 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980-81, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980-81, No. 26 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of $200,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980-81, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980-81, No. 27 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also Resolution to grant the sum of $55,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1980-81 Part 1 – Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1980-81 No. 28 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

It is also my intention subject to the approval of Your Honour and other hon. members of the House to deal with these Resolutions in all their stages today as we anticipate this will be the last sitting of Parliament and they relate to matters which have already been agreed, that is, revision of salaries and rates of pay, and we are only tidying up the financial provisions so as to ensure that payment can be made.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on Friday, 12th December, 1980, I filed a notice of a motion....

Mr. SPEAKER: Stop.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If an hon. member files a motion with the Clerk and it is returned to the hon. member, I have been taught this, and this is what I rule accordingly; it is highly undesirable for the hon. member to raise the matter on the floor of this House that it was handed in.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do I understand you correctly, Sir, that if the Leader of the Opposition or any other hon. member files a notice of a motion that I cannot draw it to Your Honour's attention that an almost undecipherable paper has been put in front of my chair stating in terms that Your Honour is not allowing a motion of No Confidence in the Chair? Are you saying that the people's rights are being muzzled before they get into Parliament? Is that what Your Honour is saying? That you are the supreme arbiter in Barbados to stifle public debate in this country on your own conduct or on matters of public importance? Is that what Your Honour is really saying, because democracy has really gone out the window in this country?

Mr. SPEAKER: *(Standing)* I am standing. I draw this to your attention.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW took his seat.)

Mr. SPEAKER sat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And now Your Honour is sitting. By your merely standing now Barbados cannot know what is going on in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: *(Standing)* I warn the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Any further attempt of any misbehaviour on this part.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Misbehaviour! What are you talking about misbehaviour? Any time you find me misbehaving, Mr. Speaker, call the Director of Public Prosecutions and prosecute me for a criminal offence. That is misbehaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on this matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Are you prepared to hear anybody on any matter of public importance in Barbados at all?

Mr. SPEAKER directed that certain remarks be expunged from the records.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South owes this Honourable House an apology and until he apologises to this House, he will not be heard in this Honourable House.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege affecting the duly elected members of the Opposition in this Parliament. Parliament is a place for freedom of speech. Parliament is not a prison; we have not been sent here as prisoners. We have been sent here to speak as representatives of the people. A motion of censure against you in your capacity as Speaker of this House has been submitted, and we demand the right to debate that motion in this Parliament.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took their seats.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should wish to join with my colleagues in raising the question of privilege in this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member for St. Michael South has risen to apologise to this Hon. House.....

Mr. TAITT: I am dealing with a matter of privilege in this Hon. House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has no privilege on this occasion.

Mr. TAITT: As much privilege as the Speaker, Sir, as much privilege as all the other hon. members.....

Mr. SPEAKER: All right. I will now call on the hon. member for St. Michael South to address.....

Mr. TAITT: I have as much privilege as all the other hon. members who have been elected in this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I warn the hon. member for St. Michael South West.....

Mr. TAITT:.....and I will not be treated by you in any manner different from the other hon. members in here.....

Mr. SPEAKER..... to withdraw from this House for the remainder of the day.

Mr. TAITT: I am saying that I wish to be heard in this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I warn the hon. member for St. Michael South West.....

Mr. TAITT: I was sent in here to represent the people of Barbados in the same way that you were sent here to represent the people.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I draw hon. members' attention.....

Mr. TAITT: I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, that I must have privilege in this House too.

Mr. SPEAKER: I draw to hon. members' attention the conduct of the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I call on the hon. member for St. Michael South West to withdraw from this House for the remainder of today's sitting. Mr. Marshal.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Listen, if the Marshal touches the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. TAITT: I got elected in this House from St. Michael South West by a majority of 801, I did not come in this House in a box cart.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have warned the hon. member for St. Michael South West to withdraw from this House for the remainder of today's sitting and he has refused to do so.

Mr. TAITT: I will not be treated by anybody in a manner inconsistent with...

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands adjourned for ten minutes. Mr. Marshal, the matter is yours.
12.30 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before the .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed any further, the Marshal had been given instructions respecting the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed along that course, perhaps you should hear me in my capacity as unofficial adviser to the House, and it might well be that what I have to say will clarify the duties of everyone in this House.

Sir, as I understand it, there is before the House under Private Members' Business a motion which seeks to censure Your Honour in your capacity as Speaker of this House. The motion goes to a matter which affects the conduct of two members of this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no mention of any particular act in the motion at all. How the hon. member could have seen it when Your Honour has disallowed it, I do not know, but I think you should set the record straight. I do not know how he could rise under Orders of the Day, Private Members' Notices, to say that he is an adviser to the House. As I understand it, the Clerk is the adviser to the Speaker, he is no adviser to me. Let us get the record straight, you are no adviser anywhere in the Constitution of Barbados to the House of Assembly of Barbados. You may be an adviser to the Government, but do not misquote my motions.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I will not be as contentious or as capricious as the hon. member. With all of his seniority in this House he should show restraint and should understand that there comes a position in the House when one ought to try to have a bit of sanity rather than partisan foolishness, so if the hon. member would just wait and show the courtesy at least of hearing me out he would be in a position of getting some settlement of the issue. There is too much indiscipline that one finds in the community with this type of behaviour.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying, Sir, the motion arises immediately after your ruling in respect of two hon. members. That is the position, Sir. Now, there are two things that I think are important in your coming to your ruling. It is within the rules of this House for an hon. member to move a vote of censure against Mr. Speaker, either in relation to a particular incident, particular incidence, or general. The Rt. Hon. member now states that his motion is in general terms. In my view, Sir, the position is that Mr. Speaker in such instances usually entertains the motion and makes himself absent from the Chair so that the matter can be determined and decided.

However, Sir, if you have also given a ruling in respect of the conduct of two former members, pending the outcome of the motion and any counter motion thereon, in my view the status quo in relation to that ought to remain.

Now, for the benefit of the Rt. Hon. member, Sir, this Parliament is not only regulated by the Privileges Immunities Act of this island, but there are certain Conventions, and one of the Conventions which was handed down to the House is that the Attorney General has always tried to give the legal position in relation to the House. I do not ever want to be an adviser to the hon. member, I turned down that job years ago when he offered me a job, but when it comes to giving the House my views on matters of this nature I think it is proper that I should give you my view as the principal legal adviser to the House, a rule that I understand by Convention and custom is one well recognised in Parliaments throughout the Commonwealth.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN rose.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I rose before the hon. member and I am not giving way. I rose before him, Sir. I rose before the hon. member. You must sit down, man. You must sit down, I rose before you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I rose before you, so you must sit down. You must learn some behaviour, sit down!

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I rose before you. I rose before you, you must sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. Both hon. members, please take your seats. The Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I want to say that the Government is prepared tomorrow morning to debate any motion raised by any hon. member on the other side.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if you would just grant me a little indulgence, and I am grateful to you for the opportunity, but I just want to remind Your Honour of something which you may have overlooked. I understand Your Honour's feelings in this matter, and I think that the Attorney General has quite rightly said that because Your Honour is affected it is all the more reason why the motion should be entertained. I am not asking for you to overrule anything, but the reason why I filed the motion was that Your Honour directed that if anyone was dissatisfied with your ruling that a motion of no confidence.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion does not trouble me, it does not move me at all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that the reason why it was filed, and the occasion on which it was filed was because Your Honour yourself said that a motion of no confidence may be filed. I think Your Honour may have forgotten that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not, and you could file another the day after, but what remains is that the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Michael South West will not be heard in this Hon. House until they apologise to this House. That is all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I take it that under Private Members' Notices that the Leader of the Opposition may proceed. I understand your ruling, I am not getting into that at this stage, Sir.

12.50 p.m.

Right now we are dealing with Private Members' Notices.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Motion:–

WHEREAS His Honour the Speaker has carried out his duties in a capricious, partial and unreasonable manner;

AND WHEREAS such action constitutes a breach of the rights claimed by him for all Honourable Members,

and more particularly the rights of the minority, and is deserving of the highest censure;

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

E. W. Barrow
Leader of the Opposition

12th December, 1980.

I would be very grateful if Your Honour could give us some indication as when some time would be set aside for the discussion of this Motion. Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Government is prepared, Sir, to fix a date at 2 o'clock on Friday for the debate of this Motion. Two o'clock on Friday.

Mr. SANDIFORD and Mr. TAITT left the House.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, and 42(5) be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1980

Item No. 2 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, Cap. 12.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendments to the Representation of the People Act which we seek are amendments to give effect to the Report of the Select Committee on Boundaries and Designation of Constituencies and two other matters.

Firstly, Sir, we have to amend the words "24" in that Act and substitute "27". Secondly, Section 4 of the Act which is in conflict with an amended Section of the Constitution which was amended in 1974 is to be repealed.

We are increasing the allowed amount for election expenses from 50 cents to $1.00. When it was fixed at 50 cents it was not safe to estimate that the cost-of living would have doubled since that time. Indeed it doubled between 1970 and 1976, Sir, far less the much smaller increase. We are taking the opportunity, Sir, rather than making an order and coming back to the House with the new boundaries to put the new boundaries into the Act at one time so that Friday will be free for matters of confidence rather than constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I really think that in a few words what I have just said, added to what was said earlier on the Report of the Select Committee itself that the purpose of this Act is made clear.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the debate on the Report of the Select Committee of the Boundaries and Designation of Constituencies, the Official Opposition is unalterably opposed to the whole exercise, unalterably opposed to any increase in the expense of running Parliament, any unnecessary increase, as we deem this one, at the expense of running Parliament. We deem it an imposition on the people of Barbados and an attempt to eliminate an effective Opposition in this country and an untarnished attempt to destroy democracy in Barbados.

I do not wish to say anymore, Sir. To show you how this exercise was entered into, a Bill was passed here. I am not reflecting on the Bill but I am saying what the Bill was. A Bill was passed here a few weeks ago abolishing the Parish Boundaries Act which delineated that there were parochial divisions in Barbados. The Bill was repealed. There are no parochial divisions in Barbados since that particular Act became an Act of Parliament in this country. The Magistrates in Barbados today maybe in some kind of quandry.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. This a point of order, not any matter of privilege or anything else. It cannot be opened for an hon. member to make a statement about an Act of Parliament, or about what Parliament has done which is contrary to the facts and to accepted canons of judicial interpretations.

The hon. member may have forgotten the expression incorporated by reference and the hon. member well knows that just as the Bridgetown–Speightstown–Holetown Act which he repealed was incorporated by reference into the Road Traffic Act so that a separate speed limit for

Bridgetown and Speightstown could lawfully be imposed, so the Parish Boundaries are incorporated by reference into the Representation of the People Act into the Magistrate Judicial and Procedure Act and indeed into the St. Philip and St. George/Glebe Act.
1.00 p.m.

He ought to be totally familiar with the canons of interpretation which incorporate Repeal Acts by reference into Acts that repeal the matters contained therein, and I submit it cannot be in order for the hon. member to say something so contrary to law and thereby indirectly have the effect of misleading the House and the public.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone is any the wiser now that the hon. member has sat down. He has made confusion doubly confused.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in the case of the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well the Chair has a lucidity which the rest of us do not possess. I am sure that the average man in the street is just as confused after the hon. member has spoken on some kind of point of order as before he got up. The point is that there was a Parish Boundaries Act of Barbados. The Parish Boundaries Act which my colleague on my left is now getting for me, Sir, and I will read it in a moment, referred to a specific map. *(Asides)* Do you want to speak or do you want me to speak?

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Please ask him not to interfere when members are speaking. The Parish Boundaries Act was Cap. 109 of the Laws of Barbados and were passed or re-enacted in 1912, and it has two very short paragraphs, and the Act says that it may be cited as the Parish Boundaries Act, that is clause 1 or section 1, and section 2 said that the bounds, limits and lines of the several parishes as ascertained and fixed by the Map of the Island of Barbados from the Admiralty Survey by Staff Commander J. Parsons, Royal Navy, assisted by Navigating Lieutenants H. R. Harris, G. Stanley and J. T. Hoskyn, Royal Navy, (1869 and 1873), shall be deemed and taken for the true and real bounds of the parishes for all purposes whatsoever.

The true and real boundaries are referable to a specific map of the Island of Barbados. If you look at the Representation of the People Act, this is what the Act says. To bring the matter a little closer to home, let us take the constituency of St. Peter. If you look at the last four or five lines, you will see this. In fact, let me go half way up, Sir.

".....in an easterly direction along the St. Peter–St. James parish boundary." That has been abolished, so you have a big constituency now, Mr. Speaker. "Thence in a north easterly direction along the St. Peter–St. Andrew parish boundary..." That has been abolished. "".....to the point at which it touches the sea coast....." – that is still there, but the line that is to touch has been abolished ".....thence in a northerly direction along the sea coast" – which is still there, the parts of it, that have not been eroded either by the report of the Committee or the action of the waves – ".....to the point where it touches the St. Peter – St. Lucy parish boundary..." – and that has been abolished ".....thence in a westerly direction along the St. Peter – St. Lucy parish boundary" which has been abolished – "to the western sea coast" which we presume is still there, that is out in the Baltic, Boscobelle area. I am sorry, the western side; "thence in a southerly direction along the sea coast to the outlet of the Scantlebury River (the starting point)."

Now, Sir, the Bill which was passed in this House said that the Parish Boundaries Act has been repealed. The hon. member says that you can legislate by reference, but you are legislating by reference in delineating these constituencies to something that no longer exist. If you say to where the St. James – St. Peter parish boundary touches the sea coast on the west, in order to find where that parish boundary touches the sea coast you have to go to a map and the legislation referred to that map has been repealed, you have not gone back to Commander Parsons and his two naval lieutenants and said that although we have abolished the Act we are still going to refer to the old map somewhere. Nothing like that is done and the hon. member gets up and tells me that I should well know this and well know that. I know a lot of things that he does not know, and a lot of things he does not know that I know I know, and I do not mean any question of encyclopaedic knowledge or anything like that, and he would know what I know that I know and that he does not know that I know that he knows. It is a simple point.

Now, Sir, I am not trying to make you uncomfortable in your jurisdiction in so far as your constituency is concerned, but what I am drawing to the attention of the House is a simple matter.

Before we brought in the Report of the Select Committee, we had a Miscellaneous Bill. I cannot remember the name, the Clerk will probably assist me if he has a copy of the Bill. This is a Bill to which I referred in anticipation. When it was stated at that time that the register which was being prepared would be the register for the purposes of election, something of which I warned the general public over 18 months ago, I also pointed to the fact that the Parish Boundaries Act was being repealed and nothing was being put in its place. Now if you have a reference to a parish boundary which you have removed effectively from the Statute Book of Barbados which refers to a specific map drawn up way

back in 1869 and 1873 by a navigating officer in the Royal Navy and his assistants, how can you say that it is legislation by reference when the hon. member refers to the Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act? Do you know what the Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act said? Let me take Speightstown because that is in your constituency. The Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act had a section which said specifically that no building should be erected in Speightstown built out of wood, so no poor people could live in Speightstown, so we had to repeal that. They said you could have it partly out of noggin, whatever that is. The only noggin I know is the noggin you get in a small glass poured from a bottle, a liquid measure. They said you could build partly out of rubble and partly out of noggin, partly out of stone and partly out of noggin, but no way could you build a chattel house in Speightstown, so we repealed that Act. I am not saying that is the only reason for the repeal, but that was the kind of provision which the Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act had in, and he is saying now that the speed limits were defined there in terms of the Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act. All of that has been replaced by the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act and other legislation of that kind.

The Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act, Sir, was a very laudable bit of legislation in some respects. Let me outline to you what I told the Vestry of St. Michael. In that same Act there was complete planning authority long before we had a Town and Country Planning Authority. There was planning authority under the Bridgetown-Speightstown-Holetown Act whereby the Vestry of St. Michael could have had some control over the discriminate kind of building that went on up there in St. Michael. The type of building was prescribed in the Act itself in so far as Speightstown was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not want to say anymore. The hon. member can get up and try and obfuscate the issues. The issues to us are simple. As far as the members on this side of the House are concerned, we cannot really make any contribution to a debate of this kind. We cannot make any contribution to a debate on something which we do not even think should be coming before this House which does complete violence to the whole principle of equitable distribution and impartial examination of the population patterns in so far as constituencies are concerned. Therefore there is no point in my making a long speech about it.
1.10 p.m.

Our position is clear. We were opposed to the results which emanated from the Select Committee on Boundaries. The Government said it was going to set up an independent Boundaries Commission. They like Commissions, but they never set that one up. That is one of the Commissions they did not go in for, they went all out with other Commissions. I suppose it was their experiences in the other Commissions which caused them to back pedal on an independent Commission to go into the resettlement of the boundaries in Barbados.

I have already discussed the question of the number of seats, we are still opposed to the number of seats, we have always been opposed to the number of seats. When we had an opportunity to increase them we did not increase the number of seats, and we tried to make the distribution of population for voting purposes as equitable as was humanly possible without too much cutting across of the parochial boundaries. We managed to do so because the major area of concern was the metropolitan area within the parish of St. Michael and its immediate environs. This was our immediate area of concern which had ten times the number of voters as some of the rural constituencies, and eventually we ended up with a situation where there were nine seats allocated to the metropolitan area of Bridgetown and St. Michael, as there were only four before, so there was an increase from four to nine but still maintaining the 24 seats which we had in this small country of ours.

It is not necessary for me to say any more, because my position has been made clear, the position of my colleagues has been made clear. Repetition does not make it any better or any worse.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, lest it be thought that in this exercise any fundamental rights of people in Barbados or any gerrymandering takes place, or any deprivation of our concept of democracy is abused, I want to point out that this exercise has been carried out by this Government in a manner which is completely different from the exercise which was carried out by the hon. members on the other side in 1971.

I was one of those in 1971 who very shortly before the election became aware of the fact that the constituency boundaries of my former constituency were being changed, and what is more, that the electoral list was not in existence for a long period of time so that they could be checked. In this exercise we have made it positively clear from the very outset that it is the view of this Government that whenever there are boundary changes they must be carried out in sufficient time so that everyone whose political constituency is affected will be in a position to know for a reasonable period of time.

Now, there is one thing that the Opposition cannot deny, and that is that an electoral list will be published in January and that full opportunity will be granted for everyone in every one of the constituencies to go out there and canvass and seek to persuade the people in the constituencies to vote for their particular candidate.

The second point that they cannot reply to is the point that at the present time there has been a grave difference between some constituencies as at present constituted and other constituencies. We have repeatedly pointed out that because of the population shifts in Barbados some constituencies became double the other constituencies, so that something had to be done.

These are the points which have motivated the Government, and all of this talk about people being deprived of their democratic rights and all of that is nothing but a lot of nonsense. Nobody can be deprived of their democratic rights if they have an opportunity to go on a list, if they have an opportunity to canvass, if they have an opportunity to persuade people to accept their political view. The trouble with the Opposition is that from the day after the last election they adopted an attitude of obstruction and of promotion of ill-will in this country. Up to this day the very Leader of the Opposition says that it is not his intention ever of going and getting rephotographed. He said that repeatedly in here. He has never as a matter of public policy encouraged the public of Barbados to go forward and try and get their names on the register, those whose names are not on the register now. We have repeatedly pointed out in here that not only will the new national identity numbers and cards and pictures be used as a basis of identification, but also the old ones, so that this talk about people being deprived of their right to vote cannot be attributed to any act on the part of the Government. I repeat again, as the Government has been repeating all along, we encourage all those people who do not have at the present moment an identity card under the old system to go forward and get an identity card under the new system. We repeat that all Barbadians are entitled to have their pictures taken.

The Chief Registering Officer has centres all over Barbados. There is still a permanent registration center in Barbados. Centres in the districts will be reopened, a draft list will be published, every member of the Opposition will receive a draft list, every political party will receive a draft list. Citizens of Barbados will be notified of where the lists are published, all in accordance with our normal procedures in relation to elections, and I appeal to the Opposition to stop trying to confuse the people. The Government has no intention of preventing them from getting on the list, the Chief Registering Officer and the Chief Electoral Officer is the same person who administered elections under the Democratic Labour Party regime, under the same statutory duties.

Let us try and encourage everyone to go and exercise their franchise. It is the duty of the political parties, whatever the constituency boundaries, to try and persuade people to accept their persuasion.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak very briefly on this Bill, and perhaps speak to the principles as you would expect me to do, of the Bill. If there is one fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy as practised in countries such as Barbados, Canada, United Kingdom, United States, Australia and New Zealand, it is that wherever possible electors should be given an equal opportunity to choose their representatives.

1.20 p.m.

There is no doubt that today on the existing constituency boundaries in Barbados that the vote of a representative in one constituency can be worth less than the vote of a voter in another constituency. Some constituencies have in almost twice as much the number of electors as there are in other constituencies.

Under the Constitution of certain states in the United States of America this disparity has been ruled to be against the Constitution and against the equality of representation and I think that it may be a mistaken attitude for anyone in Parliament to represent to the people that there is no need to equalise the value of the votes between constituencies in this country.

My own constituency up to this moment, before this Bill is passed, is perhaps among the fourth smallest constituency in Barbados, the smallest in terms of numbers. The constituency of my colleague from Christ Church North Central, however, has in almost twice the number of voters as they are in Christ Church West and therefore it seems to me fundamental if one really believes in democracy that one has to begin by accepting the necessity for changing constituency boundaries in order to achieve as closely as possible parity in the number of electors.

Now having said that, Sir, we get to the next stage. There is no doubt in my mind that since we made a change over 150 years ago almost to the number of seats in the House, that we have had an increase in the population as well as an increase in the number of people eligible to vote in this country. That has been followed on the credit side with an increase in the modes of communication but on the debit side with the abolition of all other forms of Government except Central Government. It means, therefore, that representation at the central level now attracts a whole host of duties and obligations that were formerly cast on the shoulders of parochial or vestry representatives.

There has been a case along these lines for one to rationalise not only constituency boundaries but the number and degree of representation in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, normally this exercise is carried out in other countries by an Electoral and Boundaries Commission but so far the precedence in Barbados has been for a Select Committee appointed by the House and composed of members of the House or sometimes

of members outside of the House to sit and demarcate the new boundaries.

Now, as I understand it, the Barbados Labour Party, like the under 40's in 1965 and 1966, argued for an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. This country sometimes strikes me as having a very short memory. I have heard on numerous occasions the Rt. Hon. member for St. John and Leader of the Opposition arguing in this House and outside of this House against the necessity for any Electoral Boundaries Commission to demarcate boundaries.

I have been present at the Independence Conference in London and the stand taken by the hon. member and by the Democratic Labour Party at the time was that it was nonsense in the context of Barbados asking for independent Electoral Boundaries Commission since he had never heard anything about gerrymandering yet and the Chief Electoral Officer usually looked after these matters.

I am submitting seriously to the public of Barbados that the Rt. hon. member varies his arguments not on the basis of principle but on the basis of purely political expediency because he believes that the people of Barbados can be fooled into the situation that they only hear what they hear today and they forget what was said before.

The Democratic Labour Party for the first time is now saying that there is need for an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. In 1965 we were asking for it. In 1965 the Electoral Association of the Barbados National Party led by the late Ernest Deighton Mottley was asking for such a Commission and the Democratic Labour Party insisted that it was unnecessary and argued that the absence of such a Commission did not mean that gerrymandering would take place in the country. Now, what has happened between 1966 and 1980 to change that view. The only significant one is that they are out of power. They are out of power and they believe that the sort of attitude that they took when in power to cut up the boundaries and change overnight the electoral districts will be adopted by this party.

I have witnessed in 1971 the Rt. hon. member for St. John signing an order in his capacity as responsible for Elections in this country signing an order overnight to cut through Parish Land and Providence in order to take off voters from the hon. member of Christ Church South Central, the Deputy Prime Minister, in order to make him lose his seat. That was part of the plan.

The file dealing with that has disappeared from the Archives of Government in this country because it was a file that he kept for himself and if you want an act of gerrymandering, that was one, an outstanding act of gerrymandering that they did in the result that he did cause the hon. member to lose his seat. People have short memories and we are allowing political partisanship to block the independent examination of the facts in this country and not rationalising what is happening in the political process in Barbados, but I recall very well that 1971 Election. That was only one of them, Sir.

1.30 p.m.

They did the same thing between St. Andrew and St. James. It is not a question of the hon. member even having two months in order to re-canvass the people; it was a question of giving him less than seven days and he actually saw the new list a day before the elections as to where people were outside his constituency.

Now I submit to the House and to the country that the Democratic Labour Party has neither standing nor credibility nor good faith on the whole issue of the changing of boundaries in this country. I am not surprised that they will go out. They use an emotive issue. The hon. member has spoken and the moment he speaks he runs out of the House. Now let us come to the numbers, Sir. In the 1950s when we had double member constituencies, the Rt. Honourable Member moved a Resolution asking for the country to be divided into one representative for every 3 000 people. He is in black and white as having said so. Would you believe it that despite that Resolution the hon. member is now going to argue to the country seriously that he did not mean what he said then? He only meant that it had to be 24 – despite the fact that if you credit him with intelligence and with good faith – he will recognise that there were over 72 000 electors on the roll and in fact there was some 103 000 electors, and he knew it!

The only purpose of the hon. member's ploy is that he wants to regain power so that anything that will look like bad faith, and he knows the Barbadian does not like that, he will play on the people's emotions as they consistently play on the people's emotions on every single issue in this country to confuse issues in the country. It is not that the Government is always right. Far be it from me to say that, but the people would like to hear fair and honest discussions, and I submit that what has happened in political life in the last four years and particularly the last three has been a confusion of issues and a deliberate attempt in order to throw bad faith, rumour and anything that is unkind into the actions of the people that constitute the Government. It is up to the Barbadian to decide what they want, Sir. I said before in this House that as far as I am concerned, when I run in politics I am giving service; I have chosen to give service. The day that people do not like it, put somebody else. I do not hold on to power by at any cost as they seem to think that that is all we are interested in. Impressions not truth is

the standard form of the Opposition. Impressions, nothing else. Power at any cost even if in the process you destroy your country, you destroy its credibility, you destroy every argument, you destroy rationality.

I have never heard the Opposition get up over there and give the Government credit on any single issue in the four years that we have been in here on any issue. You hear them and they tell you in the corridors that you are doing something well, but they have not got the guts of their convictions to get up in public and say so. When I was in Opposition there were many occasions when they did a measure that was worthwhile and I had the guts to say it. I am issuing a warning to Barbadians. They can introduce into this country the politics of indiscipline by telling people that they will go to Glendairy today if they can't get an issue settled. We are going to break up in here today, we are going to go to Glendairy today, and on every issue outside misrepresenting every fact. We are going to bring Barbados to that stage, and it is going to take us fifty years to get it back on its even keel. They must recognise that we must have a responsible Opposition as much as you must have a responsible Government. I am submitting that what one is seeing today is a good deal of irresponsible behaviour from the Opposition and if they do not indulge in it themselves, they condone those in our society who will indulge in it for money, and there are some of them. There are people in this society who travel all over the world; they do not work, but they are on every aeroplane going all over the world and advertising bigger meetings than anybody else, set on a course of destruction of reputations of people, and the Opposition condones that.

I regret that the Rt. Honourable Member who has made some contribution to this country in an objective manner should find himself in that position – power at any cost, no matter. Any argument regardless of how valid that argument is is the one that we hear. Well my constituency has now become the third largest from being the fourth smallest. I welcome the people who have been added to the constituency and I believe in one area that has been added to me, last time the Democratic Labour Party got more votes than the candidate for the Barbados Labour Party got. I give the Opposition the undertaking that I will reverse the trend and win between 85% and 90% in the next election by canvassing and convincing the people by argument that I am a better representative than anybody they can put in the constituency.

I am not crying gerrymander. I have got added to me districts in which the Barbados Labour Party has lost and I am not complaining. The Rt. Honourable Member got added to him districts in which he won. What is he complaining about? I am willing to take on them in the districts that they are powerful. I am sorry that Christ Church West is not near to St. John because I would run him there. I have invited him since I have been in the House from the first day I came here and we had a clash to leave St. John and I will leave Christ Church West and we go into one of the new constituencies. If he likes, if he wants to put his seat at stake, let him do it, and we can determine the election on that and he can have every carrion fly that is available in Barbados to spread nastiness about me in the process. He can have that and let us face the music in that way. He would not take on that; he likes power at any cost, but I hope that will not become the trend, Sir. I hope that the register will be published promptly, that the people will be given an opportunity to see where they are registered.

I am sure that the Government will ensure that there are fair and free elections in this country because that is what we need. We do not believe in the Barbados Labour Party that the highest standard of democracy is one gun one ballot. We do not believe that. I challenge the Rt. Honourable Member not to run out of this House after speaking, but to have the guts of his convictions and when he gets on the Grenada radio to stand up and tell the Grenadians to determine democracy not by the bullets but by the ballots, and I would then begin to have some respect for his view on these issues. He goes to Grenada and has not got the guts of his convictions to say to the Grenadians that the time has come for fair and free elections. He says they do not matter. When he is in Grenada political expediency dictates that he say they do not matter; when he is campaigning up here they matter in that he is going to lead his people in a walk out from the House.

Sir, I know a phrase that used to describe people who dilly dally and move – political weather-cockism. Depending on how the wind is blowing you adopt your principles that way. I believe that in life you have to have values, you have to have principles, and even if you lose your neck in the process, you have got to stick to that. I say that repeatedly in public life. It does not have to carry for anybody else, but I have always made the point that if you have values and principles, even if the people are going to throw you out of Parliament for that in public life, stick to it and let them throw you out. One of these days they will recognise their mistake in the process, and whether I am speaking in Argentina, whether I am speaking in South Africa, whether I am speaking in Britain, whether I am speaking in Grenada, these principles must always stand and be pre-eminent.

1.40 p.m.

I find that the argument of the right hon. member bears no strength of the strong moral character that one ought to expect from him. He varies from day to day, Sir, and that is one of the reasons why I cannot take him seriously on this Bill.

I want to deal with one final argument and finish, Mr. Speaker, the increased cost. Now, Sir, I really cannot

believe that $72,000 divided over 250,000 people in Barbados can constitute a burden on the people of this country. I really cannot believe it, Sir. I find it difficult to believe that for proper representation the people of Barbados would object to paying $72,000 more. The Government today is spending $500 million a year. That is the expenditure, the revenue of this country, $500 million. The cost of Parliament is just about a million dollars, Sir. I make bold to say that if each of us on this side, the Ministers, not even talking about the back benchers, went out and pursued their private business, that we would earn by way of fees or whatever you want from the public of Barbados between ourselves in excess of the one million dollars which is the total cost of Parliament. In other words, the public of Barbados is not being shortchanged, Sir.

You see, Sir, a member of Parliament, a back bencher, gets $24,000 a year. That is what he gets, approximately $24,000 a year. I make bold to say that I have known members of the Democratic Labour Party to do one case, work from 9 o'clock to 1 o'clock a day for a period of five weeks and get paid $25,000 for that job. Some of those who are going around talking a lot of foolishness, because my Ministry paid out to the former Leader of the Opposition and his brother $24,000 for just appearing for a few days per week in a case before a Commission of Enquiry. Now, that is the total allowances, fees and what not given to the Attorney General, subject to tax, is a little more than that. That is what we are talking about in Barbados.

I said before it is *infra dig* for me to come into this House to talk about money, because it really hurts when they know in their heart of hearts that the cost of Government as a percentage of the overall revenue of this island has declined rather than increased, although the nominal figures have gone up. They know that, but they are not going to put those points. You get a quick reaction if you have to pay a politician more, somebody believes that you should not pay a politician anything at all. He has no family to look after, he has no obligations – particularly if you are working full time as the Ministers in this Cabinet work – you should come into public life and do it. That is foolishness, Sir, I could never subscribe to that, because you will get in public life two types of people; people who are so rich that they do not need anything at all, so that a poor man could never represent anybody else, or you will get people who will come into public life in order to make money by the back door, which happened under the Democratic Labour Party.

He talked about Commissions. Commissions cannot prove everything, some of them are to smart. Those are the dangers we have in the country, and I am appealing to Barbadians to be a little sagacious. Do not let the Democratic Labour Party believe they are dunces, put on their thinking caps and analyse the situation for themselves. Do not only let the World Bank, the IMF, the Wall Street Journal and people outside of Barbados in the Caribbean and everywhere say what a good place Barbados has been in the last four years to have had a Government that has kept this country afloat and progressive. Think for yourselves and show you appreciate that by returning the Government in the next elections whenever they happen to be.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the people of Barbados are genuinely concerned with the threat to democracy they would not be concerned with the fact that the seats in the House of Assembly have been increased from 24 to 27, because the Leader of the Opposition suggested that that increase represents a threat to democracy. I believe, Sir, if they want to see what constitutes a genuine threat to democracy it may be well for them to come into this Chamber sometimes and see how disgracefully the members of the Opposition behave in this Assembly, because I feel that that genuine lack of discipline more constitutes an erosion of all the things we hold dear than the exercises that we have engaged in with respect to the boundaries here in Barbados.

The hon. member for St. John said as well in leading off his debate that he was opposed to any increase in the expenses of running Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, we would all be happy if we had reached that idyllic state of affairs where we would be able to wave a wand and command all expenses to stand still, but the realities of life are such that the responsibility of looking after a growing population with increasing demands means that the expenses associated with that exercise are bound at some time or another to increase. The civil servants have to be paid more money, members of Parliament, believe it or not, since they live in the same economy as the rest of the people of Barbados, have to be paid increased wages from time to time, and therefore it is not possible at any point in time from now until whenever the world shall cease for the quantum of expenses for running Parliament to diminish unless we suddenly decide we do not need a Parliament at all.

I have heard some of the members on the Opposition benches contending that we do not need 27 seats in this House because the 24 members can adequately look after all the services relating to being a member of Parliament. In 1940 there were 24 members of this House, there were 7,000 registered voters in the entire island in a population of 200,000. In other words, those 24 members together looked after 7,000 registered voters. The constituency which I have the honour to represent, St. Michael West, has more than 7,000 voters. As a matter of fact, it has approximately 8,000 voters by itself, so that what 24 people used to do in 1940, represent 7,000 people, I alone in the constituency of

St. Michael West look after that many people. Bear in mind, Sir, that at that time there was a Vestry, and the kinds of things that members are now expected to do the Vestry did in those days, so that those 24 members looking after those 7,000 electors had a Vestry that backed them up as well as providing the local services – housing, roads, sanitation and that sort of thing.
1.50 p.m.

Today in Barbados the members of Parliament have to look after the total legitimate needs of their constituents. That means housing and I know, Sir, that I alone sometimes in a single day answer as many as 80 phone calls from people seeking to get an apartment in Fernihurst. That has nothing to do with the fact that they are going to meet you in the afternoon down at the BMC or wherever I happen to be and some more people then pass through my office.

The burden of representing a constituency, Sir, has grown tremendously. It is no longer an easy job where you just walk in every Tuesday or every other Tuesday and talk some idle and go home. It is a very involved job. If you are doing it right it is an extremely exacting task and therefore I can see no legitimate reason why the hon. member for St. Michael South West, as an example, should be representing 4,000 voters when next door of his boundary the hon. member for St. Michael West is representing 8,000.

It would be easy for people to assume that because one member looks after fewer people than the other member that the other member would be a better representative. What they do not know is that his burden is twice as heavy as the other man's burden and this was not seen as an equitable way to look after the business of representation in Barbados today. What this exercise is attempting to do is to rationalise the boundaries in such a fashion that as nearly as humanly possible each member has an opportunity to represent an equal number of people so that each constituent will have a reasonable expectation of receiving the best possible service from its representative.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South West was trying to draw an analysis between Barbados and the United States. I lived in the United States for a lot of years, Sir, and I am familiar with the political system in the States and you have a Senate at the Federal level. You have a Congress at the Federal level. You have a State Legislator. You have a State Assembly. You have a City Assembly and you look at the spread, therefore, and then you have a breakdown of the Boroughs.

The same thing obtains in Britain where you have the House of Commons and then you have the London County Council and the various other Councils which look after the various facilities for the constituents of a particular area. In Barbados we have no such distribution of responsibility. All of it falls to the elected member, all, so the person who is elected into the House of Assembly performs all of those services, social and political that belong to those constituents so a comparison between the United States and Barbados is not a sensible comparison. It is absurd because there are four or five different levels and a member therefore of the Senate at the Federal level does not have to concern himself with manmade matters. He manages only to make sure that a block of Federal funding passes down to the lower levels so that his State is benefiting from an equitable distribution of the resources of the Federal Government.

Now, Sir, I do not know why it is that every time this Government attempts to do something it is characterised as having some ulterior, sinister motive. The Opposition Party, in my humble submission, has been attempting over the last 3½ to 4 years to create the impression in the minds of Barbadians that we have a wicked, monstrous Government that is just sitting down and waiting to pounce upon every constitutionality that we have in Barbados.

I was elected, Sir, to the House of Assembly in 1976 by a constitutional vote that allowed me to come in here after defeating a member that was in here since 1945. I sat down and listened to the votes being counted and when it was declared that I had won by a majority of an excess of 500 votes, that was a constitutional process and I have no intention of sitting in a House of Assembly that is not constituted by constitutional means. I have no intention of participating in a Government by guns, a Government of cahoots or any Government that is not duly elected by the people of Barbados. When that time comes, I will resign or go home and look after my own business in some way or another that is more satisfying but I will not sit down in here with a bullet backing me up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member still has 15 minutes more. If he so desires, he can continue on resumption.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I want to say a little bit more and I will therefore give way until after we come back.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move, Sir, that the House be suspended until 2.45 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.
2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

When the suspension was taken the hon. member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, at the point when we recessed, I was making the point that the current charge being voiced abroad is that the Barbados Labour Party is by the measures it has taken in respect of the boundaries posing a threat to democracy and seeking to rig the elections. I would gather that is about a fair interpretation of what the hon. members on the other side have said, and the point I was making was that I along with all of the other hon. members on this side came to this House of Assembly by constitutional processes, and that I certainly have no intention of participating in a Government that was not constitutionally elected in Barbados, and that is not an idle statement on my part.

I feel that part of the responsibility of elected members is that they seek to preserve freedom in the country where they reside. I can remember when the fight for political emancipation and wages in Barbados was started very successfully and progressively by the Barbados Labour Party at a time when it was known as the Progressive League. I mentioned earlier in my speech that in 1940 only 7 000 people were registered voters out of a population of 200 000, and it was the Barbados Labour Party's Progressive League that waged the fight to guarantee that universal adult suffrage should come to Barbados. It was the Progressive League led by Sir Grantley Adams and the pioneers of this Barbados Labour Party that fought to make certain that all of us here in Barbados would have the opportunity to express ourselves at the polls every five years as it now obtains. It was the Barbados Labour Party's Progressive League that fought to make certain that the property ownership requirement was abolished and that every man should have the right to vote whether he had property or not. I do not see how anybody could therefore accept or believe that a party which had its origin in fighting to establish democracy in this country and universal and fair adult suffrage would now be the very party that would be seeking to tear down all it has fought for throughout its entire history.

What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the general tenor of downgrading, the tenor of casting dirty aspersions on the intentions of this Government by the members of the Opposition. I am concerned about that trend because week after week we see a clear and unmistakable appeal to lawlessness in this society, and by behaving badly and by bringing the public mind to the point where it cannot trust even the most sincere and open intentions of the Government. By going in that direction I fear that unless we are extremely careful, the constitutional threats which we talk about will not come from the Government, but they will come from the party that is promoting it, and it will come when some misguided people, who exercising their own constitutional prerogative in supporting the other side are induced unwittingly to participate on the spur of the moment in lawless behaviour for which they may come to ruin many years after.

Sir, it is easy to tear down, but it takes a long long time to build up. These changes which have been introduced by the Barbados Labour Party are changes which are designed to give more people a fair opportunity to participate in the democratic process. It is intended to extend the services of Government more equitably to a wider cross-section of Barbadians. Indeed it is designed to make certain that all Barbadians have reasonable access to their parliamentary representative so that their legitimate aspirations and needs can have an opportunity for fulfilment. I am affected like everybody else by these changes of boundaries. When I went to the polls in 1976 I represented roughly 8 000 people and my constituency is one of those which has been divided, and I will have to determine in the fullness of time which of these sections of my constituency I will choose to contest, but I will be out there in 1981 fully confident that the representation which I have provided in the House of Assembly for the people of St. Michael West over the last four and a half years will be rewarded when the people go to express themselves on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party candidate for the area in which I will ultimately decide to run in.

I, Sir, do not have to recite the lack of sincerity which the Democratic Labour Party brings to its analysis of the changes that have gone on in this redistribution of boundaries, because I was here in 1971 when they did all the boundary changes in the shortest possible time so that members of the Barbados Labour Party would be in jeopardy. I do not believe, Sir, that it is possible for anybody who is bringing a fair analysis to the boundary changes to assert that these changes have been designed to injure any sitting member. It poses the same discomfiture, if you may use that term, for the members on this side as it does for the other members on the other side, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty at all in supporting the changes that have been made, and I would like to assure the people of Barbados that in spite of these boundary changes they should use their God given talents of reasoning to determine for themselves that what we have done is in the final analysis in the best interest of all of our citizens.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make three points on this Bill in relation to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I will not be longer than five minutes. That is all I need. There are widespread

accusations being made by members of the Democratic Labour Party about the proposal to increase the number of seats and about the proposals to redesignate various constituencies and to add three additional seats.

Now I am not going to repeat what I said on Friday when the Report of the Select Committee was up for discussion and adoption, but I just want to say for the record that I believe the public of Barbados whenever they vote in the next general election will not have reason to accuse the Government of the naked thieving, I use the word advisedly, that took place in 1971 and in 1976. I have given many examples of thieving, better known in Barbados as "tiefing" in my own constituency in 1976. I have cited the incident at the polling station at Holy Trinity School. I did not tell the House for example of other instances which I could have where people who do not reside and did not reside in 1976 in St. Philip North, but the only connection that they had with St. Philip was that they worked at Carrington Factory, and some from as far as St. Joseph voted in the Brereton box in 1976. All of that went on. That is the first point I want to make on the "tiefing."

The second point I want to make is that the Leader of the Opposition today before he went out of here himself admitted to increasing the number of seats in St. Michael in 1966 and now he is against an increase in the number of seats.
3.05 p.m.

The Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. member for St. John, said in here today about 1 o'clock that in 1966 they created nine seats in St. Michael because it was unfair to ask two people to represent 13,000 or whatever the number was at the time. Now, when the Press writes and people in the Press comment, they never carry anything, they never show the inconsistency and the wickedness and the intellectual dishonesty in the propagation of arguments like that. He said they created nine seats. Now, the electorate in 1966 was 99,800. They saw it necessary not to let two seats remain in St. Michael but to give them nine. In 1980 the electorate is 164,798 .... (ASIDE). I have to shout, because the only way to deal with liars is to bring the facts to them as forcefully as you can, even if it involves "hollering" at them. Then they can hear me outside.

Sir, the electorate has increased by virtually 65,000 since 1966, the total electorate in Barbados, and they who increased the number in St. Michael from two to nine, now in 1980 are going to complain that it is wrong to add another two seat to St. Michael and one to St. James, when it is shown and they accept that there has been a necessary population increase in these two areas to justify the additional seats.

The third point I want to make, Sir, is that in 1966 when I was in England I had the privilege of covering the Independence Conference for Rediffusion and the Daily News, as it then was, on a daily basis from London, and this whole question of a Boundaries Commission was mooted and urged by the Opposition representatives in London at Marborough House. The DLP Government then refused to brook any idea of a Boundaries Commission. It caused a lot of confusion, it caused a lot of harsh words to pass between the Secretary of State and members on that side, and between the two parties that were at the Conference from Barbados, and the Government's position in 1966 was that they would not have any Boundaries Commission far less entrench it in the Constitution as the representatives from this side, and I think it was Mr. Mottley's people in the National Party, as they were called, I believe, they were in favour. They wanted a Boundaries Commission and they wanted it entrenched in the Constitution, and they said no way, you would not get either. Today they want a Boundaries Commission.

The fourth point I am going to make, Sir, because I have to deal with the inconsistencies of the people on the other side who seem not to have any moral conscience, they certainly have no moral authority to deal with a matter like redesignation of boundaries. The point I want to make is that the Leader of the Opposition himself on the day when the Select Committee was appointed got up in here and said that the House has the full powers to redesignate the boundaries in Barbados. Now you are hearing complaints. I recall that day very well. The hon. member for St. John spoke first and said he saw nothing wrong with the House redistributing seats and settling the boundaries. He said then, and he was consistent to this extent, that he did not see a case for increasing the number of seats. That is what the member for St. John said.

After he was finished the member for St. Michael South asked this House to postpone further consideration of the matter because he did not think that the time was ripe for us to do this exercise. After he spoke the member for St. Michael South Central got up and said he was not agreeing with the other two, what we needed was a referendum from the people of Barbados on this question. Three different points of view from the members of the Opposition on the same topic, when the newspaper of the same morning carried a statement from them saying that they were having nothing to do with it at all, and that it was a rape of the Constitution and all that. All of that was said, and they came in here and took three different positions, they were not having anything to do with it, and yet the night when we appointed the Committee they came and sat on the Committee, putting up two representatives. How can you deal with people like that, Sir? They do not even know their own minds. If they do not

know their own minds, how can they go out in the public square tonight or Friday night or whenever they want to and try to inform the people? Those people must ask them why they came in here and took three different positions, why they decided not to sit on the Select Committee and yet sat on the Select Committee, and why when they sat on the Select Committee they agreed that there was a need to equalise the number of votes per representatives and that there was a need to cut across parish boundaries.

Let me quote, Sir, from these Minutes which are attached to the Report, at page 104: "Mr. Taitt said it had been agreed that parish boundaries would not be an inhibiting factor." Do not let him go and tell the public anything else. Let the newspapers and the Press quote those words, otherwise they are not reporting fairly.

Sir, I said I had a few points to make, and having spoken already on Friday on this matter, I am prepared to rest now. I do not like debating to myself, I want them in here to face me. They have never come in here and faced me and argued yet. When I was finished with them none of them ever got up yet and argued back with me. The records of this House are there to show when I am through with them they either walk out, as they did in the Budget this year, when I was finished with them and I told the people don't stop this party, they packed up all their papers and walked outside. I want them in here to face me. I will leave the rest until I can deal with them face to face, not on any platform, I want them in here, Sir.

You see, the walk out today on this Bill is carefully managed. They want to be able to go out and tell the people now that there is confusion in the Democratic Labour Party, now that the member for St. Lucy and the member for St. Michael South West are being accused in their own party of selling out and being concerned only with their private interests to make sure that their constituency boundaries were satisfactory to them, now that there is war in the camp of the Democratic Labour Party over the role played by the two members of the Select Committee, they cannot face the public properly, so they walk out to go and tell the people they were not given a chance to talk about it, or they did not have any part in that. It is the same tactic that the Leader of the Opposition has followed for all the years when there has been a debate in this House concerning the salaries payable to representatives of the people. Every time there is a debate he is not present.
3.15 p.m.

Sometimes he is present in the Island. On other occasions he would leave the Island but he always want to be able to tell the people I did not have anything to do with giving myself anymore money. I was not there. I do not know what they are talking about but he has never yet given back any of the increase that he has got. He ran out of the Island and drew the money behind his back like that.

Now let us be fair. The Attorney General has given the theoretical and practical basis to justify an increase in the seats. As I said on another occasion, Bermuda does not even have 50,000 voters and they have 40 MP's and people are walking around Barbados wanting to make an issue out of a country that has 164,000 voters having 27 representatives. It shows the level, in the words of the Prime Minister, that politics is being trivialised and the immature arguments are being passed off in this country and the people, I believe so, themselves understand that it is an increase that is not going to adversely affect the financial position of the country. If it is going to have an effect it is to redound to the better representation of the Island as a whole.

Before I sit down, I would like to know from anybody in this House if they have ever been able to find out why in 1976 preparation was made in this House of Assembly for certain additional microphones and seating capacity. I would like to know if they ever found out why just before we got into power additional microphones were requested and there is still one there, Sir. There is still one there, 25. They have not completed the job. If they had got back into power we would have seen how many they would have had. It is well-known, Mr. Speaker, they had in mind a House of 36, well-known, and I challenge them to deny it that in 1976 the Democratic Labour Party had in mind increasing the House membership to 36.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a small increase in the number of seats is, from a financial point of view, of no great moment. As I have said, the case for a small increase is overwhelming. If the Dems cannot find 27 people of any quality to run, that is there business but that has nothing to do with the principle, Sir, and I support this Bill 100%, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wants to make a contribution? The Hon. Prime Minister can wind up.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I want to be very short, Mr. Speaker. I will deal with the point about the parish boundaries first. The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Rt. Hon. member for St. John has a bee in his bonnet about parish boundaries. It is a bee which was buzzing around because of the absence of knowledge in the area of his skull in which he is operating.

It is a straightforward matter of law and the interpretation of statutes. The repeal of a Statute does not repeal its provisions in so far as they have been incorporated into other Statutes. It is a matter of law. He has

seen many of it from his years in the books and he is ignorant. I am sorry he is not here. I am sorry that he is not around so that I can tell him he is ignorant and he should be ashamed of himself because some poor foolish Lawyer is going to get up in the Magistrate's Court and is going to object to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate of District "A" on the grounds that the Parish Boundaries Act is abolished and he is going to be made to look very stupid by the Chief Justice or indeed by a Magistrate if the Magistrate gives some thought to the matter.

The point about the Bridgetown/Speightstown–Holetown Act is that that Act defines the boundaries of Bridgetown, Speightstown, and Holetown. We have not had any difficulty dealing with Bridgetown as a Constituency although the Bridgetown-Speightstown and Holetown Act is repealed. The description of boundaries still refers to the City of Bridgetown and the only place you will find the City of Bridgetown defined is in a repealed Act but it still remains the City of Bridgetown because the boundaries have been incorporated by reference into the Representation of the People Act.

If the hon. member thinks that some opening has been made for his argument, he should look at the old definition of the Bridgetown Boundary and he will then realise that the same thing has happened before and that his argument was wrong then and it is wrong now.

Now as far as the points which he has made are concerned, and I really think I have to make these very carefully because I remember, Mr. Speaker, seeing after I spoke, I was told for one hour, seeing my speech dismissed on television in one sentence and the Leader of the Opposition's speech dignified in three and hearing then that the Reporter in question who sat down during my entire speech without taking a note and clearly was therefore unable when he came to meet the responsibility for which he is paid to recall the material upon which honest reporting and comprehensive reporting should be based.

As far as the number of seats are concerned, the Leader of the Opposition said that he is opposed to the increase because of the cost. I want to repeat what was said in the speech of the hon. member for Christ Church West. The Leader of the Opposition came into this House with a Resolution in 1954 calling on the Government to have one representative for every 3,000 voters. It was the 22nd of March, 1955. At that time he had got more than 3,000 votes in the parish of St. John. He got 3,002 votes when he was elected Senior Member for 1951 so he had to know that some constituencies had more than 3,000 people in them if he alone got 3,000. The number of voters in the 1951 Election was 96,000. The number of voters in the 1956 Election was 103,000. Now we hear some specious nonsense about he never said once that there should not be no more than 24 seats.

The hon. member has never proved to anybody in this House that he is a man but yet we call him Mr. Barrow when we are allowed to outside of the House. You draw a deduction from what people say, from what people do and from how they conduct themselves.
3.25 p.m.

I want to emphasise that we are now giving one member for every 6 000 voters and he has called on this House for one member for every 3 000 voters, and I am suggesting that any argument which says that to have 27 members in the House of Assembly for every 6 000 voters is an unfair burden on the taxpayers would have to be a hypocritical argument based upon the fact that he once wanted one member for every 3 000 voters. If we accepted his formula we would have 54 members in the House, not 27. He called for a number of voters that in today's terms would mean we would have to have 54, not 27, and I reject his argument utterly, completely and with contempt.

The question of the cost because he knows better, but there are people quite sincerely who believe that the cost is a great burden. I pointed out last Friday that it cost around $25 000 a year to maintain a member of Parliament, and I want to point out that when a motor car, an expensive Toyota or Datsun comes to this country, not to speak about Mercedes, that one of those cars carries enough customs duty and consumption tax to pay for an M.P. for a whole year. That is what I mean when I say that you are trivialising politics to assess the three extra seats in terms of the $75 000 a year that it will cost. When the Ministry of Education is spending $85 million a year on our children and the Ministry of Health is spending $60 million a year, to talk about $75 000 as imposing a burden is to talk nonsense.

The hon. member said that the democratic rights of the people of Barbados are being eroded. I have no doubt he made his speech in short form from a series of headings because his view of the intelligence of the reporters is that that is all they are capable of absorbing, and that if he makes a number of short points they will copy down those points and give full publicity to them, but I have a better opinion of the intelligence of the people who sit and listen as reporters in the House and I know that they are not going to report the speech of the Leader of the Opposition in short form if they have an opportunity of reporting its refutation comprehensively. I have never before heard any measure which increases people's representation in Parliament described as taking away their democratic rights. What the Leader of the Opposition is saying is that if you have more representatives in Parliament you are taking away people's

democratic rights. That is the argument not of a school boy but somebody who can't get into school, of an ignorant old man who has forgotten what student days are like. I am not suggesting that the hon. member for St. John is an ignorant old man.

As far as the comments on the enumeration again are concerned, we have to be tolerant of people once they have passed a certain age. He has made his mind up that he will never have a new ID card, never mind he passed an Act in Barbados saying that after eight years the Chief Electoral Officer can call on you to take a fresh picture. He himself had that Act passed and it is more than eight years since he had his picture taken. Well it is up to him, but I will promise him this, when the next election comes and you have to have one of the new ID cards, not the one in 1981, the one after that, you will have to have a new ID card, I promise that if it comes to the point and I am still in here, I will personally introduce an Act called the Errol Barrow Voting Rights Act authorising to vote although he has not complied with the law, just for him, just for his sake, because I believe in preserving ancient monuments.

No full enumeration of a proper sort has been carried out in Barbados for ten years. As a result of a full and complete enumeration the number of voters has increased to over 160,000. There are old people who voted in the 1966 election but who have never voted since because no photograph was ever taken of them. They have now been enumerated and there are a substantial number of persons, perhaps in excess of 5000 old people who effectively were disfranchised from 1966 to 1976 by the Democratic Labour Party but who will be entitled to vote again in Barbados at the next election. If this is taking away people's democratic rights, well we will have to re-write the dictionary. The hon. member says that the object of this Bill before the House is to extinguish the Opposition. We cannot extinguish the Opposition. The people can extinguish the Opposition. If the hon. member is afraid that putting Brereton into St. John will cause him to lose his seat, well I cannot help his fears, but there is one thing I know; no realignment of boundaries can send the voters to Trinidad or Grenada. You can only send the voters from one part of Barbados into another, and if they do not vote for Peter, they will decide not to vote for Paul. If they do not vote for David, they will decide not to vote for whoever the candidate is; they will decide not to vote for Goliath as the case may be. Again I cannot help that. The extinguishment of the Opposition is a matter for the electorate. No Government sets out to extinguish the Opposition. I see they have seen seven hon. members present. Really it would not break my heart if I saw five of them at least back in here or more. I am just mentioning that we like having an Opposition in here. The hon. member for St. Philip North has said that. I do not mean I only want them to win five seats, Sir. I am just commenting that there are five hon. members who contribute to debate most of the time in a rational and decent way.

Now the hon. member said that the previous fixing of the constituencies was on a basis where they were as equal as possible. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the end of 1970 as I have already pointed out, St. James had 5 716 voters and St. Andrew had 5 732. In the course of 1971 the hon. member took 800 voters out of St. Andrew and put them into St. James. If that was making seats equal, then he has not only re-written the dictionary, he has re-written the arithmetic book as well. That was a case if there ever was one of a naked gerrymander. Two constituencies, one with 1600 votes more than the other and the hon. member chose to take 800 out of one to put into the other. Now that is what is called gerrymandering.

I could give another example. Christ Church South Central at that time had 4 700 voters, Christ Church East had 4 143. 4 700 was a little too few for the average at that time and yet by the time of the general election of 1971 Christ Church South Central which was the seat for the present Leader of the House had 1 000 of its voters taken away so that it only had 3 789 voters at the time of the general election. That was what I called a gerrymander. It was deliberately made smaller so as to hazard and indeed to remove the seat from under Senator St. John as he became, the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister now. That is what I call gerrymander.

I want to emphasise this in the same way as the hon. member for St. Philip North has emphasised it: no member of the Democratic Labour Party on the Select Committee opposed the present boundaries.
3.35 p.m

They opposed the increase in the seats. They were asked if they had any objections boundary by boundary to the 27 seats and neither Mr. Taitt nor Mr. Greaves, the hon. member for St. Michael South West and St. Lucy, objected to any of the boundaries. It is in the Minutes which have been laid in the House. No member of the Democratic Labour Party on the Select Committee opposed the 27 boundaries. The hon. member for St. Michael South West asked us not to change the name of his seat to St. Michael West. That was the only objection he raised. Indeed, Sir, you will remember that perhaps the only boundary which caused any controversy in Committee was the boundary between St. Peter and St. James North, and corrections were made in Committee to that as a joint initiative, Sir, but in respect of the boundary

between St. Philip North and St. John, between St. John and St. George, between St. Michael South Central, South, East, Central, no objection was made to any of those boundaries in the Committee.

Now, the point about the Boundaries Commission, the hon. member said we have not set up the Boundaries Commission. The Boundaries Commission will be set up next month in the House, but I want to draw this to the attention of hon. members. The disparity between the numbers of the seats has grown very suddenly. In 1971 no seat had 7,000 voters and only three seats had less than 4,000 but they had very close to 4,000, so the range was 4,000 to 6,000 in 1971. By the time of the general election in 1976 Christ Church South Central had barely 4,000 voters, it had 4,008 voters, and St. Michael North East had nearly 8,000, so the disparity which was 4,000 to 6,000 in 1971 had grown from 4,000 to 8,000 in 1976. It is now 4,000 to 10,000, and clearly this was a disparity which could not be left for another election. That was our view.

The Boundaries Commission will necessarily take years to be set up and to make its first recommendations. The proposed legislation contains a recommendation that the Commission report two years after it starts it investigation for the Minister then to lay its report in the House and the House debate and decide on its recommendations. There has been no time for any Boundaries Commission to be set up to correct the imbalance between St. Joseph and St. Michael North West. St. Michael North West, Sir, has been divided into two constituencies. One of them, St. Michael North, contains nothing but former portions of St. Michael North West. The other, St. Michael North West, contains but small portions of other constituencies and has given up a piece to St. James. You will therefore see how big a constituency it was. It was bigger than Christ Church before it was divided up into four, so we could not let this go on, and we therefore had a Select Committee of the House to realign the boundaries which we will then hand over to the Boundaries Commission which will take up the torch for the 1985 or 1986 election, whenever it is held, the 1990 or 1991 election, and so on.

The Boundaries Commission will be set up, Sir, and it will, I hope, put an end to all this debate and all these arguments.

So I will summarise, Sir. The increase in the number of seats costs a minimal amount, a very small amount, and it cannot be faltered on the grounds of cost. The number of electors has gone up to 165,000 from 130,000 at the last election; you need more seats on that ground. The boundaries were fixed on the recommendation of the Chief Electoral Officer and no member of the Democratic Labour Party on the Select Committee objected to those boundaries. We are setting up a Boundaries Commission to take care of all this matter in the future. Democracy, yes, I say, Sir, hostility, opportunism, disruption, no, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this be the Schedule.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
3.45 p.m.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1 is the instant order of the day.

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Development Bank Act, Chap. 323.

Rt. Hon J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I refer to the Bill itself, I would like to say just a few words about the Barbados Development Bank which would assist hon. members in coming to conclusion on the provisions of the Bill.

I would draw to hon. members attention the 11th Annual Report of the Bank which was laid recently in the House by the Deputy Prime Minister but on which there was no debate. If hon. members see this Report, they will well understand the reason for the measure presently before the House which are a reflection of the need to expand the framework of the Bank for the purpose of letting it move to greater strength in the future.

Foremost among the items listed in the Report was that in the fiscal year, 1979–1980, the Barbados Development Bank was able to commit over $12.2 million or an average of over $1 million a month in loan approvals, an increase of more than 100%, nearly, indeed, Sir, 130% over the figures for the previous year. Four hundred and forty-three percent of this total was committed to industry which is in line with the Bank's determination to increase its contributions to the industrial sector, an emphasis which has the whole-hearted support of the Government.

I am sure, also, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members will be particularly happy to learn that these commitments by the Barbados Development Bank are expected to create nearly 600 direct job opportunities, 594 in all, an increase of almost 50% over the previous year. These, of course, does not represent the overall picture regarding employment for it is generally accepted that depending on the nature of the project, indirect jobs of both permanent and temporary natures can be 3, 4 or 5 times the number of direct jobs created. It will thus be seen that the Barbados Development Bank contributed to the creation and maintenance of more than 2,000 jobs, permanent and temporary, during the past year. The employment in construction alone is a very important contributor to the indirect employment.

During the year, also, Sir, the Barbados Development Bank signed a loan agreement with the European Investment Bank for $2½ million and the very favourable credit rating which Barbados enjoys ensures that such institutions, once they are as well run as the Barbados Development Bank will continue to attract all of the external funding which they require.

I would also want to draw to the attention of members of the House, Sir, the Bank's plans for a major new Headquarters in Bridgetown. The Bank is planning, with the approval of the Ministry of Finance, to construct a large Headquarters on a site in Hincks Street, at present occupied by a building known as Marshall Hall. This site is next to the shoreline just North of the Careenage and it is planned that the new building and a certain amount of reclamation will be carried on in concert. This is the site selected for the new Fishing Harbour and the fishing jetty with repair facilities for fishermen which will involve building out into the sea North of the Careenage.

The Bank's development, which will be extensive, will preserve the old Marshall Hall but it will also include a new structure with spaces both for offices and for letting for commercial purposes which will be in harmony with this new development. This is all part, Sir, of the Government's redevelopment of the whole of the Northern part of Bridgetown.

Nearby to the Bank's new Headquarters will be the new Post Office Building. A new Pelican Village is being built. Those who have occasion to drive that way will see the extensive road widening programme being carried on at Cheapside and Fontabelle in connection with the Spring Garden Road.

We can also see the extension at long last of the properties which front on to Fontabelle right out over the Harbour reclaimed land which once laid along Fontabelle Beach and the whole urban development programme in that area of the City, Sir, is now in high gear and will be given its final touches with the new BDB building and ultimately a new building also for the Industrial Development Corporation on the reclaimed land a little nearer to the Harbour.

In further recommending the Report of the Barbados Development Bank to the House, I would particularly draw to members' attention the Section which deals with the emphasis of lending to the industrial sector. I would also point out to industry and industrialists that the Government is placing its emphasis on the industrial sector because of the proven capacity of this section to manufacture for export.

We do not intend an inward looking industrial sector, Sir. We are aiming at a sector which can go out into the market places in the world and earn foreign exchange for Barbados without putting too great a burden of cost on the local consumer who all too often has to carry a heavy weight when import substitution industries come to the Island and the price of locally produced goods turns out to be more than the price of similar good imported into the Island.

This is a drawback, we know. Sir, but nonetheless we know it is the Bank's view that industry's capacity for growth is more open-ended and the sector has the most potential for the development of a dynamic export programme with the flexibility to respond quickly to diversified and changing demands of external and domestic markets.

3.55 p.m.

I would also want to make special mention of the Barbados Development Bank's plans for small scale enterprise, what is known as small business. On page 9 of the Report, Sir, will be found a picture of Mr. Ivan Straker with his diesel taxi financed through the BDB; on on page 10 you will find a picture of Mr. Ian Banfield next to the Holiday Inn pier with his cruise boat Irish Mist Cruises financed by the Barbados Development Bank; on page 11 you will find Wilson's Auto Rentals; page 12 you will find Forbes Craft Rattan Specialties. Perhaps that needs no addition. On page 13 you will find pictures of buses not just for the Transport Board but minibus bodies being built at Acme Manufacturing Company

financed by the BDB; also Barbados Tyre Centre Ltd. You will find File It Manufacturing Office Equipment. On page 15 Trevor and Cecil Brewster, a Bedford truck and a small bulldozer; on page 16 David Jones Mobile Canteen and George Ullyett's Machine Shop.

I am not reflecting on all these people whose names I am mentioning. You will find photographs of Mr. Raymond Peters and Mr. Henderson Green on page 17. They are the people who the Barbados Development Bank is helping in this year of 1980, small businessmen being given a break by this Government that they did not get before to make a living for themselves and to give some employment to our people.

Sir, the Bank expects to finance over 100 small projects during 1980 and 1981 with a total commitment probably for the small projects of $2 million. Its total lending commitment during this year – I would not like to say how far we will go – but we had aimed at $50 million for the whole year, we reached that by October and these last two months are in addition to that.

Now, Sir, the amendment to the Act now before you are indications of the maturing of the Barbados Development Bank and the contribution which it expects to make over the coming years. I have mentioned 1980 and 1981. In the shorter run, to take us up to 1983-84 the Bank has projected a lending programme of $87.4 million of which $63.7 will be funded externally. As I said earlier confidence in Barbados is high and we can get money from overseas. Never let us forget that when we took office, because of the racket with Bath Plantation, nobody outside Barbados would lend the Barbados Development Bank money, and we have only been able to get overseas funding since we have cleared Bath off our books, Commission of Enquiry and the lot, and the balance of $27.3 million will have to be financed from domestic sources.

Now, Sir, apart from the recoveries, that is, the money that people pay in and earnings, the major source of the Bank's funds are subscriptions of its development bonds and increases in the paid up capital. The Government is at present the sole shareholder of the Barbados Development Bank, but we are exploring other sources of equity financing compatible with the Bank's developmental objectives. First among these is likely to be the Central Bank which can be expected to be putting some money into the Development Bank very shortly.

Now these contributions to share capital accomplish a number of goals. There is a need for the equity of the Bank to be increased so that the borrowing which it anticipates from overseas and other sources will not exceed the prescribed debt equity ratio as it is called which I have set at 5:1. Another important factor, Sir, is that the loan ceiling of the Bank is tied to its paid up capital at a 15% ratio, and in order for the Bank to continue to expand its operations and to finance the cost of medium size developmental enterprises, the paid up capital must be increased. Machinery and equipment are products of the industrialised nations; they have to be brought in from abroad for our development and their cost continue to rise rapidly giving the major thrust of the Bank to the industrial sector. The Bank must therefore have the capacity to finance the increased cost of machinery and other capital assets and enhance the country's export promotion capability which is so essential to the overall structural transformation of Barbados into a full employment society capable of earning sufficient foreign exchange to remove the foreign exchange constraint from its development altogether.

I will also point out that increases in the Bank's share capital reduce the cost of funds to the Bank because an increase in the share capital is interest free and ultimately will improve its profitability. Later on today, Sir, the House will be asked to guarantee a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank to the Barbados Development Bank. The interest cost of this loan and all others like it continues to increase because of rising interest rates generally outside Barbados and of the rising per capita income in Barbados. This later tends to remove Barbados from access to soft loans that is low interest funds of international lending agencies. If we are to keep interest rates down to borrowers in Barbados, it is necessary for institutions such as the Barbados Development Bank to have access to low or no interest funds.

The second amendment to the Act now before the House in the Bill which is an amendment to section 31 is a very simple matter. It seeks to bind the Directors and the officers of the Bank too in the carrying out of their duties. It perhaps should be known that before the Barbados Development Bank publish the name or the photograph of anyone of their clients, they obtain that client's permission. We want to make it sure beyond any doubt that they have to observe the same secrecy conditions as do commercial banks, and this is the reason for the inclusion of the new section 31.

The third amendment in the Act which is an amendment to the Schedule provides for a change in the quorum for meetings of the Board. The number of members of the Board has recently been increased and I consider that a larger quorum would be in order. Difficulties have been found from time to time in obtaining a quorum for the Bank. With these amendments, Mr. Speaker, the Bank will be well directed on its course for the Eighties as the major development financial institution of the country, I repeat, our principal weapon in the move to full employment with no foreign exchange constraints.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

Om motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
4.05 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE OF A LOAN OF U.S.$7,750,000 FROM THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK TO THE BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BANK

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Resolution before the House seeks to guarantee loans to the Barbados Development Bank from the Inter-American Development Bank in a total of 7.75 million United States dollars.

The Barbados Development Bank in its time has attracted funds from the World Bank, The European Investment Bank and the Caribbean Development Bank, but the Inter-American Development Bank with a total commitment to the BDB now of nearly $14 million U.S. remains by far the major contributor to its external funding. The loan comprises, Sir, three elements. The first, which is a component of $5 million U.S. on the ordinary capital of the IDB for the financing of projects in the industrial and tourism sectors. The second amount comes from the Venezuelan Trust Fund, and the total is U.S. $2 million. This Fund is administered by the IDB. This component represents the first time that a specific allocation has been made by the Inter-American Development Bank to the BDB for working capital and it will provide very significant benefits to the enterprises to be financed by the Bank.

In the past, Sir, the projects which the Barbados Development Bank financed depended largely on the commercial banking sector in Barbados for the working capital needed to finance inventory and other short term requirements. What has not always been appreciated, even by the international lending agencies, is that working capital may have both long term and short term elements. Overdraft facilities, however, Sir, provided by the commercial institutions in Barbados to these enterprises often fluctuate upon facts and circumstances outside the control of the businesses that need the money. For example, Sir, the cash flow of the commercial banks happens at the moment to be exceptionally good, due to the generous settlement reached by the Government with the major Unions representing public service workers in Barbados, but it is not always so, and in recent years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen interest rate fluctuations of a size never before envisaged in Barbados.

The provision of this facility will now permit the Barbados Development Bank to provide a source of long term permanent working capital to match the needs of the enterprises which it finances in the industrial and tourism sectors. This is of particular importance to the industrial sector, because the tourist industry tends by and large to be a cash enterprise whose overdraft facilities are relatively limited. In the industrial sector, Sir, it is otherwise, and depending upon the length of the production cycle and the tourists' lean time, minimal order level, the credit policies of the suppliers, all these things the manufacturers have to think about, a manufacturer can have large working capital requirements and must be confident about the availability and the cost of his financing if his enterprise is going to continue to be viable.

The contribution of this new financing element will therefore be a very considerable one.

The third component of the loan, Sir, consists of 750,000 United States dollars for the purpose of financing the repairs and the renovations to be brought about consequent upon the damage done by Hurricane Allen last August. The funds will be on-lent to the Barbados National Bank for its agricultural and fisheries division which will be the executing agency for that component.

I wish at this stage, Sir, to pay public tribute to the two main Ministries and to the Prime Minister's Office under the Head of the Civil Service for the work which has been done in connection with rehabilitation after Hurricane Allen. The Ministry of Housing has carried out a quite exceptional job involving 12, 14 and 16 hour work days for its technical staff in repairing the hundreds of houses damaged after Hurricane Allen. I do not think that in any country from St. Lucia to the United States has the damage caused by a hurricane, particularly this hurricane, ever been repaired so quickly. Barbadians hardly even know that we were

struck by a hurricane whose winds reached full hurricane speed which damaged houses up the whole length of the eastcoast of the island and created havoc among something like 25% of our fishing fleet and did a great deal of damage to agriculture as well. 4.15 p.m.

A part of the reason why we have recovered so rapidly is because the Central Emergency Relief Office was able right away to set measures in train for rehabilitation after the Hurricane. The Ministry of Housing dealing with house repairs and the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries dealing with fishery repairs, rehabilitation for people whose chicken farms suffered and so on, moved into first gear and gave devoted service to hurricane relief.

To return to the main part of the Resolution, Sir, one of the reasons why we borrow these funds from overseas really needs to be adumbrated and emphasized on at some length. In industrial and tourism projects, a large portion of the costs incurred in building up a new industry come from external sources and it therefore represent an initial drain upon our foreign reserves. It is essential, therefore, Sir, that if we are going to expand our industrial plant and tourism plant that long term funds be obtained which can be repaid out of the foreign earnings of the enterprise finance.

In so far as these enterprises earn foreign exchange from the exports or reduce the level of imports by way of an import substitution, servicing of the external debt which the House is now being asked to guarantee will require very little drain on our foreign exchange in the future. Indeed, Sir, it is not unreasonable to expect that enterprises in the productive sectors at which this guarantee aims other than the rehabilitation loan will become net foreign exchange earners.

Barbados' foreign debt remains but a modest component of its overall debt and represents a small percentage of its gross domestic product. Servicing of its foreign debt is of such a low percentage, Sir, that we find ourselves really right down at the bottom of the table headed by such countries as Brazil and Jamaica who find that half or more than half of all of their foreign earnings just go to pay interest and repayment of their foreign debt. We are down at 2%, 3% and 4%.

Many worries have been expressed in recent months about the level of our foreign reserves and the prospects for our foreign earnings during this year and next year. Present projections I am very happy to say, Sir, are that this year we should end up with a small increase in our foreign reserves and our current account gap again will represent a very modest proportion of our Gross Domestic Product which at present, Sir, is being projected to reach the unprecedented figure of $1½ billion during 1980.

When we took office, Sir, it was 770 million, some figure like that. During the four years in power when we had this administration of the Government, our GDP appears almost to have doubled but we will have to wait on the out-turn figures to see that, Sir, so we feel that we can continue upon the path which we have charted so far and that this loan from the Inter-American Development Bank to the BDB is not only a safe risk to recommend to the House but it is an absolutely essential component in our continued economic progress as a nation.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, earlier today notice was given of the Defence Rate of Pay Regulations along with a number of other special Resolutions and it was intimated to the other side at that time that these Resolutions were necessary to implement the salary revision which we had debated on several occasions in this House but that in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act special Financial Regulations had to be passed to allow the implementation thereof. I heard no objection from the Other Side. This is one such. It is just a Resolution to approve the rates of pay. They are contained in the Regulations. There are three Resolutions, Sir.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

I beg to move that the House go into Committee of Supply to consider three Resolutions while they sort out the other things, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 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. ODLE in the Chair.
4.55 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980–81 No. 26

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution has a very full and amplified Addendum and this is purely for the purpose of supplementing this particular Head of the Estimates to take care of salary revisions and the increased cost of utilities since preparation of the Estimates.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980-81 No. 27

Head 76 – Ministry of Trade and Industry, was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in the Ministry of Trade a project is being carried out by the UNDP as part of a consultancy arrangement between UNDP and the Government of Barbados to provide technical assistance in monitoring the Mobil Exploration Corporation who are carrying out a seismic programme in Barbados.

In addition UNDP has provided us with consultancy services in respect of our petroleum legislation, the institution of the National Petroleum Corporation and the expansion of the natural gas services. Part of this money was to be financed by the Caribbean Development Bank. Because of the Financial Administration and Audit Act in Barbados, it is not permissible for the Barbados Government to pay money to the UNDP, which money will be recovered from the Caribbean Development Bank, without an appropriation of the Legislature. It was thought at the commencement of the Estimates that the Caribbean Development Bank would be able to pay the money on behalf of the Barbados Government direct to UNDP. We have been advised this is not permissible, so the total sum has to be voted by the Government, and we will be reimbursed by the Caribbean Development Bank.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980–81 No. 28

Head 44 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for $55 000 is to give the commercial workers at Parks and Beaches back pay. They are now being paid at the new revised rates by Government like any other Statutory Corporation over a period of time. The Parks and Beaches in its commercial section at this time cannot go back to people whom they have worked for before and ask them to pay us additional money so that we can pay people back pay. The workers therefore not having back pay like their counterparts became a bit disgruntled, and I must confess that I initiated the idea that they should be given back pay like any other person, and it is for this purpose that we seek this Resolution in the sum of $55 000.

There is not very much more which can be said about it. We have $55 000 to pay them. I think they are going to be paid on Friday and therefore this is only to supplement the Estimates for this amount of money.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House be now suspended until Friday, 19th December, 1980, at 2 p.m.

We all know the purpose of our suspension. It is to consider a Resolution of which notice has been given earlier today, and we will take Private Members' Business as the first order of the day, Sir, that Private Members' Business being the Private Members' Notice that was given by the Leader of the Opposition earlier today.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

4.35 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I move that Private Members' Business be now taken I would like to announce that before we rise tonight there will be a number of Notices we would like to give to the Hon. House in order that the Governor-General's Message can be read. It is in connection with a short leave; that is all, and there are two documents which we would like to lay formally on the Table. One is the Actuarial Report and the other is that of the Chief Medical Officer, so I do not want to interrupt the business of the day at all, Sir.

I beg to move that Private Members' Notices be now taken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION THAT THIS HON. HOUSE HAS NO CONFIDENCE IN HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution which stands in my name is not the first Resolution of its kind which has been moved by this side of the House during the Session which began in September, 1976.

First, I should like to say that although in the oldest Parliament in the British Commonwealth, the House of Commons, tradition has it that frequently the seat of the Speaker is never contested, the tradition has been broken on one or two occasions since World War II, but it is generally accepted that after the Speaker has been appointed by the representative Chamber that the Speaker ceases in all but formality to be a member of a particular political party. The Speaker then assumes the role of Presiding Officer over the deliberations of the Chamber, acting in times of dispute as a referee, maintaining order in the Chamber, and interpreting, frequently with the assistance of the Clerks at the Table, the Standing Orders of the House. It is therefore implicit in his acceptance of office that the Speaker forgets all previous commitments or affiliations and makes his rulings without any fear or favour and with the strictest impartiality.

Your Honour will remember that some time around 1945 – my recollection is of the case of Yuill and Yuill – the case which went to the Court of Appeal in England where counsel had to complain about the frequent interruptions of the conduct of the case by the Presiding Judge. In giving their judgment and sending the case back to trial, the learned Lords said that a Judge should never descend into the arena, because by doing so his eyes become clouded by the dust and the smoke of battle. The Judge should never descend into the arena, because by doing so his eyes are likely to become clouded by the dust and smoke of battle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what was being complained of in the case of Yull and Yull was not that the learned Trial Judge was taking sides, by that the Trial Judge descended into the arena, like we have a pastime in Barbados which young boys indulge in, particularly on Sunday mornings in the sea, called licking cork. In other words, they splash around, thrashing indiscriminately, not caring who you wet or who you happen to touch in the case of flailing your arms and your legs. What the learned Lords were saying in that case was this. They were not accusing the Trial Judge of taking sides, they were saying he should never get down in there, cross-examining witnesses, taking over the cross-examination even for both sides, because that was not his function. The function of a Presiding Officer, whether it is in a law court or in a debating parliamentary Chamber, is to make sure that the order is kept and to interpret the Rules and Standing Orders when the occasion arises.

The Judge is not to join in debate, as has happened frequently in this House, the Judge is not to suggest to one side or the other what motions should be brought, the Judge or Presiding Officer is not to put words in the mouths of witnesses, and the Chairman, Deputy Speaker or Speaker of a Parliament should not suggest to members during the course of debate words, particularly if those words are disparaging of their political opponents. All of these indignities have been suffered by the members on this side of the House. I am not for one moment saying that indignities may not have been suffered by members on the other side of the House, but the rare occasions on which the members on the other side have been the victims of misrule or misinterpretations have been few and far between, and those members have reacted violently to what they considered – when I say violently I do not mean physically violent, I mean vociferously, with the strength of their lungs over this infringement of what they considered to be their parliamentary rights. All the more, Sir, *a fortiori,* the members on this side who are a minority in this Chamber, and who are elected to represent the people, have every right to protest if before we even come into this Chamber, when we submit Questions within the statutory time, that is, by noon on Friday, that when we get the Questions and we are called upon on the following Tuesday, we are told either that we cannot ask the Questions at all, or the Questions have been so emasculated that one would hardly recognise the original content.

I have suffered this at the hands of His Honour the Speaker. I have had Resolutions refused. The Speaker takes it upon himself from time to time to be the editor of Resolutions and motions and Questions tabled by hon. members on this side. The most recent example that we have suffered on this side was when the hon. member for St. Lucy directed a Question to the Minister of Finance, a copy of which he has, and the Speaker deleted the address of that Question to the Minister of Finance and

substituted the title of the Minister of Communications and Works, with the result that the Minister of Communications and Works came in, in answer to those very important questions, and said that he did not know anything about the matter because he was not responsible for it.
2.10 p.m.

That is almost conspiratorial. I think that when I speak I try to speak as dispassionately as possible. I entered this House some time in December 1951 for the first time, and at no time from then until 1976 did I ever hear of a Speaker substituting Questions, changing the title of the Minister to whom the Question is addressed and doing matters of that kind. As a matter of fact, if you go through the Question Book, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will find that most Questions in the House are "To ask of the Appropriate Minister", and it is contumacious for anyone, a civil servant, the Speaker or anybody else to misdirect that Question to a Minister who can come in the House and say "well it is nothing to do with me" and that is the answer to the Question. It is almost contumacious.

In the senior Parliaments in the Commonwealth, when the Speaker is elected he is almost there for life because it has never been known in the 20th Century at any rate that any Speaker had so offended members of the House on either side that they have felt themselves constrained to move a vote of No Confidence in the Speaker. Every week there are at least three votes of No Confidence, particularly during the Budget time in the Government or a particular Minister, but never in the Speaker. In the first ten years that I was in this House we had no votes of No Confidence in the Speaker, although there were three or four political parties in this House. We had no votes of No Confidence.

In 1968 the first vote of No Confidence, either 1967 or 1968, was against His Honour Speaker Brancker when the late member for St. Joseph, Sir Grantley Adams and the now Minister of Housing were suspended from the service of the House for five consecutive sittings for what was then deemed to be ill behaviour. My recollection is that this was the first vote of No Confidence in the seventeen years I had been in the House off and on up to that time, and the complexion of the House has changed in every respect. We had the Progressive Conservative Party, the Congress Party, the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party, we had Speakers, but we never had different strokes for different folks that we are witnessing now. I think the hon. member who was at the receiving end of that discipline action would say that generally speaking, apart from the occasion on which he had reason to complain – and I am not joining him in the complaint, but I am saying that apart from that occasion, I do not think that the hon. member would say that he found the Speaker would join in the debate and tell people what to say, or when members object to certain words being used in the course of debate get on as if he had never even heard the hon. member or suggest that when an hon. member uses insulting words that he should insult hon. members in a nicer manner when the hon. member who is using the insulting words is being asked to withdraw the specific words which have been used.

This is not a frivolous matter, as he wanted to put it at the time, that by bringing a motion of No Confidence this is almost a contempt of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must refer to His Honour the Speaker as His Honour the Speaker.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Personal pronoun, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot refer to His Honour the Speaker as he.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: His Honour the Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, First to begin with, I think I will say at the outsetthat the beginning of this whole thing is that members on this side could not associate themselves initially with the appointment because our worst fears have been justified. Some members on this side exercised their democratic rights in saying why they could not associate themselves without in any way trying to embarrass anyone who was a member of this House. Immediately thereafter the then Leader of the Opposition found himself held up to ridicule and contempt on more than one occasion and finally decided that it was beyond the call of his christian duty to remain as a member of this House under His Honour the Speaker, and he made this quite clear as his reason for withdrawing himself from political activity in this country. Now the Speaker may consider that a great victory for him, but it was not a victory for democracy. And to add insult to injury, when the hon. member resigned the Speaker used the most disgusting, disparaging language that I have ever heard on the floor of this House from one hon. member to another, and these words came from the presiding officer of Parliament, His Honour the Speaker.

I don't know what His Honour has against me, but they say that if you want to make an enemy in Barbados, you have to do people a favour and they hate you for life for being in a position to do them a favour. I have not done any favours for anyone. Anything I do I do in the line of my duty or because I consider it my civic responsibility to do so, and I do not want to drag up anything at all. As far as the rights of members are concerned, I do not see how we can, to use an expression, make first base if when we submit Questions and Resolutions they are deleted and re-written and infrequently not allowed at all, so that they never see the light of day or come before public scrutiny.

I wish to say this, Sir. During the present session from time to time members on both sides, I do not mean all the members over there, but all the members over here and some of the members over there in the heat of debate may have overstepped the bounds of legitimate criticism. Some of them do it deliberately, not the Hon. Minister for Housing frequently, but some of them just in the heat of the debate get carried away, and on every occasion on which members have been called upon to withdraw remarks by His Honour which he deemed to be unparliamentary and which the hon. members on reflection themselves realised to be unparliamentary, hon. members have withdrawn. The Speaker is not dealing with an unruly House. I have been in unruly Parliaments in Barbados and this is not one of them, and I am very serious when I say this. This is not an unruly Parliament. This is a Parliament which has people of various attainments, but all of them with a certain amount of sense of responsibility in the discharge of their public duties.

2.20 p.m.

This is not an unruly Parliament, far from it so I am not being partisan in this matter at all but I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the Standing Orders and the breaches of interpretation of which we are categorically stating is the hallmark of the present Presiding Officer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you saying that the present Presiding Officer is misinterpreting the Standing Orders?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, not the present incumbent of the Chair because the present incumbent has not even attempted to interpret the Standing Orders because everything has been orderly so far according to the Standing Orders. No, Sir, His Honour the Speaker.

What I wish to draw Your Honour's attention to, Sir, and my other colleagues will continue to elaborate on is this question of calling upon people to apologise or even to withdraw remarks. There are Reporters. There are Tape Recorders. There are two Clerks at the Table and anyone in the Chair needing assistance can cause words to be read out so that members know exactly what is being complained against them, but on no occasion when we have asked "What are the offending words" have we been told.

On one occasion a member was forced to withdraw his whole speech but on no occasion when he had requested the offending words has His Honour the Speaker had recourse to the Reporters or the Clerk at the Table or have those words read out to hon. members. There are certain procedures in the Standing Orders and we do not know from day-to-day under what rules the game is being played metaphorically speaking, Sir.

The Speaker or the Chairman of Committee after having called the attention of the House to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition either of his own argument or of other members may direct him to discontinue and resume his seat so that is what is put upon a member who is recalcitrant in the debate. He is called upon to resume his seat and that is the end of the matter.

The Rules say what the Speaker should do and the Speaker should tell the hon. member "I am asking you to resume your seat because you are just not adding anything to the debate. You are just repeating what you have said before or what other members have said."

Now, secondly, Order 40, Rule 2 –:

"(a) The Speaker or the Chairman shall order any Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of that day's sitting."

If your conduct is grossly disorderly.

"(b) If, on any occasion, the Speaker or the Chairman deems that his powers under the previous provisions of this standing Order are inadequate, he may name the Member, in which event the procedure prescribed in paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this Order shall be followed.

3. Whenever a Member has been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman immediately after the commission of the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House, or otherwise, then if the offence has been committed by such Member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, "That.....be suspended from the service of the House". If the offence has been committed in Committee of the whole House, the Chairman shall forthwith suspend the proceedings of the Committee and report the circumstance to the House; and the Speaker shall, on a motion being made, forthwith put the same question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, as if the offence had been committed in the House itself.

5. If a Member is suspended under the provisions of this Standing Order, he shall be directed by the Speaker to withdraw from the House. His suspension shall last for two weeks on the first occasion, for three months on any subsequent occasion."

Now the reason why I read out these Standing Orders is this. There is no absolute discretion in any

Presiding Officer, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker or the Chairman of Committee to muzzle a member for the rest of his natural stay here in this House. There is a procedure to be followed.

The Speaker has no authority to tell a person he cannot speak in this House forever. I say, Sir, that I know that there is no provision in the Standing Orders whereby a Speaker can ban anybody for life, whether it is his life or the life of a person whom he wants to ban. Those are dictatorial powers which have not been adumbrated when these Standing Orders were committed to print and in no way cannot be found in any precedence in the House of Commons or any other place where rationality prevails in the deliberations of the people's business that you will find that any Speaker has banned anybody for life or told any hon. member who has been put in there by the people or his constituents to forever hold their peace, on a strictly personal basis that you have to behave like a school boy. There is no word "apology" in these Standing Orders anywhere.

If his Honour, the Speaker, is not satisfied with your conduct, he can ask you to withdraw for the remainder of the day's sitting. If you refuse to withdraw or you are adamant in your behaviour, he can have a motion made, but not by himself, but by the House and on one celebrated occasion when he called for a motion, nobody made the motion that the member be suspended from the service of the House and the Standing Orders put limitations.

Even in Criminal Law you will find that a person who commits an offence other than homicide in which he pays the supreme penalty that there is a maximum penalty and to make sure that there is a maximum penalty the Interpretation Act of Barbados which you know well, Sir, says that every penalty imposed by the Criminal Law of this Island has a maximum penalty and no Judge can invent penalties of his own and that is the point I am making so that when you come in you do not know the rules under which a debate is going to be played on that particular day or if there are going to be any rules at all.

That is why we say in our Resolution that the behaviour of the Speaker has been capricious, partial and unreasonable. Those are not provocative terms. Those are words describing the experiences which we have had since we have entered this Chamber and if we are to finish the rest of this session without there being some kind of commotion when people feel that they cannot get their rights, then that is the kind of atmosphere that you get commotion.

I do not want to see the mace thrown out of the window. The Mace is the symbol of the dignity of this House of law and order. The person who is to preserve the dignity of this House is the person who has been keeping indignities on the members of the House. *Quis custodiet ipsoscustodes?* When you put a drunkard in charge of a rum shop the sow is bound to get under the counter. That is a Barbadian expression.

When you put a watchman to watch the rum shop, who is going to watch the watchman, therefore, the watchman has got somebody upon whose integrity and abstinence you can rely and when I say abstinence in this sense I do not mean from any guidance. I mean abstinence from getting involved in political arguments and trying to keep indignities upon hon. members. The Speaker is there to prevent that kind of thing happening not to heap it upon hon. members and I am not giving you any explanation. I am not answering you.

Is this the price we have to pay for wanting to represent people in Barbados when we come in here, the place in which one of the first privileges claimed by His Honour the Speaker from the office presiding over the Government is the Right of freedom of speech and the right to access? He is the person who claims these rights and privileges for the Lower Chamber but he is not prepared as far as we can see to grant those rights and privileges to hon. members on this side himself.
2.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the duty – I am not saying the pleasure, Sir, His Honour the Speaker would probably say the pleasure if he had to turn the knife in anyone, but I am not turning any knife – I have the sad duty to move this Resolution:

> "WHEREAS His Honour the Speaker has carried out his duties in a capricious, partial and unreasonable manner;
>
> AND WHEREAS such actions constitute a breach of the rights claimed by him for all hon. members, and more particularly the rights of the minority, and is deserving of the highest censure;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this Hon. House has no confidence in His Honour the Speaker."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, without any hesitation I rise to second this Resolution. I do so because I am one of those hon. members who suffered tremendously at the hands of His Honour the Speaker, particularly in the way in which he has interpreted the Standing Orders. The members of the Opposition obviously cannot take the unfair and partisan actions of His Honour the Speaker any longer, and it is for this reason that we have found it necessary to bring this Resolution here today.

I recall in 1977, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I suffered at the hands of His Honour the Speaker and I contended from then up to today that I was unfairly suspended from this Hon. Chamber by His Honour the Speaker for, I think it was a period of three months. If one were to take the Standing Order which the Speaker

purported to have used on that occasion, Standing Order 40, it states very clearly that a Resolution would have had to be called for, and the Resolution would have had to be put by His Honour the Speaker without any amendment or adjournment or debate or anything like that, and I am contending that I was suspended unfairly without a Resolution being put and purely at the whims and fancies of His Honour the Speaker, and I am saying that this was unlawful as far as the Speaker was concerned.

The Speaker, when I asked what it was that I did that offended him, up to this day has not indicated what it is that I said. I was sitting in my chair, I was not speaking to the Speaker, I was making a comment to a colleague of mine, and yet Mr. Speaker found it necessary to suspend me unlawfully and contrary to the Rules of this House.

I recall when on that eventful day of the opening of this Parliament in October 1976 the Opposition took the view that the hon. member for St. Peter who was then being proposed for the high office of Speaker of this Hon. Chamber was not a fit and proper person to hold that office, and that is contained in the records of this Chamber, and indeed the arguments which were advanced by the members of the Opposition on that occasion, show very clearly the reasons which we used to substantiate the position which we were taking on that particular occasion.

I happen to recall a rather disparaging editorial which was written in the Advocate News, which is also contained in the records of the House, on the occasion of that debate, because as I recall it was read into the records of the Chamber and the Speaker was likened to a fast bowler who was called for chucking and who had a suspect action, and it would as if the predictions on that particular occasion have now really come true. I remember that we were taken to task, as the Leader of the Opposition said, when the then Leader of the Opposition led an attack in trying to resist the election of the present incumbent to the post of Speaker of this Hon. Chamber, but history has a very interesting way of revealing events, and I am sure that now that the people have had an opportunity to see His Honour the Speaker functioning, to see the dictatorial way in which he manages this Chamber, the oppressive manner in which he conducts the business of this Chamber, one must come to the conclusion that the Opposition on that occasion was right in the position which it took.

We have been very concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the many occasions on which His Honour intervened in debates in this Chamber. Certainly any right thinking persons could not accept that that is a proper role and function of any Speaker, but our Speaker seems to think that this is what he has to do. Quite recently I had the opportunity to suffer another unfair, in my view, act inflicted on me by His Honour the Speaker, and I want to say very clearly that even although we have to identify these events in a personal way, we take the view on this side that when the Speaker behaves and acts in the way that he does, it is not so much that he is acting in that way against us as individuals, but he is certainly showing contempt and disrespect for the people who have elected us to come here and to speak on their behalf, because when we bring Questions to this Hon. Chamber or when we bring Resolutions to this Chamber to be debated, we do this not from any personal point of view but purely from the point of view of trying to ensure that the nation's business is conducted and certainly that people in this country get to understand certain issues with which this country is confronted from time to time, and indeed we seek answers to questions which might be questions that are being asked by people throughout the length and breadth of this country.

2.40 p.m.

We have constituents whom we represent and when we come here with Questions and Resolutions, we do so on their behalf, and if His Honour the Speaker finds it possible to alter, reject or change fundamentally any of the Resolutions or Questions, as long as they are not offensive offending the rules of the House, then we are saying that he is displaying contempt for the people of this country.

Let me give you a recent example of my experience with His Honour the Speaker. I have here a copy of a Question which I handed in to His Honour the Speaker on the 28th November, 1980. The Question was addressed in the following way: "To enquire of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister", and the question related to the Cadillac Seville which was bought for use by the Prime Minister, and in the Speaker's handwriting – I have the original which I submitted and which he changed and initialled – the Question was misdirected to the Minister of Communications and Works, and this was done by His Honour the Speaker. Now I am very annoyed that the Speaker could do something like this, and I have therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, today handed a letter to His Honour the Speaker which I will read and make a document of this Honourable Chamber.

"19th December, 1980.

His Honour the Speaker,
House of Assembly,
Public Buildings,
Bridgetown.

Dear Sir,

On 28th November, 1980, I handed in a question to the Clerk which sought certain information from the Prime Minister relative to the Cadillac Seville MP- 1. On Tuesday, 2nd December, the Question was returned to me with certain changes in the structure and more importantly with the Question being directed to the Minister of Communications and Works instead of the Prime Minister.

I enquired from the Clerk about the author of these changes and was informed that these were done by Your Honour. The changes had the effect of misdirecting the Questions and denying the House and the public an opportunity of receiving information of vital and national importance since the Minister of Communications and Works stated in reply that he could not answer the Question.

Needless to say, Sir, I am very disappointed at Your Honour's action in this matter. As you are aware members of the Opposition have on several occasions questioned the manner in which Questions and Resolutions which they have submitted have been changed.

If possible I would appreciate an explanation by Your Honour.

I remain,
Yours faithfully"

Now I think that this action by the Speaker as indeed other actions which I have outlined and which will be outlined by other members of the Opposition no doubt are cases of blatant, irrational, unreasonable and incompetent behaviour on the part of His Honour the Speaker. It would seem to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that His Honour has become intoxicated with his own importance and mad with the powers which he believes are vested in him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw the reference to madness.

Mr. GREAVES: I beg to withdraw the reference to madness, but I would say that he has become off-balanced with the powers which he believes are vested in him. I feel very strongly about this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker because there is no other hon. member in this Chamber who has suffered as I have suffered at the hands of His Honour, and I contend that in nine cases out of ten he has dealt with me in an unfair manner, and that is why I said at the very outset that I have no hesitation whatsoever in seconding the Resolution which states very clearly that we are of the view that His Honour the Speaker has carried out his duties in a capricious, partial and unreasonable manner.

I seem to recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that from a historical point of view the Speaker in the House of Commons, and since we take our precedents from the House of Commons, has always been regarded as a person who claims the right of freedom of speech and privileges on behalf of hon. members of this Chamber. I further seem to recall that the Speaker in those ancient times and certainly the tradition has been carried down was regarded as the protector of the people's liberty. I am sure you will recall the historical incident in which I think it was a King of England sought to enter Parliament to give directions to Parliament about certain matters which were before Parliament, and the Speaker on that occasion indicated to the Crown that he could not enter Parliament to give any directions unless he was invited by the Speaker to do so. So that the office of Speaker traditionally was one which was associated with the preservation of liberty and rights and privileges and these kinds of things, but we have, as I said, degenerated to a situation where we have in this Honourable Chamber a Speaker who does not see it fit to recognise that people have a right to speak as long as any speech or comments are done within the bounds of decency and certainly within the bounds of the Standing Orders by which we are guided in this august Chamber.

We of the Opposition feel strongly about this particular matter. I can go on and list many other instances of partiality and unreasonable behaviour on the part of His Honour, but I believe that by the examples which I have shown I have certainly been able to give some fundamental and important justification to the text and the content of this particular Resolution. I am sure that other hon. members on this side will be in a position to extend on the matter which we are discussing and certainly will be able to give support to the position which has been taken by the members of the Opposition. There is no doubt that the Opposition has no confidence, absolutely no confidence in His Honour the Speaker. Our past experience leads us to this point of view and we are therefore using whatever opportunity is available to us to point out the unreasonable, capricious and partial behaviour of His Honour, and it is for this reason that I said at the outset that I have no hesitation whatsoever in seconding this Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to indicate from the other side that it is not surprising to some of us on this side that this Resolution has come from the other side. All of us who are members of this House can well recall that from the very day that we had to elect a Speaker, the then Leader of the Opposition indicated in no uncertain terms their contempt for the Speaker.

2.50 p.m.

I well recall the abusive speech of the then member for St. Michael South Central. I will ask for the debates of that particular period of time to be brought to me by the officer of this House so that I can quote clearly from the speech of the then Leader of the Opposition. The trouble with the other side is that they started out by insulting and abusing the hon. member for St. Peter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am very interested in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, the now Leader of the Opposition. I have never heard the present Leader of the Opposition endorse the remarks of the previous Leader of the Opposition. I know that the present Leader of the Opposition understands the hon. member from St. Peter and the Speaker of the House.

He understands very clearly that you are dealing with a gentleman who may be suffering from different conceptions of behaviour and attitudes to the modern conceptions. After all the hon. member for St. Peter had at some stage of his life been a school teacher, was a policeman and therefore interested in law and order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not expect the present hon. member for St. Michael South Central to understand and appreciate that fact because if ever there is a person who has contempt for the law and order it is him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That remark must be withdrawn that an hon. member of this Chamber has contempt for law and order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I will graciously withdraw that remark, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But, Sir, I understand the difficulty of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central because the present member, I know he has a lack of appreciation of the importance of law and order. There is, Sir, nothing that I have heard so far from any member on the other side which would justify the Government supporting this Resolution.

Let us get this clear, Sir. Any Speaker in a Parliament like Barbados finds himself in an exceedingly difficult position because we as a community has a strong history of rebellious conduct. I well recall, Sir, in the period of time between 1966 and 1971 in which my friend, the hon. member for St. James, had his difficulties with the then Speaker. I well recall the terms of the Resolutions that were moved when we were on the other side against the then Speaker by no lesser a person than the elder statesman in the Caribbean, the hon. member for St. Joseph at that time, the late Sir Grantley Adams.

It is the function of the Opposition to try to keep themselves before the public eye all the time. That is all this motion is about. This is a motion designed to cover up the difficulties that the hon. member for St. John finds himself in as a result of the Boundaries Commission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This is nothing but an attempt to raise a smoke screen in the political arena of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. No hon. member can impute improper motives on a member who has moved a Resolution. That is a fundamental principle. I am enjoying the speech of the hon. member. I have never been so entertained in my life.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no. What is your point of order, please?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: My point of order, Sir, is that an hon. member cannot impute improper motives of this or any Resolution by saying that it is nothing else than a smoke screen. That is all I am saying.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not imputing any improper motives. What I am saying is that the hon. member's Resolution is motivated by the highest motive because it is the function of the Opposition when they are in difficulties. That is all I am saying.

Now we know, Sir, that for a long period of time not only did the Opposition have contempt for the Speaker, they had contempt from the very beginning. From the very beginning the then Leader of the Opposition sought to rake up the past history of the Speaker, despite the fact that he had paid his debts to society (ASIDES). Yes, the then Leader of the Opposition indicated clearly.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member who is speaking will not himself be permitted to rake up any past.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: With respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not raking up any past. I am dealing with the attitude of this Opposition in respect of His Honour, the Speaker. I am saying as a fact that on the 6th October, when we came in here that the Opposition made it clear that they were opposed to the present Speaker. They said he was unsuitable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Exactly what I mean. You do not start off by indicating clearly that you will treat with contempt anything that the Speaker does and I am saying, Sir, that that attitude has coloured the conduct of all of the hon. members of that side from the very beginning. They cannot be objective in this respect. It was indicated earlier that they would treat the Speaker with contempt.

I want to say this. The Speaker, the hon. member for St. Peter, has exercised a remarkable degree of tolerance having regard to their pronounced attitude, a remarkable degree of tolerance. I also want to say this. I agree 100% with the conceptualisation of a Speaker as put forward by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The only thing is this, Sir, that neither when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was Premier and Prime Minister nor

now have we been able to decide in our minds how we can reconcile within the context of Barbados our political view on what a Speaker should be and what, in fact, we expect him to be.

We say he must carry out the office as if he is not a member of a political party and all of us from the time he is elected, all of the political parties have been promoting candidates to run against him. We say that we are not accepting the British tradition that we will not contend his office but at the same time we expect him to behave as if he were a Speaker under Westminster without accepting the conventions that do not contest his office.
3.00 p.m.

Now we cannot blow hot and cold. It may well be that either we decide in our minds as a basic of pure logic that having agreed upon a Speaker we are not going to contest his office, or we do like some other countries and say as far as the Office of Speaker is concerned, that office will be filled by a person who does not have to face the electorate. We cannot blow hot and cold. That is a fundamental point that we have to decide upon.

Secondly, Sir, I think it is very important also that the public know that there is a Rules Committee of this House. I believe that attempts have been made to circulate each and every member of Parliament for suggestions as to amendment of those Rules. When I hear this talk about when we get back into power, I do not know when though, when we get back into power we will change the rules, this Parliament has intimated to the Clerks at the Table that we feel the Rules should be reviewed, and we have asked the Clerks at the Table to circulate all members with suggestions for the review of the Rules. We have had none from that side, absolutely none from that side. I welcome any contribution at this stage from any member on that side on a reform of the Rules. I do not want to be muzzled in Parliament, I have had the privilege of being in Parliament for a reasonable period of time. I have never yet been sent out, I have disagreed on many occasions with rulings, but so in the course of my 25 years I have disagreed with rulings of a Judge. The hon. member for St. John would know that we had a famous judge here in Barbados at one stage who used to start off by making you apologise before you could address him.

On this question of apology, it takes nothing off anybody to make an apology. I well recall a precedent in Guyana where no less a person than one of the Luckhoos, Q.C. was called upon in court to apologise and he had the idea, like I hear projected, that the court had no power to call upon him to apologise, and the judge just simply said that he could not hear him until he had apologised. He said, "the first thing you have to do is to apologise and then I can hear you on why you must not apologise," so this is all spurious argument. Parliament in Barbados, like Parliament at Westminster, is one of the courts of the land.

I hear a lot of talk about arbitrary powers in relation to presence in here; all of this talk I hear. I want to make it positively clear. The Government's point of view is that the reports and proceedings of this Parliament should be made public. If there is an issue between any particular person and the Speaker, let us deal with it parliamentary wise, but what I also want to make clear is, that if you decide you are going to challenge the powers of the Speaker in the law courts you have to wait until the law determines the situation before you can expect to get parliamentary position. If you decide that you are going to challenge the Speaker in the law courts of Barbados, get your lawyers to bring on your case. Your case is within your conduct, do not write nasty articles in the newspaper about these things. If you decide in your mind you want to challenge the powers of the Speaker in the law courts, go to law. If you want to go to law, you have the High Court, you have the Court of Appeal and you have the Privy Council. I believe you will get meat with the Granada case in the Privy Council, but you can go ahead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we as parliamentarians – because this is no party matter now – the Government made its position clear. The Attorney General on this side made the position clear. The Opposition has every right to bring this motion, if that is their feeling. If you want to bring the motion. The Government is anxious to have a debate on it, because we want to enlighten the public on the fact that an Opposition is entitled to bring a motion of no confidence. If they say that the rules are wrong, if they say that the rules allow too much discretion to the Speaker, I say this, that is a matter within the domestic jurisdiction of Parliament. Bring forward your suggestions for the amendment to the rules. I have seen none from you, absolutely none. Of course you may have a difficulty, the hon. members on the other side may have a difficulty now.

I well recall the irresponsible position adopted by the then Leader of the Opposition when he got into Parliament and said it is no use asking us to co-operate with you on any Committee, we shall not be co-operating with you. They are the victims of their own stupidity in relation to parliamentary life in this country. They are the victims, they failed to recognise that in the Westminster system of Government there have to be some areas where you must forget the fact that you belong to different political parties, but that

the system can only operate if there is a fundamental agreement on what Sir Roy Marshall used to say, the postulates of the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy. You have to agree to participate in the Committees of Parliament if you want to improve the workings of Parliament. You have to do it. Learn about that. If you say that the Speaker is not fit to be Speaker, and you honestly feel so, and I know you feel so, it will communicate in your behaviour. The psychologists understand this, you know.

Let us take the hon. member for St. Michael South. He says he is not apologising because he does not know what he must apologise for. Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South, after the Speaker had explained to him, not on the last occasion, a long time ago, he was so embroiled, he was so hot that he even forgets, and I will recall it for him now, because I will tell you what you have to apologise for. I know the hon. member, and when I tell him what he has to apologise for, I am sure he will say he will apologise for that, because it is no big thing. He felt on that occasion that he was wronged by the Speaker. He felt so, I am not saying with or without justification, and he was arguing on a point, he was a little irrelevant, and the Speaker was pointing out to him that he was irrelevant. 3.10 p.m.

The hon. member, feeling in his mind that the Speaker had wronged him, addressed the Speaker "you, you, you stopped me from speaking on Grenada earlier today." The Speaker got up and said the hon. member must withdraw those remarks and apologise to hon. members. The hon. member walked out and forgot that. You were wrong in the way that you addressed him as "you". You cannot address His Honour the Speaker, the honourable representative for St. Peter, as "you". You are wrong. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please! Please continue.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You can't do that. On that point alone you are wrong. I know that there is nothing in that. I know the hon. member with his facility for language would say "I deeply apologise", forgetting that His Honour the Speaker should be addressed as His Honour. What are we talking about apologise? Apologise what! The point is that you wanted to get across your point. That is what you should be apologising for, addressing His Honour as "you".

Secondly, you must not challenge his ruling about Grenada even though you may feel that he wronged you. You must bring a Resolution and say he was wrong and let us debate that. You must not do it that way. You must remember that all of us have different ideas and different conceptions about our powers and our dignity.

Now, Sir, for the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I recall that so clearly. I am sorry that the hon. member for St. Philip South is not here. The hon. member for St. John is not going to, in the present state of his party, corroborate me. I would know why. But on that occasion there were a lot of girls from St. Leonards in here. The hon. member was parading. Relevance or irrelevance was nothing to do with him; his present intention was impressing his constituents' potential or presence. (A VOICE: That is a crime?) It is not a crime, especially if you are a professional politician. That is never a crime. The constituents are the ones who put you here and the Speaker was telling him let us deal with the debate, let us deal with the debate. *(Asides)* It is not a question of whether he said it or not. The point is that a man's mind can be so consumed and so overtaken by his particular intent that he is oblivious to what is going on around him. This is a wellknown psychological problem. I believe the hon. member said he never said so because he did not hear him, but there is none so blind as those who would not hear or can't hear, and this is all of this issue now. That is the whole issue now, all these rights, because all hon. members on specific occasions got themselves into hot water, but they were so involved in what they were doing that they forgot. It takes nothing off an hon. member.

The past master, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of difficulties with the Speaker is my friend the hon. member for St. James. I have no doubt that when he speaks he will lay bare his grievances. I think as a whole though we must come to this conclusion: whether we agree with all of the rulings of the Speaker or not, it does not matter. The basic position is that no one can say that in the course of our four and a half years we have not had an opportunity to express our points of view. We have had our disappointments, but I know that this is the second session that I have ever had the privilege of being a member of this House. There are some things wrong with the Rules of this House. The Government is willing to summon a meeting of the Rules Committee at any time to tighten up or straighten out the Rules of the House. We welcome any suggestions from the other side.

I do not feel, Sir, I really do not feel that on any objective analysis of the course of debates in the course of this House that this Resolution is deserving of support of hon. members, and I invite hon. members to reject the Resolution.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have on many occasions heard the hon. member for Christ

Church South Central speak in this House, and I believe that if you wish a speech which was supportive of this Resolution, then indeed all the elements can be found in that speech despite the conclusion which he eventually came to, and perhaps it can be best summed up in his own words that there is none so blind as those who would not hear or cannot hear. There are none so blind as those who would not hear or cannot hear; his exact words. In other words, that is the confusion in the hon. member's mind. He knows that he cannot come in here and take certain positions with a degree of force that he normally speaks in Parliament, and you find him at one minute walking with one foot stretched in this direction, another one stretched out in that direction and eventually falling flat on his you-know-what, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

He said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it all sprung from an insult and abuse of a former member of Parliament. He said that there were different conceptions of behaviour to be expected from His Honour the Speaker, because he was a teacher, a law enforcement office and no doubt other aspects of his career. He said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Barbados has a long history of rebellious conduct, of which I am not aware, and that the only purpose of this motion is to bring the Democratic Labour Party before the public eye. He even conceded that we should start looking for a new type of Speaker, and of course he failed to put the question of an apology in its true perspective.

I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not like to repeat in Parliament what members say to me in the Lobby of this House, but I remember on one occasion drawing to the attention of a member on the other side the difficulties being experienced by the Opposition and the challenge of a democratic process inherent in these difficulties, and that if something is not done about it, then the democratic processes of Parliament and Barbados would be destroyed, and the reaction was that one man out of twenty-four cannot destroy the parliamentary processes of this country.

This Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is brought because we are acutely aware that all members of this Parliament believe in the democratic process and we not only believe in democracy, we believe in a parliamentary type of democracy. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no Parliament can function unless there is freedom of speech, and I intend to quote from Erskine May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament at page 73.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: From which edition is the hon. member quoting?

Dr. HAYNES: This is the Nineteenth Edition. "Freedom of speech is a privilege essential to every free council or legislature." Later on: "There can be no assured government by the people or any part of the people unless their representatives had unquestioned possession of this privilege, that is, the privilege of freedom of speech."
3.20 p.m.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that over the past two and a half years or so since I have had the honour to be in this House, that that privilege of freedom of speech has been curtailed on numerous occasions by His Honour, the Speaker, and indeed I myself feel that such a man as His Honour, the Speaker, must understand that it is not only a matter of the preservation of the democratic process but is a matter that is fundamental to justice.

He himself must know that when he himself sought in the Law Courts in this country to obtain justice, he obtained justice but although his physical body might have been relieved from the place where it was sent, it would appear that his mind remained there and hence these expressions of sadism within this Chamber as we see manifested from time to time in this Parliament.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no way that if any Speaker of this Honourable House ask me to apologise for anything and I do not feel like apologising that I will apologise and I say this for this reason. There are rules. There are Standing Orders made under the Constitution of Barbados. These Standing Orders made under the Constitution of Barbados do not and specifically do not provide, Standing Order No. 40 does not provide for any form of apology.

What it does provide for and I made a brief note of it. The Hon. Speaker may ask a member to discontinue his speech and resume his seat. The hon. member may ask an hon. member to withdraw a remark. If he does not withdraw a remark he will ask the hon. member to withdraw for the day's sitting and this is the extent of the disciplinary authority of the Hon. Speaker of this House. Anything beyond that he has to name the member. When the member is named then it becomes a matter for Parliament. It is a matter for Parliament. It is a perfect democratic process that has been outlined by the Standing Orders.

The question of suspension of a member, the question of expulsion of a member, the question of depriving a member of any rights in this Chamber apart from the rest of the day's sitting does not reside with the Hon. Speaker but resides with the House itself and in my judgment, usurpation of that right by the Hon. Speaker of this House is a contempt of Parliament. The Standing Orders are there.

There is also in another convention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that where our Standing Orders are not clear, where these are not clear then we look for other precedence. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have gone through May's with great detail on this particular matter and there are some very interesting things that I have come up with. Page 435 "In the Commons the Speaker possesses certain general powers under ancient usage, and he has been armed by modern Standing Orders with precisely defined summary powers which largely supersede those exercised both by the Speaker and the House itself under the ancient practice."

It goes on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, "The ancient usage has been so modified by recent Standing Orders which cover the majority of cases likely to arise as to be largely inapplicable".

It was under the ancient usage of Parliament which has been largely superseded by the modern Standing Orders of a modern British Parliament that the question of an apology as part of a disciplinary process existed and under the new Standing Orders, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it says clearly here "when any disorderly or unparliamentary words are used whether by a member who is addressing the House or by a member who is present during a debate, the Speaker intervenes and calls upon the offending member to withdraw the words. If the member does not explain the sense in which he used the words so as to remove the objection of they being disorderly or retract the offending expression and make a sufficient apology for using them, then the Speaker repeats the call for explanation and informs the member that if he does not immediately responds to it that it would be the duty of the Chair to take one or the other of the steps about to be described."

In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, His Honour, the Speaker, is within his rights to ask a member to withdraw any unparliamentary expression. He is also within his right to ask him to apologise. He can ask him to apologise. He can ask him to stand up on his head. He can ask him to stick his two fingers in his ears for the rest of the afternoon. He can ask him to do anything that he likes. It is a question of whether the rules permit that kind of disciplinary action.

In other words, if the Speaker asks someone to apologise and he does not, the Speaker can ask him to withdraw for the rest of the sitting. If the Speaker deems it a more severe offence in the absence of withdrawal or an apology, according to the laws of Barbados, according to the Standing Orders, according to May's Parliamentary Procedures, according to British Parliamentary Procedures, he has to go along the lines of the Standing Orders. He has no further powers.

He has no powers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to tell anyone that they cannot come in here until they apologise. He has no power to refuse to hear anyone unless they apologise. This is dictatorial. This is unheard of in any Parliament. In other words, giving a member the opportunity to apologise could only be a mitigation of any step that a Presiding Officer might wish to take.

You cannot make a member's seat conditional by making an apology. Let him name the member. Let him follow the rules. He cannot behave in this kind of capricious manner whenever he likes to do so in Parliament because fundamentally what happens is that the entire Parliamentary process within this country will be totally destroyed.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope I have dealt in some detail with this question of an apology and dealt with it very thoroughly. It can be asked for but if a member does not give an apology you take what disciplinary steps you have to take. That is, Mr. Speaker can send him out for the day or he can name him and call on the House for other action to be taken. A suspension for two weeks in the first instance, a month in the second instance, three months in the third or any susbequent instances and I think that Standing Order even has a further saving clause which says that none of the foregoing prevents the House, Section 10 of Standing Order No. 40, nothing in the foregoing prevents the House from taking any action that it might deem fit but that authority is vested in Parliament. It is vested in the rights of the people and therefore vested in the people themselves and not vested in the Presiding Officer of the House.

I hope that fixes once and for all the question of an apology because it is unlawful to deprive anyone to enter this Chamber or the right to speak because he would not make an apology to any man. Let him preside according to the Rules of the House, not according to any kind of antiquated presumptions made under the British Parliamentary System which have been replaced by modern British Standing Orders and by which we will be guided.
3.30 p.m.

Many members on the other side, I am sure, have been in great doubt about the two standards of this business of an apology, and I trust that I have clarified this now in no uncertain terms.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to give you an excellent example of what goes on in this House. I am sure that anyone, when they have listened to this, in the light of what I have read before, would realise exactly what we are complaining of. I am quoting from the House of Assembly debates, the Official Report, Second Session 1976-1981, page 2474:

"Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I will again draw to your attention that the

statement by the hon. member for St. James that as a private citizen I made arrangements with people for the Government to buy property is improper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already heard the hon. member on that point.

Dr. HAYNES: Not on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on this occasion, it is true.

Dr. HAYNES: It is criminal behaviour that the hon. member is accusing me of."

Dr. Haynes is speaking, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

"Mr. SPEAKER: Now, withdraw it immediately.

Dr. HAYNES: I will withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you will turn and apologise to this House for that misbehaviour. You will withdraw the remark and apologise to the House for that ill behaviour.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, did you hear what the remark was?

Mr. SPEAKER: Don't question the Chair, just carry out the instructions or leave.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if the remark which I have made – I just want to make this clear.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You will withdraw the remark and apologise to the House, for the last time.

Dr. HAYNES took up his papers and started to leave the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are offending against the dignity of this House and you will never return until you have apologised. You will never take your seat until you have apologised.

Dr. HAYNES left the Chamber."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Speaker of this House continued: "He has to come in here and go down on his knees and apologise." Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, prisoners in Glendairy do not get that kind of punishment any more, no longer do they have to fall down on their knees. As far as I understand, that was stopped about one hundred years ago.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are several things I want to draw to your attention here. Our Standing Orders are not clear on this question of an explanation, and I want to re-read this: "If the member does not explain the sense in which he used the words, so as to remove the objection of their being disorderly or retract the offensive expressions, and make a sufficient apology for using them, the Speaker repeats the call for an explanation and informs the member." No opportunity of explanation once, no opportunity of explanation twice. I sought the opportunity three times and then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be told that I have to come in here and go down on my knees and apologise? Those words cannot be the words other than of a man who is off balanced. It cannot be denied, there is something radically wrong with anyone exercising authority and treating free men in a free House, representing a free people in that kind of manner. There can be nothing more disgraceful than this, that can ever be in the records of Parliament, and then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I go further than this and say that another instance, when I tried to get this from the Speaker for that debate – every member has the right to get what he says inside here through the Hon. Speaker for the purposes of debate – I did not get it through the Speaker.

I go further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and say this, that one of the most scandalous fabrications ever read in this House was the day when the people of Barbados recognised that their liberties were being severely threatened with this kind of arbitrary conduct and they assembled here in this Parliament to show their disapproval of it. A total fabrication was brought before this House by His Honour the Speaker, and the person who assisted him with it. I know the person who did it, I also know the person who refused to be a part of it. I know him well, the person who refused to be a part of it. The person who assisted him in it must share a grave responsibility for the deteriorating situation in this Parliament today.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no personal knowledge of the past records or the past behaviour of the Hon. Speaker. All I can tell him, I do not know him personally as such, all I can judge and I can talk about is his conduct as Speaker of this Hon. House, but there are other areas, other serious areas. Numerous Resolutions I have brought down here and they have been returned to me.

Certain remarks were ordered by the Deputy Speaker to be expunged from the record at this stage.

In other words, the problem that one faces week after week when one comes down here, one cannot even get any information from anyone as to the status of your Resolution or Question, and often you have to come and sit down inside here and wait and you do not know what is happening. I have even

seen a situation arise in this House where the Rules clearly provide that where a member is not present and the answer to a Question is ready, that that answer should be laid on the Table of the House. That is provided there, and I have seen His Honour the Speaker ask a Question on behalf of the hon. member for St. John, contrary to the Rules of this House, because it related to a reply on an electoral matter which the Minister responsible for electoral matters wanted to get out to the Press on that particular day.
3.40 p.m.

He asked the question on behalf of a member where the rules make completely different provisions. It was almost incredible to see the rules openly broken in this kind of way. Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the biggest problems why debate cannot take place in this Chamber unless you yourself are in that Chair.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is also out of order.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the reasons why we find it extremely difficult to debate unless the House is in Committee is because debate requires freedom; you have to feel free to speak and if you cannot feel free to speak, all you can do in here from time to time is to make a speech and cannot get involved in the cut and thrust of debate, and sometimes this thing is reduced to absurdity. I will never forget the day I came in here and brought in a motion on the rate of inflation in Barbados. The Hon. Prime Minister said that it was so important he wondered whether the debate should be televised or not. It was said, the Speaker ruled, that I did not say I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Now at least two dozen occasions before that and at least half a dozen occasions after that I have seen Ministers on the other side get up and speak on a Resolution and sit down without formally moving the passing of the Resolution, and Mr. Speaker just moves his hand like that and the member would get up and move the Resolution. It is one of the commonest errors made by members in this House, and despite the clear wish of the House on that day, the clear wish of the Prime Minister himself, the clear wish of the vast majority of members of this Parliament, the hon. member for St. Peter, His Honour the Speaker of this House, out of sheer spite ordered that my whole speech be expunged from the records of the House, and then permitted a ministerial statement that was a reply.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, is it permissible for members in this debate to draw conclusions which originate in the assigning of motives to the Speaker? If it is out of order, then the hon. member having said that His Honour out of spite, in my submission is out of order. If it is a pure recitation of fact from which the House can draw its own conclusion, that is a different matter, but in my submission that is out of order to accuse the Speaker of spite.

Dr. HAYNES: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am making is that the statement made by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was a reply to what was expunged from the record and he ruled, His Honour the Speaker ruled that there was nothing before this House and when I sought to bring back in the same Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....do you appreciate what I am saying? He said that there was nothing before the House, nothing took place. When I sought to bring back in the same Resolution in the same words, I was referred to a Standing Order which said that you cannot bring up the same thing in the same session of Parliament.

Now this is the kind of limit that unless we try to retain some kind of sanity over here, unless we try to recognise the serious limitations and the type of person that we are dealing with, then it would be quite impossible, it would be totally impossible for us to carry out our functions, and to carry out our functions, that is severely compromised, because although you recognise the type of person that you are dealing with, nevertheless you are faced with this kind of capricious behaviour in the exercise of authority within this Honourable House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must wind up his speech.

Dr. HAYNES: Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the question of interventions in the debate, the Barbados Labour Party, I have no quarrel with them, has been walking about talking about some statement I made about truth and impressions. This is my last point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Would you believe that they were remarks – and I have Hansard in front of me here – that I attributed to the hon. member for St. Thomas, and the Speaker intervened in the debate and said "do I hear the hon. member correctly that in politics truth does not matter?" I said that the hon. member for St. Thomas knows that and operates on that basis, impressions are more important. I said the hon. member knows that. *(Asides)* I will go back to the original statement. The original statement was a simple statement. The hon. member for St. Thomas knows only too well that in politics truth does not matter, facts do not matter, but impressions matter, and that is his success. That is the statement that I made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that it does not matter if the Barbados Labour Party seeks to distort what you say, but when His

Honour the Speaker takes that kind of propaganda and only about two sittings ago, if not the last sitting the sitting before that seeks to bring the same kind of distortion into this Parliament from the Chair of this House, I think that is totally disgraceful and totally unacceptable.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to make it clear that I believe that every view expressed in this Resolution is absolutely correct, and it will have my full and total support, and I will be voting for it.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, last Tuesday in this House of Assembly anarchy reigned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That remark must be withdrawn. Anarchy does not reign in this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw that remark. Last Tuesday in this House of Assembly, the sitting was suspended because of states of disorder introduced by the hon. member for St. Michael South West.
3.50 p.m.

The hon. member had been attempting to address the Chair. The Speaker stood and the orders of this House of Assembly clearly state that when the Speaker is on his feet all other hon. members should sit down but for approximately two full minutes – the hon. member for St. Michael South West is correcting me. He is saying it was five minutes. His Honour, the Speaker, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West were both standing and the Speaker was attempting to be heard and he was being shouted down by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

The Speaker ordered the hon. member to leave the Chamber for the remainder of the day's sitting. The hon. member refused to obey the Chair. The Speaker then called on the hon. member to be escorted from the Chamber by the Marshal and again when he failed to leave the Chamber, the House had to be adjourned for 10 minutes. After the House had been adjourned for 10 minutes, which is a normal procedure that the Speaker uses to defuse a difficult situation, the hon. member for St. Michael South West came back into the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am attempting to make here, Sir, is that this Resolution brought against the Speaker is an indictment not so much against his Honour as it is an indictment against all hon. members in this Chamber because frequently, and my opinion is that too frequently, we fail to respect the authority of the Chair. These Orders do not state that we obey the Chair when we believe it to be right. The Orders state that we obey the Chair period. This is a convention that operates in all systems where order is essential.

Recently, Sir, in a Barbadian pastime the members of the West Indian team in New Zealand felt they were unfairly treated by the Umpires. They took action that was regarded to be unsportsmanlike and the Board of Control ruled that all of the members of the West Indian team or that a statement should be made on behalf of the West Indian team and all members had to apologise. We are talking about cricket.

When an Umpire rules that a man is out, the rules do not state that he goes if he thinks he is out. Frequently, he does not believe that he is out. Frequently, to the spectators in the stand and the members on the field he is not out but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if order is to prevail he walks and this was the system upon which our civilisation rests. The moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we refuse to acknowledge those potentials and abide by them anarchy prevails and that is the basis on which I made my remark which Your Honour asked me to withdraw because when order has broken down anarchy has taken over and order broke down in here last Tuesday and it broke down on two Tuesdays before.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West again stood up stone and toe with the Speaker in a very uncharacteristic manner and in a very unparliamentary manner and when he went outside I asked him out there in the privacy of the Chamber, "Branford, why did you behave like that today? It is uncharacteristic of you" and the hon. member said to me, "What do you expect? Do you not see the children from St. Leonard's here."

The hon. member for St. Michael South West told me, remember that the children for St. Leonard's were here and he could not allow them to believe that he could be pushed around by Your Honour. That was the extent of his remarks and I am suggesting to you, Sir, that it is frivolous, irresponsible and uncharacteristic of the decay in our society when in this Chamber we can sit in here, week after week, and witness a condition of chaos and we can then come in here and supported by some members on this side as well, presume that the Speaker is over-stepping his bounds.

I was in here on the 6th of October when the hon. member for St. Michael South West, then Leader of the Opposition, stood in his place and said that it was a sad day in Barbados when a criminal could be admitted to the highest Chair in this land. I heard the remarks. He was discussing the Speaker, Sir, most unkind, most unparliamentary, most ungentlemanly and most uncivilised but, Sir, my contention is that within Barbados in the last seven years, we have seen a serious erosion of the standards today by which our society has been guided for all of the years it has been in existence and we who are

supposed to be leaders of the people, elected, I suppose for our ability to bring sanity and erudition to the consideration of the people's business, and we come in here and act like a bunch of punks and look at His Honour and treat him as if he were not here or as if his role in this Chamber was unimportant.

I am suggesting to you, Sir, that I like all other members of this Chamber am not always happy with the rulings of the Speaker but I am satisfied that when he tells me to sit down, I will sit down. When he says go, I will go. When he says apologise, I will apologise. I am not interested in any strict interpretations of the rules of orders.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West himself read out that one of the reasons he read from May's is that when a satisfactory apology is made, the hon. member may proceed to participate in the debates. They may not be any rules but there has always been a convention and when you are talking about caprice, when you are talking about erratic behaviour in Speakers, I am suggesting that you are not discussing the hon. member for St. Peter. You happen to be discussing previous Speakers under the old administration who used to tell you I am the Speaker, wrong or right.

Hon. members might not be happy with what I say but I am going to say what I have to say in here today and who likes it can live with it and who does not like it can suck their teeth but I am going to be heard in here today and I am saying that it is an indictment against all of us that this House can descend to the level it has been descending to it in the past two weeks and nothing has been done by the responsible people on either side to bring it back to sanity. The hon. member for St. John is a man whom I respect because he has been able to serve in this House for over 20 years and you do not get to serve as many years willy nilly.

4.00 p.m.

Somebody has to believe that you are worthy of that kind of consideration, and he has been in here that long and I would expect that in circumstances when we are in trouble he would use his experience and his leadership ability to bring sanity back to bear in this, not in the interest of partisan considerations but in the interest of Barbados because it is very easy to destroy what we have constructed, but it takes generations to build. I say it is an act of infamy and cowardice when honest, responsible men sit down and watch things drift and do not take any action to stop it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, His honour the Speaker, in my view, has ruled harshly in some cases, but I am firmly of the conviction that he has been right more than he has been wrong. Maybe we can make an argument that you should temper justice with mercy, because the quality of mercy is not strength. Perhaps you can temper mercy. I heard somebody making allusions to banning people from in here, I heard it mentioned in here today about banning people for life, and I will suggest that when it suits us we look at the executioner but we do not look at the miscreant.

The hon. member for St. Philip South has never had any difficulty in here with His Honour, most of the hon. members on this side have not had any difficulties with His Honour. The hon. member for St. Lucy said that he has been unfaired in here. He has the distinction of being the only member in this Session to be named, and he was not named capriciously. He behaved badly in this House. The hon. member for St. Lucy has behaved badly in this Chamber on more than one occasion and he ought to have been sent out, he ought to have been named on that occasion, and he was named, and let me tell you something, Sir, there are other members in here who rightly should have been named too. The hon. member for St. Michael South West should have been named on at least two occasions and I heard members on the Opposition benches saying that too. They said if he offends against the dignity of the House and he would not leave, name him. In that respect the Speaker was too lenient because he did not name him. That is why you have confusion in here, because when the Speaker reaches the limit of his authority there is nothing left for him to do, and last Tuesday we saw a pitiful example of the weakness of the Speaker when he does not have the support of this House, because that hon. member did not leave, came back in here in defiance of the ruling of the Speaker. The Marshal cannot put him out, because God knows how much further he intended to go, he could have cuffed the Marshal, and I am sure the Marshal took that into consideration and that is why he did not leave his chair. When a man has gone beyond the pale of reason you cannot go and take liberties with him. The Speaker can rule from the Chair, the Marshal will have to draw near. The Marshal said: "Not me."

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Speaker cannot do anything in those circumstances, the dignity of the House is offended, the effectiveness of the House is jeopardised. All of us hon. members in here must learn to abide by the rulings of the Speaker. There is a mechanism provided for in these Standing Orders whereby you can draw to the Speaker's attention and to the attention of the House or the Committee of Privileges, or to any other body our feelings of maltreatment in here by the Speaker. Those are the established procedures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am suggesting that Barbados expects and deserves better from its elected representatives than the display of conduct we have been witnessing in this Chamber of late. Things had quietened down for a while, but things have begun to drift again. I

heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central suggest that the only time they can have an opportunity to express their views freely is in Committee. Now, the hon. member for St. George North is an urbane, avuncular gentleman, but do you know something, Sir? That urbanity and that avuncular nature is more encouraging to bad behaviour than it deserves, because people get in here and take all kinds of liberties and excesses because he is lenient and because he uses his sense of proportion, recognising that we are men and should be guided by certain principles, and we do not need to be treated like children. He does not treat us like children, so what happens? The House breaks down into chaos on more than one occasion. This is not a reflection on him, again I am suggesting it is a reflection on us, because we take liberties. He gives us an inch and we take an ell. The Speaker does not give inch or ell and we do not like that either. Now, which will it be, Sir? Give you more leniency so you will behave better? Do you mollycoddle criminals to make them behave like civilised people, or do you impose sanctions against bad behaviour? These are the things, Sir, that we as a House must bear in mind.
4.10 p.m.

I have no intention, Sir, of supporting any Resolution brought for an indictment against His Honour. I am making the point that there are occasions when I feel His Honour can be more lenient in some of his rulings, but I am suggesting he has the authority of Speaker and we have the responsibility as members to live within the context of the rules of this House, and it is only because we come in here and set out to exceed the limits of what is expected that he is then forced to use perhaps more than ordinary force to bring us to our senses.

On behalf of other hon. members who share some of the views that I have expressed, on behalf of Barbados generally I would like to make a call, Sir, for all hon. members to recognise that there comes a time when partial considerations must not be taken, and that we have collective responsibility as elected members and leaders in this community to try to uphold the institutions by which this country is governed, so that we do not have to descend to the depths that we have been descending to of late, and I am saying that when we take that attitude and that stance, this country is going to be infinitely better off than it will be if it continues on the course on which it is now pitched.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this debate I want to be very fair and objective to all parties concerned. Now the debate purports to censure His Honour the Speaker for the capricious, partial and unreasonable conduct of His Honour. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot support the Resolution as it stands, and I will indicate now that I will be voting against the Resolution as it stands. I do not wish to be misquoted, so I will spell out very carefully. That is not to say that as the representative of St. Philip North I have been totally satisfied with each and every ruling of His Honour. No lawyer wo has practised in a court of law – and I am going to draw the analogy of a court of law because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition drew an analogy of a court of law and referred to the case of Yuill v Yuill – no lawyer who has practised in a court of law can say that because a judge or a magistrate may have erred on occasion that that is enough, because he is overturned by a Court of Appeal to call for and to result in his dismissal from office. So essentially what I am saying is that man is human and man will err.

I have had an experience with His Honour earlier this year; I believe it may have been July when we were passing the Independent Broadcasting Authority Bill. I was speaking on the second reading of the Bill and expressing my reservations concerning the implications of the Bill to split the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation into three separate entities, Headquarters, Television and Radio Branches, and in order to illustrate the principle I had to refer of necessity to what was contained in Clause 6 of the Bill. His Honour chose to indicate to me that I was not speaking to the principle. I disagreed with His Honour and persisted in my speech and he persisted in his views that I was not speaking to the principle. Well rather than be sent out or named or asked to apologise or whatever, I sat down and let him run the show; he is in charge. But there was a clear disagreement between His Honour and myself as to what is implied in the Standing Orders when they speak of speaking to the principle of the Bill on a Second Reading, and this debate today has come about in a similar fashion because the hon. member for St. Michael South was purporting to speak to the principle of the Bill and His Honour did not agree that he was speaking to the principle.

Now these are matters of opinion. Since they are matters of opinion, in my view they should admit of a certain elasticity and a certain freedom to express oneself as adequately as one is able. I remember the incident with the hon. member for St. Michael South very well. I spoke to the hon. member last weekend and made certain investigations which I communicated to him on Tuesday. It seems that what His Honour was concerned about was that the hon. member for St. Michael South has made a remark that "you stopped me from speaking in here today", which was a reflection on the Chair to the extent that it implied that the Chair was being less than fair or that the rights and privileges which had been claimed for hon. members at the opening of this House were in some way being abrogated by His Honour.

That brings me to the question of apology. His Honour asked for an apology and never got it. Now our rules make it very clear that the final stage before a question of contempt can arise is that a person can be named. I have no difficulty in seeing the argument put up by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and I showed him outside just now that I saw the point of the argument, but before you come to the stage of naming, surely there is an intermediary position which can be adopted by a Presiding Officer where short of naming him he can ask that you apologise, and if you are man enough you say "if I have offended the House, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry" and withdraw and apologise. It takes nothing off anybody to say that. On the other hand, the whole question of an apology and what is involved in an apology can be carried too far. I am not saying it has been carried too far in this case, but where members of the Opposition may feel concerned with some justification is that inherent in an apology is the possibility of relegating yourself to a level of grovelling. No member of this House should be put in a position to grovel; but at the same time every member of the House should be able, if he recognises and we must be sufficiently responsible to be able to recognise if we have infringed the rule to apologise. I do not believe that His Honour wants anybody to grovel or to make himself less than a man in tendering an apology when an apology is necessary. As I say, I do not see an apology as coming after the point of naming, but as a stage before the point of naming when both parties can pull back or certainly the offending party can pull back from a position which may lead to unhappiness.

I do not believe that anybody today other than the Leader of the House has spoken about His Honour the Speaker as Speaker. It might not be known to the general public, it might not be known to hon. members on the other side, and I will say, that His Honour the Speaker, is trying as he sees it to adopt a stance of a Westminster Speaker. He wishes to raise the level and dignity of Parliament. I agree with his intentions to raise the level of debate and to ensure the dignity of Parliament. Personally having regard to my own position and my own beliefs about the Westminster model and whether it should be adopted in toto by Third World countries, especially Third World black countries, I believe to some extent His Honour may be anachronistic in some of his desires for a Westminster type Parliament and Speakership in Barbados in the 1980s, but that is a matter for his own predilection, and I think we have to be sensitive to the fact that he is the presiding officer and each one of us has different idiosyncracies and is different in our makeup, but nobody on the other side has so far been able to tell this House that they believe His Honour the Speaker does not know the Rules or does not interpret the Rules correctly.

4.20 p.m.

To put it another way, Sir, it is the view of all the members of this House, I say all without reservation, that His Honour, the Speaker, is in cognisance with the rules of this House to a better extent than anyone of us who knows and understands the rules better than anyone of us. His weakness is that he tends, in my personal view, to interpret the rules too strictly thereby disallowing a certain degree of latitude to members. That is not a criticism of his knowledge of the rules. That, if it is a criticism, is a criticism of his construction and interpretation of the rules which may vary from Speaker to Speaker.

I regret that we have to be in here this afternoon debating what essentially is a refusal of members to tender an apology because I believe that members on the other side feel strongly against tendering an apology. That has been their problem and I do not think that I misread members of the Opposition, Sir. I said in here on Tuesday that there was no issue in Barbados so they were creating one by walking out because there was certain dissension in the DLP on the question of the increase of seats.

I may be named David but I am no prophet and on Wednesday the day after I spoke, Senator Connell and Senator Hunte, members of the Other Place – I told you that I would get it in – members of the Other Place proved that there is total confusion and dissension on the Other Side. Now having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in parenthesis, nobody wants to give you blows today on that. I am not going to forget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he started his debate drew an analogy of a trial Judge descending into the arena. Now I really cannot complain that His Honour, the Speaker, descends into the area of debate excessively. I find everybody recognise, those who read the debates or those who visit with us on Tuesday, that His Honour from time to time makes comments which are timely and more often than not witty and humorous but I do not accept that he unnecessarily gets into the cut and thrust of the debates but since the Leader of the Opposition himself drew an analogy of a Judge, I want to rely on that analogy for making this point, Sir.

This, as we are told, is the highest Court in the land. The Speaker is the Presiding Officer, is a quasi Judge, a kind of a Judge. It is inherent in the office of any Judge or a Presiding Officer to preserve and regulate the dignity of the body over which he is presiding. Now before a Judge would sentence Counsel for contempt, before a Judge would take a member to cite for contempt, 99 out of 100 Commonwealth Judges would require some conduct on the part of the offending Counsel to make up for the transgression which a Counsel may have committed. That is why he is obliged to ask

if you have anything to say to show cause why you should not be cited for contempt. That is where Sonny Maraj went wrong in Trinidad.

Similarly in the case of His Honour, the Speaker, I am submitting that it is well within inherent jurisdiction of His Honour, before he takes the prescribed action, such as naming a member, to require of that member a retraction of the offending remarks or an apology in order to maintain the dignity of the Chamber. To that extent I have no quarrel with that inherent power in the Speaker. What I have difficulty with, Mr. Deputy Speaker and I want to be frank because I speak in here and I criticise my side and I criticise the other side because when I go home I intend to put down my head and sleep and my conscience is not going to bother me so I speak as my conscience rules.

What I have difficulty with is the power of the Speaker to say that you will not be heard again unless you apologise. I have difficulty with finding the authority for the exercise of that power. That he has the power to apologise, I have no problem with that. He has that power but to say that you cannot be heard again until you apologise is where my difficulty lies and I would like somebody to show me where that power exists, either in our Standing Orders or in the precedence on which we have to draw where the Standing Orders are silent in May's Parliamentary Practice.

An allegation has been made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, concerning the Speaker's right or ability to edit questions. Now let me just assure the hon. members again that if they read the Standing Orders and I had to study them very closely last year when I sat in that Chair for a whole week as Chairman of Committees during Estimates and I believe I have a reasonable understanding of them and their operation.

Where I have a little problem in understanding the Opposition today is that there is complaint that the Speaker edits or sub-edits from time to time questions submitted. Our Standing Orders are silent on that power. They say that the questions must conform to certain tenets but if you look at May's Sir, the 19th Edition at page 325 and following it says this, Sir.

> "The Speaker's responsibility in regard to questions is limited to their compliance with the rules of the House. Responsibility in other respects rests with the Member who proposes to ask the question. On many occasions the Speaker has stopped a Member asking by private notice a question that had been refused at the table, or asking the parts of questions struck out at the table or taking the opportunity when raising a point of order to read out a question which has been refused at the table, or by the Speaker as a private notice question. The refusal of a question at the table cannot be raised incidentally in the course of a debate.
>
> The clerks at the table have full power to sub-edit questions and the speaker also has called the attention of the House to an alteration made by his direction in a question."

Now the English practice is clear that the Clerks at the Table and to use a Latinism of the hon. member for St. John, *a fortiori*, the Speaker, also has that power to edit or sub-edit a question so that it cannot be held and the hon. members who urged that on the House today, that is to say the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Lucy, who urged that the Speaker was in somewhere in excess of his jurisdiction in seeking to authorise and edit or himself edit the question, that allegation cannot stand in the light of the practice.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other charge is that he has acted in an impartial and unreasonable manner, but having regard to the experience that I have given where His Honour dealt with me on the Independent Broadcasting Authority Bill, having regard to the fact that His Honour ordered out of this House the Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands, I do not believe .....He says two, but there have been other instances when His Honour has had to call on members on this side to withdraw or behave themselves or whatever. I do not believe that it is fair to allege that he has acted in an impartial manner. I have stated the extent to which I am prepared to go in any criticism that I have of His Honour, that I think he is too strict in his interpretation of the Rules and does not allow members the laxity, for example, which I believe I allowed members last year in the Estimates debate which evoked from the hon. member for St. Philip South some commendatory remarks at the end of that debate, the first time in the history of this Parliament, but as I say, that is a matter of opinion.

I have not found that His Honour has been wrong on the Rules so far. I have explained already, Sir, and for the avoidance of doubt, now that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has come back, that I have already said that I have difficulty in understanding a ruling which says that you will not be heard until you apologise, because that seems to me, to be striking unnecessarily at the rights and privileges which were claimed for all members on the opening of this Parliament.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I will call upon Your Honour to let me be heard in silence, having regard to certain cacophonic sounds being emitted from the room next door).

Your Honour, there is a fundamental problem with the Rules. The Rules purport to lay down a framework within which members can debate and conduct the business on behalf of the persons whom they represent. The Rules are in need of updating, the Rules do not go far enough. There is a lot that has to be interpreted by reference to May's and other parliamentary precedents. I share the view of the Hon. Leader of the House that the Rules concern each and every one of us in here, whether we are on the side of Government or on the side of the Opposition, and therefore I have no sympathy with the members of the Opposition who have refused to accept that they should share in an exercise of updating and redrafting the Rules. But even though I have no sympathy with them for that position which they have adopted, I understand it, and I do not go as far as the Hon. Leader of the House, because he castigated them for not sharing, he castigated them for not coming on Statutory Boards. I am not going to do that, I understand it, Sir, and I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is not here now to tell him why I understand it, because there is only one policy which has so far been enunciated in the Democratic Labour Party, and that policy is that we, the members of the Opposition, will not do anything to assist in the better government of Barbados.

I will give you the evidence. At the last Annual Conference of the Democratic Labour Party, a Resolution came from St. Philip South drawn by a certain lawyer who lives in St. Philip – even if he may only be an academic lawyer, that is for the identification of you all, but I know who I am talking about – the Resolution asked that the Opposition call on the Government to do something about Princess Margaret School, extending it and improving the facilities at that school. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. John, refused to entertain the Resolution on this ground, Sir, that when you are in Opposition you do not do anything to help the Government, you do not show them how to improve their governance. That is what he said. He has gone out of in here today, I want him here. I will get him, though. He has gone to set up the meeting for 6.30, he is going to finish with Your Honour so he can go and talk up there. Tell the people about Hunte and Connell, that is what you have to tell them tonight.

You can keep all kinds of meetings about Barbados, like the last one held in the Ivy which attracted 225 people and 48 cars, including P. 1311 and S. 1025. Go and tell them why you all refused to bring the Resolution on Mr. Speaker and elucidating the point that the Opposition had the opportunity to assist in making the Standing Orders against which this Resolution is brought today, Sir, making the Standing Orders better, and they refused to do it because of a fundamental attitude that they have of non-co-operation with a view to better government of Barbados.

Now, the Opposition makes me wonder from time to time. I do not want to be irrelevant, otherwise I would tell them a lot of things. I would even tell them about a telephone call made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, No. Please do not tell them about it, stick to the Resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS: Why did you stop me, Sir, do you not want to hear it? *(Asides).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr. SIMMONS: Sir, I want to say that the Opposition has said that there has been an infringement of their rights by His Honour the Speaker, that it is an interference of the democratic process, and out of the mouth of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central today, he said that he was representing a free people. How come all of a sudden you are going to hear about.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. I am representing a free people, I wish to continue representing a free people, and that is why we have the motion in here to make sure that the freedom of Parliament in a parliamentary democracy is maintained. It is the only way we can remain free in a parliamentary democracy.

Mr. SIMMONS: He was dealing with the possibility of a threat to the freedom of the people. As I understand it, he is not saying that at the moment the people are in some sort of bondage. I understand him, Sir, but the candidate against him in the next election will see to it that he is the representative of a free people, you do not have any say in it, this is the first and last time for you. He has been in here twice, Sir, the first and the last time. I have twice already chalked up, you know, indelibly twice. *(Aside).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir, getting back to the Resolution. I am dealing with language which was used in the debate by hon. members on the other side, this threat to democracy and the Speaker being intoxicated with power, according to the hon. member for St. Lucy. Far be it from me, Sir, to use the same language in relation to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I will not say that he is intoxicated by power, Sir, I will not say that. He is not intoxicated by power, he is intoxicated with a lust for power.

4.40 p.m.

He is intoxicated with a great desire not any longer to continue as the second most powerful man in Barbados up to 1976, but as the first, and that is why on a day to day basis he walks around in the Democratic Labour Party confines and makes up adhoc policy. You see, Sir, the Speaker has a seat in Parliament; he is the representative for St. Peter; he is one of twenty-four; he will be one of twenty-seven next time, and I am glad to think that the two members of the other side who sit in the Other Place had the good sense to support the Government in the increase in the seats to 27 to ensure that His Honour the Speaker is one of those 27 and that St. Peter is one of those 27.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your time has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS: Has it expired, Sir? Will you give me a minute to wind up? I do not believe that the charge made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Speaker's behaviour has been almost conspiratorial can be substantiated. I agree with him that this has not been an unruly Party and that members on both sides have exercised a high level of responsibility and a high sense of dignity.

I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in my contribution to this Resolution, I have been able to convince members on both sides that His Honour is a human being who will make mistakes and may have made a mistake or two in the past, but that that is not enough to evoke from the other side a censure motion calling for his dismissal from office, because that is what it would involve if the Resolution was supported, and I trust, Sir, that as this is virtually the end of 1980, as we go into 1981 with election fever setting in, if it has not set in because they are keeping meetings even on the 19th December, so they must be bitten by some election bug, and as members on the other side who see their seats in jeopardy get more and more nervous, then at least we will have some restraint and control our nerves and our attitudes while we sit in this House and try to ensure that the work of the Chair is made comparatively easy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to vote against this Resolution for the reasons already adumbrated.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened attentively to my parliamentary colleagues from both sides, and I can say that over my ten years in Parliament I was the victim of rulings by Speakers which I did not agree with, and maybe I demonstrated my anger in a manner which was not in keeping with Parliament. I have paid the penalties and I have lived on to fight another day. It saddens me however that at this time of the year when one should be sharing and giving goodwill, peace and love and charity that such a brutal resolution should be brought to the House.

I believe, Sir, the resolution however should read:

"WHEREAS His Honour the Speaker has carried out his duties in a capricious, partial and unreasonable manner;

AND WHEREAS such action constitutes a breach of the rights claimed by him for all hon. members and more particularly the rights of the minority, and is deserving of the highest censure;

BE IT RESOLVED that the hon. member for St. John and the Democratic Labour Party have no confidence in any Speaker."

That is how this Resolution should read because there is not a single Speaker since 1956 that did not come to bad terms with the Opposition. It was Mr. Kenmore Nathaniel Rhystone Husbands when the now Leader of the Opposition kept the then Sir Robert Arrundell some two hours in the Senate and let go a tirade of abuse on the then person who was nominated to be Speaker, that was Husbands. The battle then came between Brancker after Husbands by the very Democratic Labour Party. Then the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away Maxwell by the Democratic Labour Party. Eyre Hoppin was sacrificed on the altar for the now sitting hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and a Resolution is now brought today by the very Democratic Labour Party and by the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. John, against the present Speaker. So the Resolution should read not the present Speaker but all Speakers, because it is an unruly crowd founded on an unruly doctrine. That is the whole problem with the Democratic Labour Party.

Now I feel, Sir, and there is no doubt in my mind that I was sent out of Parliament as Minister of Housing, and I have no grouse with the Speaker. He sent me out for not taking my seat, because the remarks used I will still contend anywhere at all were not offensive remarks, but he asked me to take my seat at the time and I did not take my seat. It is on that premise he asked me to leave the Chamber and that I did. I want to say this for Mr. Speaker. What I have to say about Mr. Speaker should make him a very very good Speaker. The Speaker is like a batsman who can get runs, but he is a cross-hauler. That is his trouble. He is awkward. He knows how to play his strokes, he can interpret the rules, but he is clumsy. He is a cross-hauler; that is all that is wrong with him. Now because a man is a cross-hauler and gets runs, you do not drop him from the team. He is a run-getter but his style is wrong. I do not feel that when Mr. Speaker is asking a member of Parliament to take his seat that he should use remarks like "immediately" and "forthwith". That does not work with big men. I disagree with him on that. There is a much more dignified way of doing

it. Imagine at the age of 52 somebody telling me I am rude or immediately. If a man is working with you you can tell the man to bring your lunch immediately, but not me, and that is where I differ with Mr. Speaker. I have sat here on more than one occasion and I have called upon Mr. Speaker not to send them out, and I have heard him warn the Opposition and say "I know you are asking me to send you out, but I am not going to send you out at all today. I am going to allow you to speak." That is not an erosion of human rights. You can see that in Hansard. He has called upon them to get up and speak, and now you are talking about erosion of your rights. He is clumsy; that is all that it is.

4.50 p.m.

I would say this for Mr. Speaker. Lord Peel, the famous Speaker of Commons once asked his predecessor "What would you do if you are in trouble and could not make a decision as Mr. Speaker?" and his reply was "Seek the advice of the Clerks at the Table who are experienced" and this is what I would suggest to Mr. Speaker to do. When in doubt, stop, seek the advice of your Clerks. There are experienced and it is their duty to advise the Speaker.

There was another famous Speaker who drove fear into the people. Then there was Dr. Horace King, a small man and he controlled the House of Commons with a finger. Now I have no doubt in my mind and I have said this over and over that Maxwell had the makings of a good Speaker because he was a fearless Speaker and so is our present Speaker. He is fearless. He is not afraid to take a decision but I would say this, when a decision is taken and it is wrong, he, Mr. Speaker too, like other Speakers have done in the Commons is not too big to come back to the Chamber on the following day or the following session and say I believe that my ruling was wrong. This is a historical fact in the Commons. In the Commonwealth Speakers have come back to Parliament and said my ruling was wrong on that occasion, I apologise.

In the Third World countries words like "apologise", that is finished with but if Mr. Speaker is prepared to introduce it into Parliament, there is nothing wrong in apologising. Nobody ever asked me to apologise when you said that I said they should starve. When you said that I said they should starve, nobody asked me to apologise. I came in here because I felt within myself that I had made a statement not in keeping with my office. I could say so on the Opposition bench because the Opposition is wild. You are wild. You throw about your hands and talk nonsense at night like you now do and talking and comparing Eric Sealy with the Prime Minister like nonsense. People who did not know about Sealy, you abused Mr. Sealy because the people did not come to our meeting so they did not hear the Prime Minister but you talked about him so you cursed the man. That is what you did.

Now, Sir, you can have other good Speakers. Now, I firmly believe that the present Speaker with his knowledge of 14 years, 10 years in the Opposition and his skill, his debating skill, for all of those years the present Prime Minister was sent out of Parliament. Well you know I have the gold medal for being sent out.

Sir Grantley Adams was sent out. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was sent out but the present Speaker for all that was said about him, in all those 10 years on the Opposition bench was never sent out of Parliament because he had the skills and power. He knew the rules and that is what made him the choice, I believe, to be Speaker of this August Assembly, Sir.

I will say this again, Sir. If the Gallery is empty, if there is nobody at all in this Gallery the business of Parliament would finish in half and hour. If there is no person in the Gallery, the business of Parliament can be conducted and finished in half an hour sometimes but our Apostles are in here. We want them to carry the message so we have to let them see how militant we can be, right or wrong and to be aggressive in our approach but when all is done, all of us here, on that side and on this side are talking and drinking and they are down in the yard killing each other. That is what I do not like. That is what I do not like about politics. You cannot put one foot out here and I am not with you and I am against you. I would never be a member of the Democratic Labour Party.

You see the hon. member for St. Michael South Central? You see him there? We are friends. You do not know. You do not know how good friends we are. I have with me here this afternoon. I searched all sorts of old papers for months to find this. The Leader of the House asked me not to worry with it but you had it typewritten. Your Secretary typed it. You signed your name to it and gave it to me to bring in here and ask questions about the member now sitting beside you when he was Minister of Health.

Dr. HAYNES: Make it a document of the House.

Hon. L. S CRAIG: If I had another copy I would.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member has said that he had a document typed with my signature which I purported to give to him to ask questions relating to a member of this side. I am asking that that letter or that piece of paper be made a document of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is a point of ignorance. Now, Sir, at that time – I do not know anything about any neurosurgeon – I told you and the present Speaker of the House was at that time Shadow Minister for Health and I gave it to him because he was *au fait* with the hospital problems and I gave it to him and he gave it back to me and told me it was nonsense. That is what he said. It was a battle between the two of you. Now you have closed ranks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You have now closed ranks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Will you please get back to the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this is a Resolution dealing with the behaviour of the Speaker and Parliament and therefore I am dealing with all aspects of Parliament and the Speaker at this time and I am stating as a fact that there was at that time a dog fight between the two of them. That is what I do not like about politics. There are closing ranks now. There are closing ranks now all of a sudden.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Standing Orders leave no doubt in my mind from a very careful look at them because as Parliament becomes more and more complex the work load of Parliament increases and all of those things, Sir, and we have to review these. There is no doubt in my mind. For example, in this it tells you here, Sir, "When the Speaker or Chairman rises during a debate, any member who is then speaking, or offering to speak, must resume his seat." Now, that is a Standing Order that is broken everyday.

It also goes on to say that any ruling by the Speaker is the final ruling unless you bring it as a substantive motion, which you have brought today.

Now, I want to demonstrate to this country and listen carefully. The Opposition has gone out saying that the Government, listen carefully, is muzzling them. How do you mean muzzle? You muzzle somebody that they cannot bite. You do not muzzle the Opposition. They have in rubber teeth. You do not muzzle them because we could have muzzled them this afternoon. They brought the Resolution in here. It was their duty to form a quorum. We did not have to come in here to debate this and you made no quorum. You had no quorum.
5.00 p.m.

We had 11 members on our side and when Parliament sat you had 3 – the Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. Michael South Central and the member for St. Lucy. If we wanted to muzzle you, if we did not want to censure Mr. Speaker we did not have to come here, because this was your style in 1975. In 1975 we had to march to Government House, we had an audience with the then Sir Arleigh Scott, and in that delegation was Mr. Sealy. I am the person who forced the Prime Minister to bring him in. That was an error of judgment on my side, but I am human and I am here to error. The Prime Minister, the Oxford Goliath, was sure enough to warn me, he pleaded with me, "do not bring him, Lionel," and I asked him why and he said he was not a member of the Barbados Labour Party and that was a Barbados Labour Party delegation. I pleaded with him and I forced David, little David he is now, 'D' from 'B', that is what you said about him, you know. I pleaded to bring him, and this is what he said at that time. I pleaded with the then Leader of the Opposition, but it was an error of judgment. That error of judgment is reflected in Mr. Speaker not accepting the Leader of the Opposition's motion last Tuesday. I disagreed with the Speaker on that. He should have, but I would have done it differently.

I was never a Speaker, I am a talker, that is my success in life. What I would have done is this, knowing that it was a Resolution of no confidence against me, as soon as I came to Private Members' Notices I would simply have asked the Leader of the Opposition to take his seat and called on his Deputy to sit down in the Chair and take the Resolution. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could teach you one or two little things, because a man would not accept a Resolution of no confidence against himself. Do you know he would be an idiot to do that? Neither would Mr. Speaker sit down in the Chair and hear a blatant attack made upon him. He leaves the Chair, and Mr. Speaker has the power to make a speech in here, all he has to do is to leave the Chair and stand up by the side of the Chair. I think, Mr. Clerk, you would nod your head in approval. You call it the Woolsack.

Now, Your Honour, in 1975, almost from June of 1975 until the run up to election Parliament did not meet, we could not form a quorum, Mr. Speaker Hoppin would come there every Tuesday, the Clerks of the House would come down, the caterer would come down, and the only other member from the Government was Mr. Talma, so Parliament could not meet. But look at the difference today. If you go outside now we can still talk on the Resolution. We are not afraid to debate with you all, you have nothing to debate. In the Financial Times on December 3, a reputable newspaper, this is what it has:

> *"Barbados.* Although the economy of Barbados is vulnerable to the ailments of the developed world, the island's political stability and prosperity excites some envy among its Caribbean neighbours.

For most of the people of Barbados, probably the closest thing to a disaster would be for the England cricket side to emerge as winners in the coming tour of the West Indies."

Now, really, can an Opposition challenge that? The Financial Times? A reputable paper throughout the entire world? Can you challenge that? When you should be in here debating the economic problems that are confronting the Third World, not only Barbados, you are on a public platform talking about a Malone Report, and if there was no Pele death you would have nothing to talk about at all this evening. Gerrymandering of constituency boundaries. Now, Sir...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now,.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is exactly what I said earlier, we are here to error, and that is what could happen to Mr. Speaker. I just made an error, but look at what you are looking at, Sir, gerrymandering of constituency boundaries. You would have the gall to discuss that? Of course, you do not speak, I saw you with the little umbrella over your head listening to the 240 people out there. I was there with you, and we spoke. That is a fact. That is when I went to the Pine to hear Pope John and listen to the criticisms of this Government. That is why I know you are shallow, you have nothing to offer this country. The present Prime Minister is skilful, able and brilliant, and he is recognised throughout the entire Caribbean and North America as an able man, full stop. The other one lost, past tense, done. He has made a contribution, nobody can deny that. I feel that his name should be written in gold letters. I say that here, I have said it publicly, but Garfield Sobers had to resign some time as the world's greatest cricketer. He is finished, but the thing is he has no successor that can gain the respect of the electorate. That is the trouble with you all.

Now, how do we look at it? I will come now from here. We know each other very well, from the days of Cable and Wireless, and we have our little side talks. I am not going to say what you say to me, I am not going to say that, we know each other. The member for St. Michael South is a respectful intellectual who has no charisma. You are dull, that is all, brilliant but dull. You cannot capture the imagination of the electorate or the country as a whole for leadership qualities. That is clearly understood. Do you see how strange life is? All four of them are my insurance clients; Branford Mayhew, Richard Christopher, Rameses Bordice and Erskine Leslie. Why should I denounce you this evening? It hurts me. The other member from over there is neither fowl, fish nor pork. You demonstrated that down by St. Mary's Church with Calvin Alleyne and now your good friend, John Connell. You let them go very early, so we know that you cannot win a country because when pressure comes you will let it go, so you are not in it at all. You have demonstrated that, you are not stable. That is your problem. As a matter of fact, I will tell you. You have the worst record of attendance in this present Session. You come into Parliament one in every three sittings to make sure you do not lose your seat.

5.10 p.m.

You check it; you have the worst attendance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can we get back to the Resolution?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is the Resolution, Sir. We are dealing with parliamentary democracy, the erosion of people's rights, the censure of the Speaker, all these things, and that is why I am on the Resolution, and that is the end of it. So I called three and you would not be in it; you, you and you. The light blue is nothing; the washed out blue.

Now attempts to extinguish the rights of the Opposition. Now if we come here this evening at 2 o'clock on the dot and form a quorum, would you have the nerve to tell people that the Government is trying to muzzle you? Did you think about that? If we wanted to muzzle you, we could even stop you from keeping your public meeting tonight. Let me tell you how. We have enough in here to talk for half an hour and then you could not go until 8 o'clock, but we are not going to do that. (ASIDES) You can go along and talk because you do not have anything to tell anybody. You didn't even get a pick in it or you. Look, Sir, I will only show you how shallow you all are. My argument is based on the Leader of the House who said you put up a smoke screen. I was in the Opposition too. Do you know the number of times we threatened to walk out and the present Prime Minister would say "no, don't walk out, let us remain here and hold them". He used to tell me that. On one occasion he was sent out of the House and I told my colleagues to let us go, and the present Speaker said "no, we are not going anywhere; I can hold them alone." You know that is true. I do not have to get on the floor of the House and lie, but in 1975 going into 1976 they would not even open Parliament furthermore debate any Private Members' Business with us. They never came back after lunch, and I remember the famous words of the now Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. He said "we won the toss, we decide who will bat, when they will bat, we roll the wicket, so we feel like pulling up the stumps now"; and they got pulled up. That is what Frank Walcott said. That was contempt of the Chair and for Parliament; that was erosion of people's rights that you would not open Parliament, but we came today to hear you because we know you have nothing to say.

The Leader of the Opposition started in low gear and ended in low gear. I was making some notes here. I can't even find them. All I have here is "Barrow started in low gear; can't get anywhere else". If your leader can start in low gear, how do you expect to get the others in high gear?

I will say this: Mr. Speaker has no reason to feel this evening that he is any boy on the burning deck; he has my support because it is support of conscience. This has not got a policy. This is a Private Member's motion and I can vote how I feel like voting, either for or against, but my conscience dictates that he has done nothing wrong that other Speakers have not done. He is not the first Speaker to be censured. I believe he is the first Speaker to be attacked publicly by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in St. Peter, who then came in here and said the only thing he knows about him is since he is Speaker. A vicious attack. He started off in St. Peter by saying "I am not here to talk about Burton Hinds, you all know him, you all know so and so; that clown;" not the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I would not call you a clown. I know what to call you, when, where and how; you can rest assured.

Sir, I feel sad that I have to speak in this fashion at this time of the year, and I would hope that it be the duty of the Opposition now since we have demonstrated on the Government benches that we are not here to muzzle you all because you have nothing to bite with, and since you have been able to air your feelings and your views and express how you think about Mr. Speaker, and so we on this side have done likewise, as a Christmas gift to this country and to Parliament to withdraw the Resolution because it cannot get through. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, so much was said on this Resolution that one would think it is time that we bring it to an end; but a Resolution of such proportions is one that should be well aired and the position of all members should be known. I take it that I would be doing an injustice to my constituency and certainly to myself if I did not speak on this matter.

The first Speaker in Barbados to have claimed the ancient rights of members of Parliament was a distinguished predecessor of mine who represented the constituency of St. Andrew, Sir John Gay Alleyne, and therefore in defence of those rights, I speak, and therefore I want to say that anything I say today in defence of Mr. Speaker is not because I do not recognise the rights of every person who is here sitting. When people send us here, it is because there are only 24 seats and people who vote cannot occupy the 24 seats, they are too many, and therefore they send their representatives to do that for them. Therefore I subscribe to the view that all members of Parliament are entitled to have the freedom which they are entitled to and the opportunity to freely express their views on all matters pertaining to their constituencies.

What we are concerned with at the moment is fundamentally to do with the rights of members and the Opposition too, Mr. Deputy Speaker. While Mr. Speaker claims on behalf of all of us the ancient rights of Parliament, he does not claim them for himself and certainly he cannot claim mine. He claims them on behalf of all members of this House, and therefore I think and I am sure that all members are entitled to express their views very freely. This view has been expressed already and if I do say anything which was said already, it is because I want to emphasise the points which were made.

The present Speaker of Parliament never had an easy time in trying to preside over the affairs of this House. When the history of this present Parliament is written, it will be known in my view as the walk-out Parliament of all times. Walk out by the Opposition, and they have walked out so often that walking out now becomes meaningless. If you move out now nobody pays you any mind, therefore my advice to you is to sit down and to participate in the debate because the public is going to judge you on the fact that you have made no serious contribution from the time you were returned in this Honourable House. It is against that background that Mr. Speaker is called upon to preside in this Parliament.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been reading from time to time reports of the meetings held by members of the other side, and if you were to read them yourself and see what is said about His Honour the Speaker, you would be appalled to think that members who are serving in a Parliament can say the things which they go on political platforms and say about His Honour the Speaker. The hon. member for St. Michael West this afternoon in a very moving address and one that I subscribe to very much has made an appeal to hon. members to try to retrieve the ground and to bring back some respectability to Parliament. When you try to pull down your institutions, when you try to pull down your Speaker, when you try to pull down your judges, when you try to pull down your leaders, you are doing the country no good.

5.20 p.m.

In a national crisis which involves two Governments the Opposition does not take upon itself to praise the virtue of the other Government as against their own Government. If you want to say it is hypocritical you, at that period in time, joined forces with your own Government.

When I go abroad and I form part of a delegation, including the Opposition, I do not see myself as part of a delegation that has two factions. I see myself as a member of a Barbados Delegation and I hope the time will come when the present Opposition will drop its divisive tactics and decide to see his country as their country and try to leave it a place that is free and continue to be a democratic society. For myself I want to make sure that it is so.

Up to now I have heard no argument deduced from the other side which would cause me to remotely feel that I should vote for them on this Resolution. There is one thing that disturbs me and I will tell you exactly what it is and it has to do with the hon. member for St. Michael South. I thought that when he came in here today that he would have quickly got up, the gentleman I know he is, and to the Deputy Speaker would have said at the request of His Honour, the Speaker, I apologise. Whatever he might have thought about the decision to ask him to apologise, I think he is a big enough man. It would have taken absolutely nothing off of him.

As far as the hon. member for St. Michael South West is concerned, according to the Standing Orders he was totally wrong. When the Speaker was on his feet, he defied the Speaker and as his usual showmanship he set about to prove to the children from the school where his constituency is that he can do it better than anybody else.

Even if the Speaker might have erred in judgment on other occasions, in my view he was not wrong on that and I sat down there very unhappy that a move was not made from this side for the suspension of that member. He was totally wrong and here you find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the eyes of those little children who were sitting there from Richmond Secondary School, in the eyes of those children, children who will be the Leaders of tomorrow, he set out to show how great he was and to bring down the Institution in this country. That is the type of thing you get from that side. This is the type of practice we are seeing today in Barbados but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it will not succeed. The country is aware of the thinking and the practices of that side.

Take the hon. member for St. Lucy. I have never met a member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, more contentious, more willing to destroy and to sacrifice everything that comes along his way. You do not have to trouble him for him to be offensive. You do not even have to talk loudly for him to be annoyed. Mr. Speaker, or no Mr. Speaker, Christ would have to be in that Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the problems which I believe he has to be able to tolerate a member such as the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Now, what can you expect of a human being? The Speaker in Parliament is only a human being as you are, Sir, and all of us are. We can only tolerate so much and no more but you have your Speaker, your Presiding Officer, the person who has to carry the dignity of this House and when you have him there sitting down, he reflects whatever this Parliament is whether you like it or not.

When you have the Speakers' Conferences abroad he goes to represent the whole of Barbados, not the DLP or the BLP and therefore it is your duty to uphold him, not to go down in his constituency and say the worst things about him. Not to go up St. Joseph and say the worst things about him. Not to get up here and try to character assassinate him. That is not good for us. We have seen what character assassination has done for the whole of this society. We have seen the fabric of this whole society being destroyed.

I appeal to you on that side to join with us in a new effort to rebuild the society which is virtually in a state of collapse and decay. You do not have the capacity alone to do it. There are some of you who will and I am calling upon those who will and despite what I heard them say about the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I know within his heart he does not want to see this society destroyed. This is how I feel about him.

I feel the same way about the hon. member for St. Michael South. I do not believe that either one of them would want to see this country destroyed and I believe that within the ranks of the Opposition Party there are people out there who are willing to see a stable society and that democracy continues to reign.

Mr. Deputy Speaker the Honourable, His Honour the Speaker has during his time as Speaker of this Parliament conducted himself with honour and dignity and he has been a credit to this Parliament, whatever might be said against him to the contrary.

The hon. member for St. Philip North has said, and I agree with him and nobody will dispute this that there is no one in this House, no hon. member who understands the Standing Orders and the rules of this House as His Honour, the Speaker. He has given a great deal of study to those rules and he knows them from beginning to end. He has to be guided from time to time by his Clerks at the Table who are knowledgeable in Law and whose duty it is to assist him in certain matters but he is an extremely knowledgeable man. He has carried out his office with dignity and I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the country accepts him as a straightforward and honest leader who will see him in that light and I am going to oppose this Resolution and while the Government does not propose, because we consider this to be a

vote of conscience, to put down an amendment to the Resolution, we will vote, those of us who feel that strongly and I believe that most of us feel that way and I would hope that some of you on the other side will refuse to vote for this Resolution because, let us face it. You have and you wanted to air your views. You have been trying to halt the Press. You have been trying to get the publicity that you think you could possibly get.

I do not know if you liked the type of publicity you got in today's *Nation*. I do not think you liked that but I think the same position will apply even on this. If you come tomorrow morning with a Vote of No Confidence on any of us here we are going to face it. We are not going to run away from anything you put against us because we know you cannot succeed. We know you cannot succeed not on the question of votes in numbers, not on the terms of the debate and in the course of the debate you are going to fail up. Up to now you have said nothing to convince us that Mr. Speaker has done anything that is that wrong that we should pass a Resolution such as the one which you have just put down.

For myself I have the highest regard and respect for Mr. Speaker. I know that for the future and I consider this debate even though certain aspects of it were very unsavoury especially that coming from the hon. member for St. Lucy, I believe that this Resolution at the end of the day might serve a very useful purpose in the sense that the Speaker will understand the feelings of members of both sides of the House and will apply himself to the task of ensuring that the envious feeling which has been generated over a period of months and years will not continue to be so generated.
5.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg again to assert myself in the fact that I am going to vote against this Resolution.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know that I have always shown unfailing courtesy to the Presiding Officer and to the dignity and rules of this Chamber, and I am always willing at any time that I have offended against the Standing Orders, the rules, the customs or conventions of this Hon. Chamber, I stand ready at any time to apologise for any such breach of those rules or conventions. It takes nothing off me to say so. On previous occasions the Speaker has ruled when I got up on a point of elucidation.....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to congratulate the hon. member, he is a big man, Sir, and he listens to advice.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member for St. Philip North is trying to confuse this Hon. House by making suggestions that did not take place. (ASIDES).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order!

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am a firm believer in parliamentary democracy and in Parliament as the corner stone of the freedoms and liberties of the people of this country, and I believe that as we meet in this Parliament, as the representatives of the people have been meeting ever since 1639, that we try to conduct the business on behalf of the people of this country in terms of question and debate, and arriving at decisions which are for the well-being of the people of this country.

In order to discharge those functions, it is necessary for certain privileges to be ascribed to members, and it is the Speaker who claims those privileges, as the member for St. Andrew has quite rightly pointed out, who claims those privileges on behalf of hon. members. He rightly said that ever since the Speaker, Sir John Gay Alleyne, I believe it was in 1766 on the 3rd June, first lay claim to those privileges successfully, all succeeding Speakers have claimed those privileges. At the start of this Parliament Mr. Speaker Hinds claimed them on behalf of all hon. members. Those privileges of the ancient and undoubted rights and privileges, particularly freedom of speech in debate, freedom from arrest, freedom of access to the Governor General whenever occasion shall require, and that the most favourable construction should be placed on all their proceedings.

I am concerned about the privilege of freedom of speech in debate, because in a debate such as this I believe all hon. members would wish to understand what has motivated me in this particular manner, how I have seen the situation and why it is that this Opposition has had to respond in the way that it has responded. It is ironical that the Speaker who should be protecting and guaranteeing the rights of freedom of debate, my right of freedom of speech in debate, should appear to be the one who was curtailing that right of debate. It is ironical that the Speaker who should appear, not only appear, who should be enabling debate to proceed by question and discussion should be the one appearing to prevent questions going to the Chair by saying "don't question the Chair".

What is the background to the impasse? As Opposition spokesman on foreign affairs, I was deeply concerned, and I am deeply concerned as Barbadians are deeply concerned about the deterioration in the state of relations between two CARICOM partners, Barbados and Grenada. I was even more concerned at the fact that such deterioration, accompanied by a rupture in the erstwhile friendly relations between our two countries could take place without this Parliament having any say or any discussion on that particular matter. I was deeply concerned about all of that, and in order to register my

concern I brought a motion or sought to give notice of a motion in these terms:

> "That this House takes note that certain comments made by Prime Minister J. M. G. M. ADAMS on Tuesday, November 4, 1980 in relation to his call for the holding of elections in the independent State of Grenada;
>
> Reaffirm its commitment to the principle and practice of fair and free elections within a democratic system of Government;
>
> Express its deep concern over the deterioration in the state of relations between the Governments and peoples of the countries of Barbados and Grenada; and
>
> Call upon the Governments of Barbados and Grenada urgently and prudently to take all steps necessary to restore relations with Grenada to a state of normalcy."

I submitted that Resolution in the hope and with the request that it be debated as a definite matter of urgent public importance. Mr. Speaker ruled that while the matter was definite and was certainly of public importance, that it was not urgent. In my own heart of hearts I disagreed with that particular ruling, but as an hon. member in this Chamber, I abided by the ruling. The Speaker further directed, and I refer to the Minutes of the Proceedings of the House of Assembly for the 18th day of November, 1980.
5.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker further ruled that the notice of the motion should be given as an ordinary Resolution. In other words, he directed that it was not urgent but that notice should be given as an ordinary Resolution. I took Mr. Speaker at his word and I proceeded to hand in the Resolution so that I may give notice of it as an ordinary Resolution as he had directed, and on the following Tuesday when the Clerk of Parliament called the item "Private Members' Notices" I got up and waited to catch the Speaker's eye because he says you have to catch his eye, and I told him that I was speaking or proposing to speak under Private Members' Notices which was called by the Clerk, and the Speaker then replied and said that it was certainly the duty of the Clerk to call the item "Private Members' Notices" but it was the privilege or the right of the Chair to call upon hon. members to speak, and he never called upon me to speak. In other words, even before I was asked to apologise I was not catching his eye.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was occasion number two on which I was prevented from speaking on Grenada. I would like you to follow me very carefully. The first occasion that I was prevented from speaking about Grenada was when I sought to move discussion of the matter as one of urgent public importance, and I was prevented from so doing. The second occasion was when in accordance with the direction and advice of the Speaker I sought to move it as an ordinary Resolution, and I was not permitted so to do. Later on that Tuesday which I believe was the 25th November whilst speaking on a Shipping Bill, I sought to make the point that that Bill which was before this Honourable Chamber was defective in certain respects because it was not sufficiently explicit as far as the welfare of seamen or seafarers in this country was concerned. I was seeking to establish that principle just as the member for St. Philip North has indicated. You can't just make a principle and leave it in mid-air. The principle has got to be illustrated in terms of certain relevant matters, and I was making that general principle, and the Speaker advised me or indicated that I was dealing with details and that I should leave those matters for the Committee stage of the Bill.

Now I pass over the fact that the Minister, my friend the hon. member for St. Joseph, had himself earlier said he was not dealing with the Committee stage of the Bill on that occasion, he was deferring it for consultation with interested groups as far as I recall. This is what Mr. Speaker asked: "Will the hon. member agree that these are details for Committee stage and not second reading? Would you appreciate that?" I replied "I appreciate everything; I do not understand why you want to stop me from speaking." Mr. Speaker then said "Now listen to me" and I calmly told him "I am always listening to you. If you want to send me out, you can. I am not offending against any Standing Order and I am prepared to go out". Mr. Speaker maintained his position that I was dealing with details and asked me to desist from discussing the details. I pointed out to Mr. Speaker as respectfully as I could that I was dealing with the welfare of seamen in this country who made a contribution, who were making and continued to make a contribution to the economy of this country, and I told him that he had already stopped me during the day from talking about Grenada, which was a fact as I have illustrated to you before. As soon as I said "you have already stopped me from speaking about Grenada today" the Speaker said "the hon. member will kindly forthwith withdraw that remark that I already prevented him from speaking about Grenada." He repeated "the hon. member must withdraw that remark and thirdly the hon. member must withdraw that remark; if he does not withdraw the remark, he must leave the Chamber and he will not be heard until he apologises to the Chair and to this House for his ill-behaviour." In other words, I only said that the Speaker had stopped me from speaking on Grenada, and I am certain that all hon. members in this Chamber can see from the record that

I have just recalled that I was stopped on two occasions from speaking about Grenada.

It was a fact that I was stopped and up to this particular time I have not been enable to speak about Grenada in this Honourable Chamber. That was a fact. So what I am now being called upon to do or what I was called upon to do was to apologise for the truth. Now I know that Mr. Speaker is very much interested in the truth; he was a proponent of the truth, so much so that he had a newspaper called "The Truth", and I was speaking when I referred to Grenada and that I had been stopped from speaking about Grenada. That was the truth and if I am asked to apologise for speaking the truth, I could not bring it upon myself to seal with that particular problem in that way.

I am willing as I have said at any time to apologise. Now if I had withdrawn that remark at that time or at any other time, what would I be saying? That I had been enabled or that I had spoken about Grenada. That would be far from the truth and I am certain that Mr. Speaker himself would not wish me to do that.

Now there is a third occasion on which I was stopped from speaking about Grenada, but I am not talking about that at all. I consider that that was off the record and I am not dealing with that, but I have cited two examples, two instances in which in truth and in fact I was prevented from speaking about Grenada; so that is the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The history of my subsequent attempts to exercise my rights as a member of this Parliament is well known to hon. members and I do not propose to go into this. But it is very strange, passing strange as one hon. member has said in here that the Speaker made an error when on Tuesday last he ruled that the motion of censure or no confidence put in by the Leader of the Opposition was not being accepted, he was not going to accept it.
5.50 p.m.

An hon. member on that side, on the Government side has said that he was wrong on that and I agree that he was wrong on that. He was wrong on that, blatantly wrong, monumentally wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, up to this particular point we have not had any apology from the Speaker to this Honourable Chamber acknowledging that he is wrong and whenever it turns out the Speaker is always calling upon members to apologise but when he himself is wrong not once does he come into this Chamber and say that he is wrong or acknowlege his human frailty.

I am saying that anytime that I am wrong I am going to get up and say that I am wrong and I believe that that should be the position of all hon. members in this Chamber and it does not matter whether they are presiding as Speaker, Deputy Speaker, or Chairman of Committees. Nobody has apologised to anyone up here for any infringement of their rights and privileges.

I recall very well an occasion in which I was prevented from speaking on a motion, I believe it was dealing with one of the many Commissions that was set up in this country but the Prime Minister of this country got up and moved the closure of the debate on the grounds that three hours had lapsed for that debate when in truth and in fact 3 hours had not lapsed for the debate and my right to speak in this Chamber...

Mr. ODLE: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: An hon. member is on a point of order.

Mr. ODLE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe I well remember the incident of which the hon. member is complaining. I can well remember that the Presiding Officer at the time had checked with the Clerk of Parliament with respect to the time and I believe, if I remember correctly, that the Clerk of Parliament confirmed that the time had elapsed.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You can send for the record in time and I am saying and it is well attested that the time had not lapsed and up to this particular point no one has apologised to me for the extinction of my rights on that particular occasion.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, even if the hon. member according to his barometer, his watch or whatever time piece he had on him for checking the time, it is clear that if a Presiding Officer checks with the Clerk of Parliament and the Clerk of Parliament confirms that the time has elapsed, there can be no question as to what the time was, whether it is longer or shorter. The hon. member must know that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I recall on another occasion in 1978 when I rose to speak on a motion, the motion was proposed that progress be reported and I believe that leave should be asked to sit again. I rose to speak on the motion and again I was ignored even though I was on my feet and my right to speak was again extinguished.

Mr. ODLE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again, if my memory serves me well, the hon. member was about to bring a motion of No Confidence

in the Presiding Officer at the time which he later withdrew. I do not believe it is proper for him to comment on it now.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, commenting on any motion of censure. I am saying that it is a fact that I was on my feet and that I was.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we are now really infringing on the rules and customs of this Honourable House. If the hon. member is complaining about something which happened under the Chairman of Committees, he must move a substantive motion against the Chairman of Committee. He cannot get around it by using a motion against the Speaker to attack the Chairman of Committee and the Opposition must understand that they have not yet learned the rules of this House and they just must not do that.

He cannot begin his debate by saying he is not too big to apologise but at the same time to attack the Chairman of Committee when he is dealing with a motion of No Confidence against the Speaker. He must deal with the Speaker of the House in this motion and not the Chairman of Committee. If he has nothing to say against the Speaker, let him sit down. He cannot do it. He should know better.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not attacking anybody. I am not attacking the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. He cannot deal with an infringement of his rights on a matter which deals with the Chairman of Committee. The Resolution is against the Hon. Speaker of this House, not the Chairman of Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's point of order is well taken.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as usual in this Chamber I abide by your ruling on this particular matter and if I have offended in that particular regard I will even go further and say that I withdraw those remarks which have offended in that particular regard.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the position. The general point I am making is that the rights of members over here have been infringed but no apologies have been made. It seems as though apologies only come in one direction and until we have the situation in which it is recognised that all of us can make mistakes, including the Presiding Officer and including the member for St. Joseph who make a lot of mistakes, until we get that particular situation, I do not think all of the eloquent appeal.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue. Will the hon. member who is on his feet please continue with the debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You want me to say that you have not made any mistakes?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There must be no cross-talking, please. Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe I have made my position quite clear on this matter and I really do not wish to say anything more at this particular stage. I believe that this Honourable Chamber having given consideration to this particular Resolution is in a better position to understand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: To understand the problems that hon. members face. I would like to refute any suggestion that from over here we do not participate in the work of Parliament. We have heard a lot about Standing Orders and so on.
6.00 p.m.

I was a member of the Committee, the Standing Orders Committee, which dealt with a revision of the Standing Orders. I am also a member of the Standing Orders Committee of this Hon. Chamber. I do not recall receiving any summons to attend any meeting of the Standing Orders Committee in this present Session of Parliament. We are willing at all times, so long as it is a matter which affects the Rules, the Standing Orders of this Hon. Chamber, to participate in such an exercise, and I think that it is quite wrong for hon. members to get up and indicate that we are not willing to share our part of such work.

Mr. TAITT rose.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, or a point of explanation, or a point of privilege, whatever it is. I invite the hon. member to send a memorandum in reply to the one that was sent out by the Clerks at the Table as to what particular area in the Standing Orders which were drawn up by them they are now disaffected with.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Sir, it is now five minutes past six. I do not wish to deprive the hon. member for St. Michael South West in any way of the opportunity to make any remedial measures with the Chair and the House, but I think that we owe an obligation to the staff, since we have started since 2 o'clock, that is four hours,

and we know that the skill of shorthand is very demanding and very mentally demanding. As the hon. member for St. Michael North Central would understand, it has a little strain.

So, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 7.45 p.m.

Mr. ODLE: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on the motion for the suspension, Sir, the Standing Orders of this House have not been suspended.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of correction, Sir, this is a suspended sitting, and we did suspend the Standing Orders.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When? On Tuesday?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Yes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on the motion for the suspension, Sir, it is very unusual for the House under the normal Standing Orders to take more than 45 minutes for dinner. I am prepared to amend the motion that the sitting be suspended until 7 o'clock in deference to the staff, but certainly not for two hours. However long the hon. member suspends for, if he is going on till 12 o'clock tonight, we will be here, you will not frustrate the public purpose. I will move an amendment, Sir, that the sitting be suspended until 7 o'clock.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: No, no, it could not be possible, we started at 2.00. We normally start at 12.00 and suspend at 2.00, which is two hours. We have put the shorthand.....*(Asides)*. We normally start at 12.00, take a break at 2.00, and then we start back at a quarter to three. We have put the shorthand writers under strain from 2.00 today till 6.00; that is four hours. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will know that in a different profession four hours constitute a day and a ground for refreshers.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The kind of refresher that the hon. member wants in the liquid form would not take that long to imbibe.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: All we are saying is that we will suspend until 7.45, which is a quarter to eight, which gives us an hour and a bit. *(Aside)*. Am I hearing from the hon. member for St. Lucy that he is agreeing to us, the House, putting his members of the Barbados Workers' Union under the strain of four hours of shorthand writing without an adjournment? I am saying a quarter to eight, that is all I am saying. I am prepared tonight to go on for another four hours. That is the maximum amount that I am prepared in consequence of the Government's view of how much you can put workers under strain without a break. I am prepared to go on.

I beg to move that this House be now suspended until 7.45 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

6.10 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on this censure motion tonight because I felt that there were enough competent speakers on this side of the House to put the case for His Honour the Speaker in a motion of this kind, but statements made by the hon. member for St. Michael South have caused me to rise to put something straight. The first thing is that it seems to me that within recent years the behaviour of the Opposition has been such that not only have they portrayed the idea of disobeying established rules and regulations and orders, but they have carried their bad behaviour from inside the Chamber outside in public with the result that the young people of this country are now behaving in the same manner. It started with the by-election which brought one hon. member to this Chamber when he started within four to five weeks of becoming a member, before he even understood the Rules of this Honourable Chamber with a confrontation against His Honour the Speaker.

Now it stretches a bit further than that. The hon. member for St. Michael South in an attempt to make out a case on his own behalf sought to draw into the debate the Chairman of Committees although there was no Resolution against the Chairman of Committees, but he above anybody else should be the last person to talk about infringement of rights. Some people in this country believe that they have rights and nobody else has got rights in the country. They can only see rights on one side.

Now I am going to take the Chamber back to 1971 when the hon. member for St. Michael South first entered this Chamber and used to sit in this very seat with Philip Greaves sitting next to him, and his ploy at that time was that when the Opposition was in full cry between the two of them used to get up in this House and say "on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the question be now put", and would turn to the Rule Book and say there can be no debate on that

question. They said they had a right to apply the guillotine and when we applied to the Speaker to protect the rights of the Opposition, they said the numbers were on their side.

I well remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there was a Standing Orders Committee that sat and worked out the Standing Orders for this Honourable Chamber, and after the Committee had agreed on the Standing Orders, they took them to Cabinet of which the hon. member was a member and came back down to the Honourable Chamber. They did not present the Report of the Standing Orders Committee, but they passed each order by a vote in this Chamber after it had been manipulated at Cabinet to suit themselves, and they don't even know the very Rules that they put down in order to curb the rights of the Opposition at that time, and in the first Estimates coming after these Rules, Mr. Russell Lowe who was then Chairman of Committees stood up and said a member only has fifteen minutes to speak on a Head, and then we protested and said that a Head with something like 20 to 30 items you could not speak on in fifteen minutes, he stood up and said "when I rules, I rules; this is the highest Court in the land, take your seat." We abided by that. We learned how to use the Rules of the House in order to represent the people of this Country when we were in Opposition, but they have not learned that as yet. They believe they are still the Government in power.

I remember the hon. member for St. John, Prime Minister of this country, would stand and break every Standing Order in the House, and when Maxwell the hon. member for St. Philip North told him one day that he was out of order, he sat down and said "the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh." Do you want to know about rights? Where is Maxwell today? I remember in the same Boundaries Commission when they were cutting up the country and we were arguing they had Mr. Eyre Hoppin in the Chair and after Eyre Hoppin was ruling according to the Standing Orders and being advised by the Clerk at the Table, they called for a suspension of the House, went outside for fifteen minutes and brought Mr. DaCosta Edwards and put him in the Chair in order to pass the Bill at the time. You are talking about rights? They said that Mr. Hoppin was leaning on the side of the Opposition and they had no confidence in him. You are talking about rights? Mr. Deputy Speaker, they do not yet understand, they have not read the Rules of this Honourable House. They do not understand the residuary power that remains in a Speaker that despite the fact that there is nothing written in the Standing Orders that he can refer to May's Parliamentary Procedure.

I have been a lawyer in court. There are Rules of Court and I have seen judges in this Chamber looked at Lawyers and tell them they have to apologise, and the lawyers, big men as they are, apologise. That is why I say there is nothing in the Rules about an apology, but lawyers have apologised to judges. In the heat of an argument, you can be carried away, and if the presiding officer tells you that you are outside the Rules and asks you to apologise, there is nothing wrong in that, but because they believe they are still the Government in power, they want to break the Rules. Do you know the thing about them? The thing about them is that they are still in Barbados. All of them should be down in Grenada and calling themselves the Government of Barbados in exile and then they could rule how they want to rule. That is what they want to do. They only think that they alone have rights. They know when to refer to May's.

I heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition tonight. In order to lead off the debate, he referred to the Divorce Laws of England but at the same time I heard his followers saying that you can only deal with the Rules that are passed by this House. Now they are in conflict among themselves even at this point in time, because if the Leader of the Opposition has gone into the Law Books – and I believe Yuill V Yuill is a 1948 case decided in England, not in Barbados – and he is quoting the Appeal Judges of England to tell us how you must operate in Barbados, and he says that is standard; but the others said "oh no". The rest says you must only look at the Standing Orders as they are written in Barbados, and the hon. member for St. Michael South boasts about his position as a member of the Standing Orders Committee and that he is ready, willing and able to come to a meeting to amend the Standing Orders which they amended in 1970–71 in order to stop the Opposition from talking, and now they come in here they want to amend them again. You are not in power and you must understand that. That is the long and short of it. You cannot be rude to the Presiding Officers of the House.

We were in Opposition. I remember Mr. Maxwell came in here, the first time he won a seat, the first time he had ever been in a Parliament, and they made him Speaker of the House. He came in one day with bands around his neck and the next day Maxwell threw away his wig, he threw away his gown, he put an African topee on top of his head and wore a shirt jack and slippers in here, but at the same time he said the Reporters of the House must wear jacket and tie, and he looked at members of the House to tell them how to dress but we did not oppose Mr. Maxwell. We sat down and quietly among ourselves talked about the double standards. *(Asides).* I do not mind you because you are Mr. Malicious and you like to malicious in people's business. You can't tell the truth no matter what happens, so I don't mind you. You don't know how to debate anything because you are the man that brought bad behaviour to this country.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: You came down in the yard of Parliament for a confrontation with the Speaker and if I were the Speaker, all like now I would have showed you the powers that I have as Speaker because you would be in jail up to now, if you realise it or not. You must realise.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please address the Chair?

Dr. HAYNES: Do I understand that the hon. member said that I would be in jail all like now?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The other Doctor that was in the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, talked about the second powerful man in Barbados. He is not the second powerful man in Barbados for me. He can lead the hooligan who will follow him and try to bring down and pull down this society because as far as he is concerned, he is power hungry but all I would like to say is that those who strive for political power and get it by the gun usually end up either dying by the gun or a political refugee somewhere. That is all I have to say to you.

You know where you and I stand. I am not afraid to answer you anytime. You know I can hurt you when I am ready. I have told you so already so you had better keep off of me. You know that my temper is short and I would tell you what I do not wish to tell you. Do not talk to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Go and talk to Lionel Riley, Do not talk to me. I am a living example. Talk to Lionel Riley.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member who is presently speaking must address the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am addressing the Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well then you must not address the Chair as "you".

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all I am saying is that they must understand that I am a living example. It is not me. It is people like Lionel Riley, my good friend.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue with the debate.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, they talk about Mr. Speaker amending questions. They should begin to look at the powers of their Speaker.

I will tell you something, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Democratic Labour Party started off to build a crematorium at Warrens. When they had reached 32 ft. down in the ground, still excavating, I brought a question to this Chamber and the then Speaker held it in his Chamber for three weeks, rewrote the question and then told me that I had to ask it in that way. I asked it in the same way but they did not know of the Supplementaries that were coming and the now Leader of the Opposition who was Prime Minister got up midway between the Supplementaries and said, let me tell the hon. member the truth. He said they dug to 32 ft. and they cannot find foundation. I do not know what they are doing and he said that he is sorry that the question did not come in its original form.

What are you all talking about now? You have not seen more manipulation in Parliament. You have not seen it. You do not understand that the then Speaker adjourned this House and refused to hold a meeting in the House for nearly two months because they did not want the Opposition to come in here. You talk about rights. You talk about rights and privileges. You are getting on good. You are getting on well in this House.

I see a man called Morgan that you brought from England and put him in here got up and insulted the Chair. He got up and insulted the whole of Barbados, and everyone of you, including the member for St. Michael South, stood up and defended Morgan. Why not look at that? Why not talk about that? You talk about rights and and the people outside. What people you all represent? Morgan stuck his hands in his ears and said to him, do not talk to me, talk to the Democratic Labour Party.

Talk about Austin Clarke. That is what you must talk about rights. Talk about Austin Tom Clarke who cried outside in the corridor. Those are the things you must talk about. You talk about suppression of rights? You know now what it is to be in Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remember a time that we could not get a question tabled in this House. We could not. We sat down as an Opposition Party and if you check the records of this House, you will notice that the phrase "the appropriate Speaker will divide, the appropriate Minister will divide by us in Opposition" but the member for St. Lucy, he is the greatest mischief maker there is in this country, the greatest mischief maker there is. He does not have any guts too, you know, a big coward, a coward.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw the reference to an hon. member as a coward.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: That what, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I beg to withdraw whatever remark Your Honour feels is out of place but I am going to say that the hon. member for St. Lucy never stands on his feet to put his case or to do what he wants done. He sits down and he pulls them down and whispers in their ears and then gets and laughs at them and points his hand over their heads and he is complaining about questions.

I have never heard him asked a question. If you check the Order Book, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If you check the Order Book for the last 4½ years, all the questions he has ever asked are about buses in St. Lucy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: That is all and I have said that in law there are the Advocates and there are the Solicitors. The Advocates depend on the Solicitors to give them proper guidance and lead them in the Law but those over there have not yet understood that when the member for St. Lucy sits down next to you and tells you to do something or to say something, you should never take his advice and he comes in here and talks about his question.

If he went in Parliament for all these years and if he does not understand who buys Government vehicles and if he says Mr. Speaker amended his question, but the point about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this. He cannot tell anybody that he did not sign the question because the record you will find in this House is that the hon. member signed the question before he got up and asked the question in this Honourable House. If he knew better, he would have said to Mr. Speaker, I am not asking this question and would have withdrawn it. He would have found ways and means of asking the questions that he wanted to ask.

Do you know the trouble, Mr. Deputy Speaker? If they go and rely on Mr. Speaker to help them frame their questions, they have to take what they get. That is the trouble. They should begin to learn Parliament. They should understand that the Clerks of Parliament are here to give them assistance, but you know their trouble? They have abused Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker they have abused you as well. They have now abused the Chairman of Committee. They have abused the Clerks at the Table in a superficial way. They go around the table. They do not want to come out and say Mr. Clerk. They put the blame on everybody.

I do not believe that they are pleased with a soul in this country and when the hon. member for St. Michael South joins with the other goodly Doctor and talks about backing Bishop, well they have abused the whole people of this country. I have said before. *(Asides).*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to withdraw that remark about the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to withdraw it but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have said before, I have travelled abroad with Government members when I was in Opposition. From the time you go to the Airport, you are a member of the Barbados Parliament, the Barbados Government.
8.05 p.m.

You do not join with anybody to pull down your own house. I have said before, I have a friend called Winston White, a man in Grenada. In 1976 when the CPA held a conference in this country, Winston White led the attack on Gairy, he literally abused Mrs. Gairy, and I said to Winston it is not fair. I went to Jamaica and Winston White was in Jamaica begging the Government of Barbados to back the New Jewel Movement, because they said Gairy prevented them from joining in the discussions of the CPA, and I said as a member of Government I could not do it, I told him that was his business. Today Winston White is locked up in gaol in Grenada, his house is taken over by the PRG, his cars are used by the PRG, and that is what the goodly gentleman, my friend, would like to bring to this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have seen and I have read censure motions. I believe the people of this country have reached a point when they begin to wonder whether or not the Democratic Labour Party is really serious about the business of opposition. As another hon. member has said, I have never seen so many walk outs as I have seen within the last four years. I remember Mr. Lloyd Smith being in this Chamber, the Democratic Labour Party put Lloyd Smith in the Chair and they did round robins on Lloyd Smith until Lloyd had to stand up and say: "If you don't relieve me now, I will do it here on the ground." Do you know something, Mr. Deputy Speaker? When we had Estimates in this House they never even sat down in here, they used to go up at Culloden Farm at the time and plan how to come back and frustrate the Opposition. I remember that, but nowadays every one of them talks about the rights of the Opposition. What rights? The only right you have is back up the road, and I guarantee that you are not coming back in here next time. You are the leader of the bad behaviour, you, but you can enjoy yourself until the Hon. Prime Minister chooses to ring the bell. When the bell is rung I will come back in here and say thank God we are rid of that nuisance.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have always sought to assist in upholding the dignity of this Hon. House, and that at any time I may have infringed the rules, the laws of this Hon. House, that I have never been above indicating to this House that it would have been a deviation from the law.

So, Sir, in rising to speak at this late hour on this Resolution, I wish to acknowledge my responsibility in this Hon. Chamber and say, Sir, that for myself not being inebriated, I am able to say to this Hon. House that I regret any difficulty, that permits me, Sir, to participate in this debate in the manner in which I wish to participate. It has been said for long and for all day, since 2 o'clock, from that side of the House that this Resolution is ill timed, that this Resolution bears no relationship to the Speaker.

It would seem to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I listened to the hon. members on that side, that they were talking about someone else completely different from the hon. gentleman who occupies that Chair weekly in the position of Speaker. I could not believe my ears as I heard hon. members on that side get up and rush to the defence of His Honour the Speaker. If we were outside of the Chamber there are some things I would have to say about them which I am not permitted to say in here.

This Resolution calls on this House to censure the Speaker for acting unreasonably, for acting capriciously and for acting partially or in a partisan manner. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that anyone who holds office, no matter who that someone is, must accept and understand that he holds that office within the confines of the terms of that office.

I am going to start, Sir, with an issue that has not been touched on the floor of this Hon. House so far as I am aware. Standing Order No. 78, Sir, says "The Speaker may grant a general permission to the representative of any journal or broadcasting or television station to attend the sittings of the House under such rules as he may from time to time prescribe for that purpose. If the rules are contravened, or if the journal or broadcasting or television station publishes a report of the proceedings of the House which is in the opinion of the Speaker unfair or inaccurate, permission may be revoked."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for some considerable time now it has been in the public domain that a journalist in this country.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I think I should draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that the matter to which the hon. member now alludes is *sub judice* before the courts of this island, and in the circumstances I respectfully submit to Your Honour that that matter rightfully cannot, and should not, form the subject of debate at this time.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member cannot get up on a point of order whilst I am on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Dr. HAYNES: I thought you had finished.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It does not matter that the question of the Speaker's ruling is before the House, the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act also envisages the participation of the courts to a limited extent in adjudicating on privileges and immunities of this House.
8.15 p.m.

If the matter is before the court, I again respectfully submit that comment on that matter should not be pursued in this House.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I may be permitted to rule, my ruling is that the hon. member for St. Michael South West should continue the debate and desist from references to the matter which is before the Court.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of order. This is a matter that needs some clarification. The Standing Order is perfectly clear. It does not stop you from referring to any matter before the Court, but it stops you from referring to a matter before the Court in such a way as would prejudice a pending judicial decision. That is what the Standing Order says. It is not a blanket ruling to the best of my knowledge. The Rule says that you cannot comment in such a manner as is likely to be prejudicial to the outcome of it. I have checked this before when a ruling was made inside here when this House was in Committee and I tried to raise the matter before a Commission or something like that. The Rule does not put a blanket blockage on any debate in the House on this matter.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest respect, I wish to draw to your attention that prior to my discussing the line I am about to discuss, I had quoted Standing Order No. 78. I am proposing to discuss Standing Order No. 78 and I take cognisance of Your Honour's ruling in the matter. I am saying that Article 78 of the Standing Orders gives the Speaker a discretion. It is a well-known and well-accepted principle however, that

where a discretionary power has been given to a functionary that in the exercise of that discretionary power the functionary does not have the power to go outside of the bounds of the power which has been given to him. I shall cite authority on that later to deal with other aspects of illegality of certain of the actions by His Honour the Speaker, but there is nothing in Standing Order No. 78 which could give any Speaker anywhere at any time the power to ban anybody for life. No Chief Justice in this country has the power to ban anybody for life from anywhere. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He can send you to prison for life, though.) If the hon. member wishes to talk about who went to prison for life or who can go to prison for life, I would not spend time on that, Sir.

I am saying that it is a travesty of the understanding which this Honourable House would have given to any Speaker when the Speaker does not give the House itself any explanation at any time for any action taken in regard to members of the Gallery or members of the Press, and no one in this Honourable House is able to go back to his constituents and state categorically this is the position or that is the position in regard to that particular matter. I go further, Sir; I contend that this House must be held in contempt by all right-thinking people outside of this House when they see that on certain occasions when certain officers or when Your Honour more specifically is sitting in the Chair.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please don't draw the Chair into the debate.

Mr. TAITT: I am not drawing you into the debate; I am drawing a point of reference of fact that it has been observed by a number of people in the community that on certain special occasions certain people can come into the House and on other occasions when the Speaker is in the Chair they can't come into the House. This is inconsistent; it is not in keeping with the Rule of Law, for if this House is properly convened now, then any decision that is made by this House forms a precedent for the subsequent meeting of this House and any other meetings thereafter, therefore, Sir, when a decision is made in this Honourable House in certain circumstances, for example, if Your Honour is sitting in the Chair, these decisions ought not to be countermanded in a manner that smacks of personal and vindictive spite, and the people in this country have every reason to believe that the matter with regard to some people in this community is motivated by personal attitudes as opposed to official attitudes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to clarify one small point that was made by the hon. member for St. Michael West. The hon. member for St. Michael West is a man who is not able to be with us because his sabbath does not permit him to be here at this time. I feel that any man who takes his religion as seriously as that ought not to lie to this Honourable House. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, the hon. member said that he feels that any hon. member who takes his religion as seriously as the hon. member for St. Michael West ought not to lie to this House. Now lying in the House is a very serious thing. It caused a resignation in the House of Commons.

Mr. TAITT: I am going on to make my point. I am going to give Your Honour sufficient information to justify the position I took. He said in this Honourable House that I said to him that the reason I behaved so on a given day was that there were some of my constituents here, and I say I never told him any such thing.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not in the law thing, but I believe my experience in here has taught me a number of things. It is unfortunate in the debate, but another hon. member cannot refer to an hon. member as a liar. It is not fair. He said he lied to the House. He knows he cannot do that. I am asking you to call on the hon. member to withdraw the remarks and let him go on. We are here to accommodate you. We have a whole quorum here to accommodate you. Withdraw the remarks. Ask him to withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member having given an explanation, my ruling is that he must withdraw the remarks.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw the remarks. I would never myself discuss matters in the terms which it was alleged that I discussed them, because when I was speaking in here and His Honour ruled, in fact he did not even rule, Sir, he said "I am tired of this ragging, I am tired of this ragging, I am tired of this ragging." I submit Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is not a proper intervention by the Speaker. I submit further that it was confusing because I understood him to be dealing with another hon. member who at the time was heckling me as I spoke. I did not understand him to be speaking to me. I wish to submit, Sir, that it is precisely that mode of thinking which accounted for six million Jews being killed by persons who were subsequently heard to say they were following orders. An unlawful order or unlawful command has been held not to be an order or command and I feel that any individual reserves the right when he is faced with an unlawful command or order to refuse such unlawful command or order.

I wish to draw to attention to another matter which goes on in this Honourable House with His Honour the Speaker being perpetrator time and time again. According to the best evidence available in the 18th Edition of

May's Parliamentary Procedure and in a number of learned documents that have been written in this field, and in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House, when His Honour the Speaker has said to an honourable member "you must withdraw", he has ruled, that is a sentence and that is the end of the matter.
8.25 p.m.

When he goes on to add anything else after that, it is not legal. It is not proper and it cannot be presumed that a person merely because he has ears to hear who maybe on his way out and as he passes by the Speaker's Chair the Speaker rules and that he will not be able to come back in here. That ruling, I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker is null and void.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, what the hon. member is trying to say is that having ruled his power is *functus officio.*

Mr. TAITT: I can make a comment that the Leader of the House is functus but we will not go into that. The fact is, Sir, the fact, Sir, on many occasions what His Honour had done is to rule that a member should leave the Chamber and then as the member is proceeding from the Chamber he attempts or alleges to make further additions to that ruling.

I believe that if His Honour, the Speaker would consult with the Clerks of Parliament more that he would not make those kinds of errors. His errors go fundamentally to the rights of the people in this Chamber for if and when Mr. Speaker says an hon. member must withdraw regarding that particular incident I believe that authority on that is clear and needs no further elucidation from anyone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker of this House has demonstrated by his attitude that he is capricious. On more than one occasion while ruling, for example, to members of the Opposition, he has had comments to make which suggest that his ruling has to do with his personal attitude to the particular hon. member.

Only last week when the members of the Opposition were leaving this Chamber, the Speaker having ruled, he was heard to say because we have loudspeakers in here, "That is the extent of their contribution to the debate." I submit that that is no business of a Speaker to be saying what is the extent or otherwise of any Opposition or indeed the Government in circumstances where the hon. members feel that they are doing what they have to do or what they ought to do.

I go further. I have heard hon. members over there during the course of this debate talking about participation in Committees. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to say that I have never heard of any attempt, any circulation of any information, I have never received any from that side of the House about changing the Rules in this Honourable Chamber but I will say this, selected by my side to sit on a Select Committee, and I sat on that Select Committee. I attended every meeting of that Select Committee.

I merely wish to say this. The Speaker's behaviour as Chairman of that Committee cannot be said to have been the same as his behaviour in this Honourable House in the context of sticking to what he interprets as the rules. That Committee had and I repeat and I will say it and I will continue to say, had a number of irregularities which left me in a position where I say this. I would need to see a lot of chapter and verse before I go to sit on another Committee of that kind.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am asking for Your Honour's ruling on how far an hon. member can debate and reflect on the proceedings of a Select Committee which has not been challenged by a substantive motion and it seems to me, in my submission, out of order for the hon. member to refer to the proceedings of a Select Committee which has passed and is current as well in this session of the House as being irregular unless the hon. member had by substantive motion or when the Select Committee's Report was being debated, raised that issue and it is to reflect, therefore, in my submission on the proceeding of the Committee and the vote of the House on those proceedings.

Mr. TAITT: I would like to submit to Your Honour that the submission by the hon. member is not correct. The rules say that a member of a Select Committee may report to Parliament or any Parliamentarian. The rules say anybody other than a Parliamentarian. Check the rules. Furthermore, this motion has to do with the conduct of the Speaker. The Speaker was Chairman of that Committee and I feel.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I may be permitted to rule. The Resolution before the House deals with His Honour, the Speaker, in his duty as Speaker. I interpret it as Speaker of the House proceedings over this Honourable Chamber and my ruling is that you must desist from referring to the Speaker's conduct as Chairman of a Committee.

Mr. TAITT: Sir, I cannot challenge your ruling even though I am in disagreement, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with the debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I am very interested in this because I was once removed from the House for saying exactly that. "I cannot challenge the ruling of the Chair even though I know it is wrong" and I disagreed with it and I was actually put out.

Does the Leader of the Opposition remember the incident? Mr. Maxwell was in the Chair and I was put out because I argued and I said that a Speaker can rule and you must obey the ruling but you are entitled to say it is wrong and I was put out for that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member will continue with the debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been said of him that he knows and understands the rules better than anyone else. I doubt that anyone would challenge that. There is no doubt that the Speaker knows the rules. It is his interpretation of them, Sir.

The Speaker seems somehow to have gathered to his breast the concept that he is a School Master and we are all little children, pupils waiting for him to say yea and nay. Anyone who has gone through the debates of this House for the past 20 to 30 years and who has had to exist under the present Speaker from this side of the House must look with envy at what used to go on in those Parliaments.

It seems to me that the level of freedom which existed in those Parliaments has not been touched in this Parliament. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker cannot give me lines. The Speaker cannot put me in detention. In Parliament this is not a Sunday School and in the Parliament of the United Kingdom they fight and scuffle in corridors, they hurl insults on each other and Mr. Speaker tends not to hear them because it is not in his interest to hear them.

We have had a situation where the Speaker of this House caused the hon. member for St. Lucy to be suspended for three months and it is questionable whether he had the power to do so. It is questionable whether he had the power to suspend. In fact, I can find nowhere in the rules that the Speaker has the power to suspend anybody for one week, or one day or three months except on the authority of Parliament other than by a substantive Resolution and yet in the course of this Parliament we have had a situation where an hon. member has been suspended for three months.
8.35 p.m.

In fact, he was suspended for the balance of the Session, and it was only the intervention of Divine Providence, through the ending of the Session, that the hon. member was only suspended for three months. But worse than that, I am told on the highest authority that the Speaker sought to see if he could stop the member from getting his pay. I am told on the highest authority that he sought to stop the hon. member from getting his pay. What business is it of the Speaker if he has ruled and he has ruled correctly whether the hon. member is paid or not? He is not the Accounting Officer of this Parliament, the Clerk is the Accounting Officer of this Parliament.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Surely this alleged action of the Speaker, which I do not believe, could not possibly refer to anything that has happened inside the House, where you have already ruled alone must the Speaker's conduct be called in question. I have with my own ears heard John Yearwood quarrel with the Clerk for paying my father and Lionel Craig when he wrongly put them out in 1968. With my own ears I have heard him question it from that Chair there. I have never heard Mr. Speaker or anybody else question the payment of any hon. member who is put out. I heard John Yearwood sit in that Chair and say that Sir Grantley Adams and Lionel Craig.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. An hon. member has been called by name, the member for St. James. That is contrary to the Standing Orders.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw the reference to the name, Sir, but I am sure that the hon. member cannot be alleging that it was said in here anything about stopping pay.

Mr. TAITT: As I was saying, Sir, it is no business of the Speaker to get himself involved in what happens to an hon. member after that hon. member has been decided upon in this Chamber. It is unfortunate in many ways, Sir, that the example which has been set by Your Honour has not always been followed, for, Sir, those hon. members over there, as we do know, I heard him with my own ears saying how he would kick the Deputy Speaker to Kingdom Come. The Speaker, when he felt that the Deputy Speaker had ruled in his absence in a manner in which he was deemed to have a personal interest, he said how he would like to kick the Deputy Speaker to Kingdom Come.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is clearly out of order. It is not part of His Honour the Speaker's duty to behave in a manner in which he is alleged to have behaved. The Resolution speaks of Mr. Speaker carrying out those duties which are imposed upon him by this Hon. Chamber, and we must not have any reference to anything other than the duties which he is bound to carry out in accordance with the directions of this Hon. Chamber.

Mr. TAITT: Well, Sir, it happened inside the Chamber.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West is a little confused about kicking people. It is the Leader of the Opposition who threatened Lloyd Smith to kick him to the moon. That is in Hansard, and it is the Leader of the Opposition who took up a paper weight to hit Freddie Miller with. Now it is you, so you do not really know what is going on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is not even in his place so he cannot be heard by the Chair. Go outside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. Michael South West could get back to the Resolution and deal with Mr. Speaker's conduct in relation to his duties.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. The point I was making in relation to his duties is that I believe that the precincts of the House fall within – if my understanding of the Speaker's duties, especially since he has been made a full time officer – those duties embrace the responsibility for the precincts of the House in relation to members, and we were sitting in the dining room, Sir, when he said he would kick the Deputy.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you could desist from making any reference to any such thing and stick to the Resolution itself.

Mr. TAITT: Very well, Sir, as Your Honour wishes. I am coming out of the dining room and going by the Speaker's Chambers, and I feel that a Speaker who causes a Prime Minister to have to break down the door of the Speaker's Office is not a Speaker of whom it cannot be said something is wrong with him. (ASIDE). What the Prime Minister is saying, I do not know if he is saying that it was not him who caused the door to be broken down, but what I know is that it was not the Prime Minister who took the clothes to the laundry. It is in this context, Sir, that I have come to believe that something is wrong with His Honour. I have come to feel when I watch his demeanour and when I listen to his colleagues who say how knowledgeable he is of the rules, I have come to the conclusion that one who is so knowledgeable of the rules and yet who behaves in such a capricious manner from time to time must only do so at certain times of the year or certain times of the month. I really do not understand how someone as affable as the Speaker can be from time to time can turn into what appears to be a demon as he advances from that Chair down the steps with white wig flowing and he attempts to speak to hon. members as if they were children: "You...will..not... speak." "Sit down!" "The hon. member will not be heard!"

Mr. Deputy Speaker, no one speaks to children like that in this day no one will attempt to deal with children in that way, and it is our duty on both sides of the House to let His Honour understand ...(ASIDES). I understand from what is said over there that they view this Resolution, if they vote for it, as being a form of dismissal of the Speaker, so no one is surprised that they will not vote for the Resolution, because I do not think that it is in the interest of the Government to have the Speaker dismissed at this point in time, although I am certain that from time to time the Prime Minister must have raised questions in his mind if in appointing the Speaker he had done the best thing and the right thing. I am sure that that must cross his mind from time to time. I have watched the Prime Minister in here look on incredulously as the Speaker made some ruling, and then as usual the Prime Minister buried his head behind a newspaper so that one could not observe his real features as he contemplated what other foolishness it had been that the Speaker had done. But one can understand why they do not want to vote for the Resolution. It is not in their party's interest to have the Speaker fired at this point in time, but they should stand up and let the Speaker know that some of the foolishness which he does from the Chair is unacceptable to them as well as to us.
8.45 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for St. James. The hon. member for St. James says that if the Speaker would consult with the Clerks more often that a large percentage of the difficulties of which we complain would disappear. I do not know if the Speaker is speaking to the Clerks. I do not know that; but whether he is or is not is totally immaterial to his responsibility as Speaker. I know he is not speaking to the Deputy Speaker. I know that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired and he must wind up.

Mr. TAITT: I will wind up in a minute. If His Honour the Speaker would consult with the Clerks whose duty it is to advise him on the proper manner in which this Parliament should be conducted, then we would not have some of the rulings which have led us on this side, when for example, we have a clear point of order, when we do the point of order in the manner suggested in the Standing Orders to have Mr. Speaker say "the hon. member will not be heard, sit down." We are not children, Mr. Deputy Speaker; we are representatives who have been sent here by the people, and those of us on this side feel very strongly about representation of people and especially at this time in Barbados it is very important that the voices of the down-trodden be heard. We do not believe that those voices can be heard if we on this side come to feel that our interests are being pressured and our rights eroded by an insensitive Speaker.

It is primarily the duty of the Speaker to see that debate is conducted in a reasonable manner and inherent in that is a prime responsibility to protect the rights of the minority, and despite the fact that other hon. members on that side seem to suggest that because something happened in the past it should continue, I would dare to suggest that even if in the past they could point to instances where a Speaker or a Deputy Speaker or a presiding officer interferred with their rights, the time has come for them to join in the call for the stoppage of any such erosion by presiding officers.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not have in mind speaking here this evening, but a few thoughts have come to my mind. In fact this debate has turned out to be quite interesting and rather educational. When we arrived here we had in mind to debate a matter relating to the present Speaker of Parliament, but during the debate a number of names have been called of former Speakers where many of us who are in Parliament for the first time can see clearly that this abuse of power has not just some about within the last four years, but has been existing for quite a number of years. Therefore this debate does not stop here this evening. We will all vote and will bring everything to an end as far as this matter is concerned, but the problem as to Speaker continues with us, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, regardless of what Government is in power, when you only have a Parliament of 24 or 27 or even if sometimes it was 30 seats, the numbers of a Government are going to be so few that the Prime Minister selects five, six or seven of his best people and make them Ministers, and then and then and then. You rake up something that is left to make a Speaker. This has happened in Parliaments. You pick your seven best or eight best men as Ministers and then you say, let us see who remains and therefore you get this abuse of power. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not a problem that the Opposition is throwing upon us that did not exist in their own camp.

We heard tonight that the former Prime Minister said "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away" to a Speaker, just letting him know that he would not be there for too long if he does not play the right tune, therefore that exists on both sides, because when they are in power they will do it and when we are in power or another person is in power, the Speaker is always in a position within a slight moment to be dealt with if he does not fall into line. Therefore Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a problem that we have to overcome and it is not easy.

This evening when I believe the Deputy Prime Minister was speaking, he referred to some parts of the world where they have constituencies that are not contested so as to get an impartial Speaker; but it is very difficult to get an impartial Speaker when you have elected sixteen. If I were a Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would favour my side, and the hon. member who just sat down would favour their side more than I would; so what are we going to end up with? We are going to be back to square one. So let us face up to it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some arrangement has to be made. We are going to have 27 seats now, an odd number. Let us take out one and select somebody to run who would be impartial. I do not know how we can do it because that is a tough problem to put to either side, but the point remains that while I may be making a certain amount of jokes of the whole thing, this problem is going to remain. I do not see that any Prime Minister picking a Government out of seventeen and picking his six best men as Cabinet Ministers and then selecting somebody else to be Speaker, that that person is going to be impartial. He has just been in a contest with his colleagues and he is therefore going to favour his colleagues.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not heard one person in here today talking of a Speaker in the last 20 to 25 years who was impartial. They have all taken sides, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the few words I have to say are simply these, that after we vote this evening it is not the end of this matter. The next three years there will be a vote of censure against the Speaker and another vote against Speakers, because Speakers coming from a small group of 16, 17 or 18 members will find it very difficult not to make rules that would benefit and are partial towards the other side. So I just leave those few comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it a little bit difficult to comprehend in its entirety the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat. The allegation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or the suggestion that no Speaker can be impartial or truly impartial is one which I cannot accept.

The Resolution before us which attempts to censure His Honour the Speaker of this Chamber in a motion of No Confidence is one which I cannot support. What hon. members must realise is that this entire debate is a debate on the behaviour of members of Parliament. I am very glad that it has come up today, and what hon. members in this Chamber must understand is that the Speaker of this House of Assembly is a strong Speaker. No one can deny that, and what His Honour the Speaker of this Chamber is trying to do is to insist on a standard of conduct, a standard of orderliness which in his view is becoming of the Parliament of this country for the benefit not only of Parliament itself but all the people in this country.

I have had opportunity on several occasions travelling through the country and particularly in my constituency to see several youth groups who regularly hold meetings, and I am very pleased indeed to report

that the manner in which they conduct their proceedings is in the best parliamentary traditions. Sometimes I myself feel that they need not stick to the details as they do, but nonetheless they must be encouraged and they are doing a good job when they in their small meetings insist on high standards of conduct, and I think that hon. members of this Chamber should realise that any time they in the performance of their duties conduct themselves in a manner which has got to be repudiated, it is a shame on this Parliament.
8.55 p.m.

I think that hon. members of this Chamber should realise that anytime they, in their performance of their duties conduct themselves in a manner which has got to be reputed, it is a shame to this party but I must say, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have to agree with the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he said earlier in his remarks that this is not really an unruly Parliament.

There are Parliaments over there in the Commonwealth in which people behave really badly. We over here in this Parliament by and large have tried to conduct ourselves on a fairly high level but whenever there is need to castigate, to bring to order hon. members, the Hon. Speaker does not waste any time in doing it and all he is trying to do is to let Parliamentarians understand that they cannot come in here and behave as they like, walk out as they like, say what they like and then come back in here as if nothing had happened. That is the whole crux of the matter.

I am not going to be long because indeed there are other things going on. What I would like to suggest is this. There is need for a revision of the Standing Orders. I firmly believe so as I believe that we can all make a contribution to them. It is about time that something be done to these because while we all aim for perfection, perfection is indeed something that is not easily attained but we must nonetheless strive for it.

I heard the hon. member for St. Lucy in his speech use strong words in respect of Mr. Speaker. I am not going to be too long. Dictatorial, oppressive, contentious, capricious, intoxicated, but I have never heard His Honour, the Speaker referred to an hon. member in this Chamber as being somewhat or slightly ill-mannered or lacking in training. Members must understand that they cannot come into this Chamber and behave as they like, do as they like and be not admonished.

I want to make one other reference before I sit down and it is this. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central made a point in which he said that debates are allowed when His Honour, the Speaker is not in the Chair. I would like the hon. member to understand any other Presiding Officer would not consider it the least bit flattered because like, Mr. Speaker, in many respects, all Presiding Officers of this Chamber will insist on a standard of conduct and behaviour of which this country should be proud.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am not speaking as Prime Minister now. I am speaking as the hon. member for St. Thomas who has been in this House. This is going into my 15th year who has sat on Sir Theodore Brancker in the Chair, Mr. Neville Maxwell, Mr. Eyre Hoppin. I have had to put up even during a major debate with Mr. DaCosta Edwards who, whatever his other qualities, brought a degree of partiality to the Chair which has never been equalled and I have sat under His Honour, the present Speaker, and while I do not endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for Christ Church North Central who I think is somewhat pessimistic in assuming that no Speaker can be impartial because we are such a small House, I must say, Sir, that history is repeating itself over this question of Speakers in a way that it would be ridiculous if it were not a little tragic.

All Speakers make mistakes. All Speakers take a certain view of the rules. All Speakers are subject to criticisms by the Opposition. All Speakers send out a Government Minister from time to time for bad behaviour and in my opinion, all Speakers, again with the exception of Mr. Edwards, have to my mind tried very hard to be impartial and have mostly succeeded.

Now, Sir, the present Speaker like the rest of us sinners has never been infallible. Nobody is ever entirely right. All of us make mistakes from time to time. There is undoubtedly a certain dichotomy in this Resolution since the speeches of many hon. members have been directed towards the question of apologising while the speeches of other hon. members are directed towards the general behaviour of the Speaker.

On the question of apologising. There is a particular form of Parliamentary Procedure for questioning in the long term the ruling of a Speaker. There is even a form of words which I believe is hallowed by practice. You set out what the ruling is and you recite that it has been given in such and such cases and you end up with an Addendum, I think it is called, saying that such a ruling is contrary to the usages and orders of Parliament and should not be followed and this is a means of discussing a rule and establishing a practice for which all hon. members can vote or cannot vote, depending on how they see these usages and how they think the usages should be in the future.

I myself think a better way to deal with it is to deal with it through the Standing Orders but there it is. It is a form of a Resolution can discuss a narrow point. In this case, as I understand it, whether somebody who

is asked to withdraw something or really has to apologise if he does not withdraw it or whether there are any circumstances under which he can ask for an apology or, on the other hand, Sir, the dichotomy consist in the general conduct of the Speaker.

I do not intend to address the first part. You, Sir, say privately that you do not believe that an apology can be called for and others say they do not believe it because it is not in the rules. I know there are usages of Parliament which are not in the rules. I have not researched the point because it is not a point which the motion specifically addresses.

I believe that my father, the late senior member for St. Joseph, lost his seat shortly before the 1938 Election because he refused to apologise and he refused to apologise and did not come back to the House, and fought the next Election as a member whose seat had fallen vacant, I think it was through the absence, through the non-apology and the absence. Anyhow, the House was dissolved and he so to speak, faced the electorate as a candidate under a ban but was returned. The Historians can deal with that when the particular point comes up to be analysed.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central tells me that he has researched the point, that the rules of Parliament that existed at the time were not the rules of Parliament now. All of this may well be so but that, to my mind, is a technical and procedural point. There is a wider point contained in this debate tonight and the wider point is well exemplified by the speech to which I have already referred, that of the hon. member for Christ Church North Central.
9.05 p.m.

The general attitude towards a Speaker in a small House and the general attitude of a Speaker towards a small House. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there can be few people in public life who have been so abused by his political opponents than His Honour the Speaker. His Honour the Speaker has been subjected to unprecedented attacks from the Barbados Labour Party many years ago when he was not in our camp, and very vigorous and indeed more abusive attacks from the Democratic Labour Party from about the year 1964 onwards.

The Speaker, according to a complaint which he made to the Committee of Privileges during the last Parliament, was even subjected to physical attack by one of the Clerks of Parliament who subsequently became a Senator. I myself heard things said about the Speaker, read things written about him, listened to debates which made me realise that he must be a man with an exceptionally broad back, but these things leave their marks.

In 1976 there were scenes in Parliament which I never hope to see repeated when the hon. member for St. Peter was nominated to be Speaker. The behaviour of the then Leader of the Opposition was in my view totally reprehensible and totally unnecessary. So the Speaker has had to start out this Parliament under the shadow of some singular abuse from the Opposition.

Now, the election of this Speaker was likened to the election of the Speaker in 1948, but the election of the Speaker in 1948 was not on the occasion for abusing anybody. On that occasion, as I remember it, the parties were very evenly balanced and the party which had got the majority of the seats was seeking to make a member of the Opposition Speaker. There have been other occasions. In 1956 Parliament had a great deal of contention at the start, but again not contention in the way of abuse of either of the candidates for Speaker that Mr. Speaker at present has had to put up with. And you know when we are dealing with Mr. Speaker we are dealing with a man who in ten years in Parliament has demonstrated a mastery of the rules, a man who has been recognised all over the Commonwealth, because he was an indefatigable attender at CPA meetings, keen to work within the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if hon. members in this House realise that the hon. members of the Barbados Labour Party who came into Parliament in 1966 who were never put out were chided continually by the present Speaker. One of my great disappointments with the Leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister was that when we came to appoint the Rules Committee that had written the present Standing Orders in 1972, when I nominated the then hon. member for St. Peter, the then Prime Minister said that we were going to make the Field Marshal of misrule a member of the Rules Committee. Why I was disappointed was the error in regarding the one man in the House who really was interested in the rules as a person who would give difficulty in the Rules Committee, and of course Mr. Speaker was one of the most prominent members as the hon. member for St. Peter of the Rules Committee at the time, and we produced new Rules. After all, Sir, the new Rules were produced by a House dominated by the Democratic Labour Party, I do not know how they got to be such hard rules all of a sudden. They are only six or seven years old. (Dr. HAYNES: We are not complaining about the Rules, your side is complaining about the Rules). Obviously I am in error, I read in the newspapers that certain members on that side had told the Press they did not like some of the Rules. Obviously they were misquoted, and you should stop me when I quote something I read in the Press, just as His Honour the Speaker stopped me when I quoted something I read in the Press said by the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, coming to the Resolution itself, the hon. member for St. Michael South West said the Speaker treats members like children, and so on, but sometimes

the members behave like children, and they never behave more like children, the members on the other side, than in their self-centredness. The 15 long years in the House in power convinced them that if there is a doubt about the Rules, that that doubt must be resolved in the favour of the Democratic Labour Party. I very well remember a debate, I was ashamed, I felt for Neville Maxwell when the present Leader of the Opposition was about to be sent out of the House for bad behaviour when he was Prime Minister. As Mr. Maxwell was about to send him out, he said "the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away". In other words, there used to be a rule that the Prime Minister must not be sent out of the House. (ASIDE).

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has made a very wise *sotto voce* remark. He said that he heard me use the words "nasty, stink and dirty" the very day of the debate. I did not hear the Speaker say without any intervention from the other side that that language was not proper language to use in here and made me withdraw it.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. When he used it the second time, my recollection is that His Honour the Speaker did not make him withdraw but he said he should tidy up his language a bit.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I was behind the Chair and I said in a *sotto voce* remark that you have to withdraw that after the Speaker said he had to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there must be some limit to what some members recall. 9.15 p.m.

I quoted from The Nation newspaper without any objection from the Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker stopped me from saying anything more about the Nation. I tried to go on, the Leader of the Opposition got up and said "Your Honour has just stopped the Prime Minister from talking about the newspaper, why is he continuing?" and the Speaker said "there is to be no more about The Nation" and then a little later on when I used those words, and I did not use them in respect of a member because I try to cover the language in such a way that it did not offend the Standing Order, the Speaker made me withdraw the remarks.

Now all over Barbados you hear how the Opposition has been punished. Nobody points out that the Prime Minister was prevented from reaching into intemperate flights of language by the Speaker on his own initiative. Nobody worries with that. Nobody said the Speaker is a bad Speaker when he put the hon. member for St. Michael South East to sit down on the grounds I believe of repetition on television. Nobody said the Speaker was a bad Speaker when he sent out the hon. member for St. James for bad behaviour, a proper action too. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Please continue with the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Speaker apparently must be free to suppress the Prime Minister, remove the hon. member for St. James, put the hon. member for St. Michael South East to sit down, all of that; I believe the hon. member for St. George South and the Speaker have clashed too.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would give way on a point of elucidation, what I said in my speech with regard to the hon. member for St. James on the question of partiality, is that when the hon. member for St. James returned to the House after the behaviour of which the hon. member now speaks, the hon. member resumed his position in this House as if nothing had happened, and we contend on this side that that is partiality because we, when we returned to this House, were being told we had to apologise or else we could not come in.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, that is not correct. I was present. They were asked to apologise as part of the punishment because of their contemptuous behaviour, but they did not stop there like men and apologise. The hon. member for St. James with all his experience as to how to deal with this situation left before the Speaker could ask him to apologise.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, the hon. member's memory seems to be failing him tonight because His Honour not only asked the hon. member for St. James to withdraw, but skipped the whole idea of any apology that he always applies to this side and then went to the point of calling on the Marshal to put the hon. member out. He skipped the whole idea of an apology in respect of him, but went to the third step by calling the Marshal to take the member out, and when the Marshal got there the hon. member for St. James ducked out and ran outside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Prime Minister will continue with his speech.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this is not a debate on the conduct of the hon. member for St. James. The points being made by all hon. members only illustrate my point that we discuss the matter of the gradations of punishment, apology, withdrawal and so on, which is I think a slightly separate matter from the general conduct of the Speaker. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know I have been in the House once during a naming. There has only been one naming that I can

recall anyhow. Mr. Edwards threatened to name me once, but I think he was restrained. I remember how Sir Grantley Adams and the hon. member for St. James came to be named. Sir Grantley Adams perhaps was defying the authority of the Chairman of Committees, there is no doubt about that, and the Chairman of Committees said "I name the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and I name you Lionel Craig" and pointed his finger at the hon. member for St. James, and he had not committed any offence at all, not any offence of any sort, and we had to go through the whole procedure of the naming and the removal, and having Mr. Yearwood say that they should not get any pay when they were out, all of that. And a Resolution had to be brought, but the then Prime Minister and the Leader of the House could not do otherwise because to do otherwise or for the Speaker to refuse to accept the report would be to decide that you are going to have a different Chairman of Committees. I well remember that, and the naming of the hon. member for St. James is undoubtedly the unfairest act that has ever taken place in here, and on that occasion we did not bring a Resolution because sometimes you have to forgive ignorance in the heat of the moment and so on. Mr. Yearwood's penalty was to be told by Mr. Lloyd Smith that they should not have made him Chairman at all because the higher a monkey goes the more he shows its tail, I believe, was the precise expression. And so now all of a sudden, capitalising on the years of propaganda against the hon. member for St. Peter, the Speaker.....

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, the fact is, Sir, that all hon. members on both sides might agree that when the present Chairman of Committees is in the Chair that sometimes the ruling may or may not be acceptable to members, but the thought of bringing a motion of censure against the Chairman of Committees hardly ever arises in the minds of anyone for precisely the reason that his attitude in his ruling may suggest ignorance but it never suggests malice. This is the whole gravamen of the argument put from this side. The hon. member may be called upon to make a ruling and the members accept the ruling. The Speaker knows the rules, so that when he makes a ruling that suggests that it is heinous, people understand the decision which he has made in the context in which he makes it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael South West has never forgiven the Speaker for putting him down on television when he had nothing more to say and he did not call him home during the budget debate. That didn't mean I am going to say that the hon. member for St. Michael South West is malicious every time he gets into an argument with the Speaker or deliberately provokes the Speaker in order to create an incident in Parliament to stir up spurious public protest. So why should he suggest that the Speaker is malicious every time he makes a ruling with which he does not disagree?

The Speaker has been in Parliament many years, the hon. member for St. Michael West not so many. Why should it be assumed, this is the gem of the whole thing, that the Speaker is so omniscient that every time a ruling comes about which is inconvenient to the Opposition that there is something malicious about it? The hon. member for St. Michael South West said that nobody brings a motion of censure against the Chairman of Committees. I think the Chairman of Committees should bring a motion of censure against the behaviour of the hon. member for St. Michael South West who behaves extremely badly sometimes in my opinion and sets out to embarrass the Chairman of Committees, almost as if he is practising for the Speaker, or because he feels the Chairman of Committees is better natured than the Speaker, he set out to behave badly and be offensive and belittle the Chair with his finger.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member would wish to withdraw those remarks which suggest improper motives on my part during the sitting of the House. I object to those remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The words must be withdrawn.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw the words.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to challenge the hon. member for St. Michael South West that on several occasions he has said in the dining hall when we are in Committee we can now get a little fun when Jack is in the Chair. You can run round Jack. You have said that repeatedly and you have demonstrated in here that when the Chairman of Committees is in the Chair that they set out to embarrass the Chairman of Committees and say that he does not know the Rules, but they are afraid of Burton.

Mr. TAITT: What I might say, if he ever heard me say anything, I would say that when the Chairman of Committees is in the Chair we can now look forward to a little justice from this side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Prime Minister will please continue with his address.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, it is a matter of commonsense. If the hon. member for St. John does not mind my saying this, there is a lot of politics in this

motion. I am not going to dismiss it purely as a political tactic, but there is a lot of politics in this motion.
9.25 p.m.

The *Nation* Newspaper, Sir, I am quite prepared to make this a document of the House, has done a real public service in analysing the relationship between the Speaker and the Opposition since 1976 on pages 14, 15, and 21. For the first time, probably for 20 years, the Leader of the Opposition was told to discontinue his speech on December 7th, 1976.

He behaved, I remember the occasion, as if he was still somebody in a position to say God giveth and God taketh away and he behaved badly and would not sit down and the Speaker had to be pacified. I remember the hon. member for St. James saying "No Burton, do not sent him out of the House. Do not sent him out." I well remember that occasion. The hon. member was accustomed to overriding Speakers and treating them like children. (ASIDES). Did I write it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No cross-talking, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe John Connell wrote it. I would like to give you something else to go to Quaker's Road tonight and curse him when you get a chance.

To have a look again through the pages, one finds that Mr. Evelyn Greaves, the hon. member for St. Lucy, apparently was a regular clasher with the Speaker, and was always saying things about him. Now, it is going to be suggested that the Speaker always had something in him for the hon. member for St. Lucy. It is not more correct, bearing in mind the things that the hon. member for St. Lucy said outside of the House about Mr. Speaker, that it is more probable that the hon. member for St. Lucy had something in him for Mr. Speaker. That is the atmosphere. That is the poisoned atmosphere occasioned by that first debate in 1976 with Mr. Smith, the hon. member for St. Lucy and the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is a matter of commonsense, Sir, I am not going to support this motion. There is no Government whip for it. Matters relating to the Speaker are matters as far as I am concerned to touch the conscience of individual members of the House and they can vote according to their conscience and their estimation of how the Speaker has acted and how the debate has gone.

I am satisfied with the Speaker's great reputation outside of Barbados. He has been a member of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. He was elected to fill my place after I became Prime Minister. He has attended a great number of Conferences. He is very widely known throughout the Commonwealth. He is widely respected throughout the Commonwealth Parliament for his knowledge. Even the Democratic Labour Party when it was the Government sent the Speaker outside of Barbados, I believe, to lead a Parliamentary Delegation in Grenada or one of those Islands, the Speaker and the hon. member for St. James.

Inside the political spectrum of this country he is known as a person who has mastered the rules. I do not say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there have not been occasions on which they must have been slips. I remember Mr. Cameron Tudor in the great debate of 1969, it must have been. Under Sir Theodore Brancker, said that occasionally Mr. Speaker had slipped. All of us have made slips. We recover from our slips and we reverse ourselves. The Speaker did that in respect of this very motion here having first indicated that the motion was intolerable. He subsequently when notice of it came properly to be given allowed it to be dealt with.

I believe when the Brandford case, the Journalist, is finally decided by the Courts that whatever the outcome that the members of the House will eventually see Mr. Brandford back in here but I do not think that you can possibly ask the Speaker or anybody else, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to re-admit Mr. Brandford while there is a law suit in the Constitutional Court between Mr. Brandford and the House of Assembly. Do not mind that the defendant is the Speaker. That is a case between Brandford and the House of Assembly.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. If what the Prime Minister is saying is true well this hon. member in the House of Assembly would like the whole matter dealt with in a different way. I have not got Brandford in Court. What House of Assembly are you talking about? No, No, Brandford has him.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, exercises the collective authority of the House and it is the House whence Brandford was excluded, however the exclusion went, but I am not dealing with the case. The case would be dealt with one way or the other. I do not believe it is true that because Albert Brandford knows he will lose the case that he is not having it called off deliberately so as to help the political party which he supports by keeping the issue alive. I do not believe that is true.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the Prime Minister.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sorry, I withdraw that. I am told I should withdraw it, all the words from "I do not believe that Mr. Brandford." I am told

that I should withdraw that. That is a reflection on the case, Sir, but anyhow all of these matters time and the healing process will make right. We know in here that it is the hon. members' behaviour that give rise to the angry scenes which have led alternatively to this motion.

Mr. Speaker has shown less partiality, surely less than Speaker Maxwell. Surely anybody who has been in the House under Maxwell could think that the partiality or impartiality of Maxwell could ever be measured against that of His Honour, the present Speaker. Not that that is a total test one way or another but he has shown as much impartiality, the present Speaker, as any human being could in such a small House under the pressures which the Opposition have put on him and the pressures both within this House and outside this House.

They cannot attack the Government for misruling so they attack the Speaker for misruling and in the circles in which they move constantly all the time you hear, "Oh Mr. Speaker. The Speaker stops us from doing this." The Speaker does not stop them debating the Budget. The Speaker does not stop them from walking out when they cannot answer the charge that they did not oppose the boundaries in Committee.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister has repeatedly made the statement that we did not oppose the changes in Committee relating to the boundaries. I wish to record for this Honourable House what is already in the Report. On every single point except St. Andrew and St. Lucy a division was called for. Two hon. members voted against and three hon. members voted for. It is not right to continue saying that there was no objection.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Nobody is saying that there is no objection in the widest sense. What I am saying is that they did not ask for a single boundary to be changed. That is a separate matter. I will not deal with that. Senator Connell and Senator Hunte in the Other Place have dealt effectively with the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Hon. Prime Minister could wind up his speech.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I do not regard the Speaker's execution of his duties as being capricious, certainly not capricious, partial, he treats all members the same way, or unreasonable. Hon. members express amusement in that but that is the whole point that the Speaker treats all members in the same way, nor does, to my mind, the Speaker behave in a generally unreasonable manner.

I do not think in anyway that the Speaker's actions constitute a breach of the rights claimed by any hon. members and more particularly the rights of the minority The language is proper but the sentiment is wrong.
9.35 p.m.

I do not in any way think he is deserving of the highest censure, and I have every confidence in His Honour the Speaker and I intend to vote accordingly when the moment comes.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the introducer of this Resolution did not seek to remove the Hon. Speaker of this Chamber from his position, but it could be rather misleading to the general public, because the whole question of a no confidence motion tends to give the impression that either the Government or the person against whom that no confidence motion is being moved will be removed if the Resolution finds a majority of support.

What I think was the main reason for bringing this particular Resolution was and is to get an opportunity to express their feelings on certain matters and at the same time the Opposition was and is seeking to alert the public that they want to have an issue. They have tried all sorts of things, they have taken all sorts of non issues on the political platforms and have failed, and we are seeing a last minute scooping from the bottom Resolution before this Hon. Chamber so that the public of Barbados will feel that they are being wronged and ill treated, ignored in this Hon. Chamber on meeting days. I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is the main reason for the Opposition supporting this Resolution.

A Speaker in any Hon. Chamber, in any Parliament, has a very difficult task to perform. He must be able to see speakers as they stand or as they get up to make a contribution, and his task is even more difficult when he has to contend with a larger Chamber. It is very difficult in the United Kingdom for the Speaker to be able to see the speaker who gets up first. In that Chamber where there are some 635 members of Parliament it is very difficult for him. I am not one who will advance an argument that it is difficult for the Speaker in this Hon. Chamber to see a member who wants to catch his eye, but we must understand the difficulties, because on several occasions more than one hon. member rise to speak and would like to make a contribution at a particular moment for various reasons, but the Speaker, because he cannot allow each member to speak or all members to speak at the same time, must as is now the phrase, someone must catch his eye and sometimes the one who gets up first is not allowed to speak because he or she did not catch the Speaker's eye. Therefore it is grossly unfair if one seeks to convey to this Hon. Chamber the impression that because he or she has not been given the right to speak when he or

she gets up at that particular point in time that the Speaker has acted in a partial manner.

What I can see wrong in Parliaments today, especially in a Parliament which is comprised like the one in Barbados, is that we have certain factors which we have to examine. We do not have like in Britain a system where the constituency of the Speaker is not contested. That is a convention in Britain where the major political parties desist from campaigning or putting up candidates for that particular constituency. We have a different situation in Barbados where the Speakers over the years are members of either political party and they must address themselves to campaigning at election time, and that is one of the things that we must seriously address ourselves to. I am not saying that all Speakers' decisions and rulings are activated by political beliefs or political leanings, but I am saying that it is quite obvious that a Speaker at some time or other must take into consideration his political allegiance, and I think the time is ripe for us to examine the role of the Speaker and the manner in which he is elected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to point out that I am not saying that His Honour the Speaker is one who is activated by any political or party sentiment, but the possibility is there as long as we continue in this situation. We have seen this sort of conduct exhibited in former Speakers where they felt that they had to toe the party line and to reflect the feeling of a political party, and this is a dangerous element and we have got to seriously look, certainly in the future, at how best we can resolve this particular situation.

I do not agree that His Honour the Speaker has acted in a partial way. I have never been sent out from in here, neither do I intend to be sent out. I have been called upon to withdraw remarks from time to time and I bowed to His Honour's ruling, because that is the sort of game, but we have seen in here when some members of the Opposition are told to withdraw remarks that they have blatantly refused to apologise or to withdraw the remarks. I would go as far as to say that there are some members on that side who seek to catch the eyes of the Gallery, and when there is a following of their particular party or constituents, they seek to behave in a manner which they feel is exciting and good for them, and I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all of this leads to the sort of confusion which we have seen in this Hon. Chamber, because some members do not understand that when they come to this Hon. Chamber that they should try to exhibit the very highest conduct and that the Gallery should be treated better than what they are treated with from time to time.

9.45 p.m.

This is the sort of thing that we get from politicians. They said some politicians are matured, and they realise that to behave sometimes in a disorderly manner is not doing their image any good and that is why it is difficult for the Speaker to sit there on Tuesdays during parliamentary sessions and allow that sort of conduct.

Now, Sir, I am sure that His Honour the Speaker would like to bring dignity to this Honourable Chamber, a dignity which was deteriorated certainly during the Democratic Labour Party regime. I would go as far as to say that. I have been present in the public Gallery when I heard some rulings from the then Speaker and some other Presiding Officers which were not in keeping with the Rules of the House, but the Presiding Officers contended that that was their interpretation of the rules and that is what it should be.

Now, Sir, His Honour the Speaker must be a man who can interpret the Rules and he is the judge in this Honourable Chamber.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member would give way, I draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that His Honour the Speaker tries his best to maintain very high standards in this Honourable Chamber and I would feel that he has been doing his utmost to see that the standards of this House are kept at the very highest level, but we have seen how members come in here, and we can see sometimes it is discussed before it gets in here how they are going to make a fuss, they are going to make the Speaker send them out and they are going to behave in a manner which would cause the Speaker to make a ruling, and that is why we have seen very often from this side members appealing to His Honour the Speaker not to send out certain members, but some members still continue, because they feel that when they are sent out and it is reported in the press or on radio or television that it is doing them good and looking at the Speaker and causing people to ridicule the Speaker or the Government. We understand the political game. Walking out or being sent out is a means of drawing the public's attention to the Opposition, it is part of their strategy. It is a game, but the Opposition must understand it is not always good to be sent out. They should stand up like men and fight back, and a little apology can do nothing, and if they were strate-

gists they would be able to come back and win the day. But what have we seen? We have seen them bringing this Resolution before this Chamber deploring the conduct of His Honour the Speaker. And what are they claiming? They are claiming that their rights are eroded or that the minority rights are not protected. That is what I understand; that is what they are claiming, but I want to refreshen their memories.

In 1974 it was the hon. member for St. Michael South who said during the Democratic Labour Party's conference in St. George.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I am again drawing your attention to the fact that there is no quorum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. BRADSHAW: In 1974 at their annual conference the hon. member for St. Michael South who was then the President of the Democratic Labour Party said that he would wish to see the Opposition depressurised, deflated and removed. That is what the hon. member said.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, having been at that conference myself the hon. member is misquoting the hon. member for St. Michael South. He never said those words. I know and remember very well the exact words.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member would have to tell us what he said, therefore, Sir, this House can only accept that the hon. member for St. Michael South East is correct; remove and depressurise.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I maintain that I am quoting accurately what was reported in the press, remove and depressurise. That is what was said. Not only that, but they are talking in terms of the right of the Minority. Do they forget what they did with the reporter of the Nation? They chased him out. He was in the minority and they chased him out. That is the sort of thing that they get along with. They did not want to see any opposition, but now what has happened with them is that the boot is on the other foot. They never thought they would have been in the Opposition. They are down there now and you must lick your wounds and take your blows. You never wanted to see the Opposition; every obstacle was put in our way, but we fought back like men and like a responsible party.

They have been around this country, rather than facing up to issues. It is not the Speaker that should be censured; we should have been censuring them for their irresponsible conduct night after night, day after day. On Sunday night rather than discuss the issues, discuss what is going on – people want to hear what you are going to do for them – all five speakers had one theme. Mr. Deputy Speaker, nothing they have to offer and that is why they have brought this Resolution before this House. We must understand what is going on. Christmas is coming. People want to hear where they are going to get some money from; they want to hear if they are going to give more money. We have released some $60 million that have gone into the people s pockets. They want to hear if you are going to give them some more. You can't tell them what you are going to give them because you believe in taking income tax, but we are going to give them back income tax at Christmas time. That is what we are seeing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we must respect His Honour the Speaker for is that he did not sit in that Chair during this No Confidence motion. It is not unusual for Speakers to sit through No Confidence motions. Here we can see an exhibition of the decency of His Honour the Speaker.
9.55 p.m.

I can well remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while in Dominica, a No-Confidence Motion was brought before that Chamber against the Speaker and the Speaker, Mr. Francis, now deceased, sat in the Chair right through that No-Confidence Motion. That was in Dominica in 1974 but we have got here today, a big man in His Honour, the Speaker, as he not only allowed the No-Confidence Motion but he did not sit in the Chair and I think that we must understand that the man is holding the highest position of that office. Now, what do they want?

Last Sunday night the hon. member for St. Michael South West castigated His Honour, the Speaker, and what was worse, then came in here asking someone to sympathise with them? Mr. Deputy Speaker, they really have the gall to come in here and talk about protecting the rights of the minority? I really cannot understand it.

Last Sunday night when I was in my constituency standing by one of my constituencies, their supporters spot a light in my face twice. That is the sort of conduct and behaviour. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my constituency of which I am legally the representative, legally and constitutionally elected to this House of Assembly for St. Michael South East and I have every right to be in my constituency.

But you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must understand what is going on. They said absolutely nothing. They told the people in the area nothing about what they were going to do. All they did for the whole night was to talk about one Pele issue, every one of them. That is all they did and they referred to the people as beggers in the constituency. I want to warn

them now that when the time comes they will always have to fight what they have said that the children in St. Michael South East are beggers. I will know how to put it over. That is what you have done with yourselves.

We must bear in mind that this Resolution is not one against the Speaker. They are setting about to embarrass the present Government. That is what they are trying to do. They have picked on the Minister of Housing. They have created a lot of fuss. They said they are going to have him removed. They have not moved the rock of Gibraltar.

They have tried their little thing with me, but it did not work. They are now trying with Mr. Speaker. We must understand their aims. They are going to pick out individuals whom they think are vulnerable but they must bear in mind that we have enough time to recover and we will deliver some very telling blows on them when the time comes.

Now, I am sure that the hon. members from that side came in here today because they thought they could rip up a massive crowd in the Public Building Yard or bring them into the Public Gallery. They are playing to the Gallery. They want to show up their side, but what do they see? In the words of the Leader of the Opposition, where have all the flowers gone. You remember the debate of 1974? Where have all the flowers gone? The people have gone. They do not want to see you. They do not want to hear you. They are not interested in your No-Confidence Motion. They do not want to hear you.

What they must concern themselves with, and I am going to tell them what they should do because I am going to be an Advisor like Herbie Alleyne. I am going to be Advisor here. You must concern yourself with the rift you have in your Party. That is what you should concern yourself with when you cannot even tell anybody how to vote. Those hon. members in the Other Place have demonstrated what you all stand for. You do not know your minds.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are confused. They are terribly confused. Look in the Gallery, they do not have any supporters, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us see the Resolution for what it is. It is a Resolution which they had hoped to whip up support for them or for their ailing Party, a disunited Party, a disenchanted Party, a Party that does not have any answers for the problems that would be in Barbados. In fact, there are none and they will seek to make issues out of non issues and I submit that this Resolution is not worthy of my support and I do not think that hon. members from this side will support it either.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to give my support in the negative to this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate has, I think, generated one of the highest degrees of levity that I have ever witnessed before an Honourable House and I think that the hon. members intended it to be treated as such and I wonder at the end of the day how serious the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John was when he put down this debate in the terms in which it was set in this House.

It is no easy matter to be a Speaker in a House of this nature and indeed, as the election time draws nearer, it becomes even more difficult for any person to maintain a certain level of decorum in this House. I have been in the House now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for something like 9 years and I have had the privilege of sitting under Speaker Maxwell, Speaker Hoppin and the Chairman of Committee, Mr. Russell Lowe, and now the hon. member for St. George North.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I want to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum.

(The bell was rung and a quorum formed).

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have had the honour, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to listen to the recordings of this House after a debate and sometimes I think members should take the opportunity to listen to the cross talk which goes on, the difficulties which are encountered for persons like Your Honour in the Chair in maintaining the decorum of the House, and sometimes fractious moods in which members of the House conduct themselves, the element of confrontation which has been imported in the House by some hon. members including the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.
10.05 p.m.

The attempts to involve the public in adjudicating on the rights of the House, like "we are not going to apologise and we will bring everyone down here." These types of trends in the political forum of the country will eventually destroy the democratic structure of our country. I have spoken out about them on numerous occasions and it must pose great difficulty for any Speaker to be able to keep this House focussed on the central issues and the necessity to maintain not only the dignity and the privileges of the House, but also the very fabric of democracy itself.

Let me say for the present Speaker that whatever one may say about this Speaker he has demonstrated an unrivalled knowledge of the Rules of this House, he has also demonstrated the necessity for members of the House to show punctuality, he has demonstrated the necessity for members of the House to show respect for each other, and he has demonstrated the need for the House to ensure that the public shows respect for the

House. I believe that these are qualities that one finds in a a good Speaker, and regardless of what members may say, I have heard members *sotto voce* refer to His Honour the Speaker in the most scurrilous of terms and when he has got up and said that they must apologise they want to know for what they must apologise.

Now, it is nonsense in such a small Chamber to sit down and be scurrilous about the Speaker and expect that the Speaker must not retaliate in some way by demanding a certain standard from the Chamber, and on numerous occasions one has had to appeal to members in the House at least to remember that it is the dignity of the House which is at stake.

This motion makes it appear as if the Opposition is more sinned against than sinning, and I think that if one looks at the conduct of the Opposition at times, particularly in relation to His Honour, one will find that they have been more sinning than being sinned against. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I refer to the beginning, to the election of the Speaker, although it has been referred to already in debate in this House. I have never heard a more scurrilous attack made on any person than was made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central at that time.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. The Standing Orders prevent tedious repetition of the arguments of other persons; your own argument or the arguments of other persons. That is in the Standing Orders, and that argument was used by at least six members on the other side already today.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to use it again on the hon. member as well. I have heard the hon. member, both on tape and in person, outside of this House using the Speaker's past to attack him viciously.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Standing Orders also prevent the tedious repetition of the arguments of other persons, and that argument has been used by at least three other persons already today.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member could refer on five different occasions, but I am saying that I have heard him personally getting into the marketplace trying to attack the character of the Speaker. (ASIDE). Yes, the hon. member. If he wants to know, I will tell him. He wants to know whether it is Fairchild Street, Sir. The marketplace is used in this case not referring to a particular place, outside then, attacking the Speaker viciously, and then he expects that the Speaker is not flesh and blood, and to look at him to see how serious he is when he is talking about his rights being infringed.

Now, what are we asking people? If you are asking the public to have some respect for the House, you cannot go out there and condemn the man, attack him viciously, say he is unfit, he is not suitable, and then you come in here and try through a mere pretence to say that you respect his high office but the Speaker does not respect his office as well. I do not know what the Opposition really wants from the Speaker. I have seen the Opposition given more than latitude in this House to debate issues. I have had Mr. Russell Lowe rule that in Committee I could only speak once for 15 minutes on any question. I have seen Mr. Speaker Maxwell rule wrongly on occasions against us when we were in the Opposition, and on each occasion although I may have disagreed with that ruling I have got up when he has called for an apology and apologised. (Dr. HAYNES: Spineless). The hon. member says I am spineless, but he has come into politics in which he considers it as politics of confrontation. He can only put a point of view if he thinks he hates somebody and if he thinks he has a row with them. He does not understand normal disagreements in debate, he does not understand this, he must have venom in his mind and nastiness in expression in order to put a point of view. That is what he must have. He must bring the mob out in order to be able to attack someone. That is what he wants to talk about, he does not realise that he has to talk about something else.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I am sure the hon. member on reflection would wish to withdraw that. The remarks are reflecting on the character of an hon. member, Sir, saying he has to have venom in his mind in order to put a point of view. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure he would want to withdraw that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is merely interrupting the speech in order to make a point, but let us be serious. The hon. member's politics is of that nature, because he believes that this gives him the image of the man who will succeed and who is toughest in this country. I have told him outside the corridors of this House that it is foolishness, that he must understand proper debate, he must understand that we can have political disagreement without believing he has an enemy that he is fighting all the time, and I am not surprised that he conceives of the Speaker in those terms, Sir. He has a long way to go, I hope that he gets outside, not only in Opposition, that he loses the next election to humble him a bit, and the House would be a happier place, because he can understand that the very crowd that he is trying to create can become double headed and hydra headed to deal with himself, Sir. The hon. member is typical of the sort of politics that we do not need in this country today.

Obviously last week, on the last occasion this House met, when the Speaker had to suspend it for a few minutes, I was surprised to hear the hon. member

say it was Glendairy that day. He could only think in terms of Glendairy, he cannot think in terms of any way of compromising. He said you would have to lock him up, the House was going to meet, as though the hon. member is a bully. I have told him before he is no bully for anybody at all, and he cannot frighten anybody by that; not at all, Sir. So that when I hear his speech against the Speaker I cannot take him seriously. I cannot take his politics at all seriously, because I do not believe that he brings rationality to politics, I do not believe that he brings common sense to politics, I do not believe that he brings humanity to politics. I understand that he brings the love of power to politics, but that is not all that you need to be a proper statesman or indeed to be a proper politician at all.

Now, Sir, I want to move off to some of the other things. The Speaker has been in this House since the 1960's. I have sat in here with him, I have seen him in debates get down to perhaps some of the longest speeches that we have had in the House, and at times perhaps he has stretched the patience of the very Chair to its limits by being able to extend debate but within the terms of the House, but never once have I seen His Honour the Speaker when he was on that side being rude to the Chair, or even if he was not rude to the Chair and the Chair ruled against him, I have always seen him bow with respect, withdraw the remark and apologise and start afresh.
10.15 p.m.

Now does it take anything off hon. members in the interest of debate when all of us get hot sometimes to offer an apology? Are we a set of little boys and girls and we get to bloated with our minds that we cannot say "I am sorry?" You may not agree with His Honour the Speaker, but get on with the debate.

We recognise that the public at large laugh at us when we come into this House and believe we are the biggest enemies, we have the biggest fight out and that the Speaker is so bad. I think it is a wrong approach that hon. members have on these matters. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is obvious that you and I don't get into that sort of situation. I have had some of the strongest disagreements in the approach to politics on particular issues with members on the other side and with members on this side as well, but when I leave in here I consider their arguments, sometimes I think I might have erred in not accepting their suggestion, but I don't go out with this same feeling that we are about here to do what! All of us have a short time on earth. If we can make a contribution, we make that contribution, but we can't make it with enmity and venom and destruction in our minds. It is hopeless, it is a stupid approach to take to politics, and I am appealing to hon. members not only of the other side, to try to bring back a little sanity, a little rationality, a little commonsense into the life of this country, and most important a little discipline.

Believe me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the problems that we are having in the country of indiscipline is created by the sort of attitude we ourselves generate in the community, and the divisions in our society based on partisan political approaches unnecessarily, based on race, based on black and white, based on Indian and Negro, are eventually going to destroy this country. All of us in here have had opportunities that our foreparents did not have. Let us change the attitude of looking down on the Speaker by believing that he did not have the opportunity like some of us to go to a University and that sort of thing. Let us stop abusing the Speaker on public platforms. If the hon. member would stand up and give us an undertaking that he would not personally abuse the Speaker in the way they have been doing on public platforms, not only rinsing him out, abusing him personally, and that is a fact .....I could not support the motion when I have heard the sort of harsh things that they had said about the Speaker in his capacity as a man. From the very first day in here, let us be fair, I could not support them at all in this attitude, and therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the Opposition ought to withdraw this motion. We have a debate. If there is one thing I would like to leave to His Honour the Speaker, it is that at times I recognise his patience is sorely tried and there are times perhaps that he will have to extend a longer spoon to some of the others. Sometimes he may have to do that because he must recognise that sometimes they err out of ignorance and not always out of malice. That is the only thing I would say, but I would hate myself at times to have to preside over the Chamber as fractious as this Chamber can become. When there is a Gallery, Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South West goes to flights of oratory that sometimes he himself does not imagine he is capable of, and if you stop him at that time, Sir, he becomes very angry, he has gone to the mountain peak and he thinks that you are pulling him back, and woe for His Honour the Speaker if he crosses with him on those occasions.

When the hon. member for St. Lucy comes in here wrought up particularly on an issue that concerns either his constituents or the rights of workers, woe to His Honour the Speaker if His Honour the Speaker crosses him at that time. When the hon. member for St. Michael South Central comes in here at any time looking at the power that he thinks should be for him, rightfully his, the second most important man with the first man no longer having the capability and seeing it slipping through his arms with the hon. member for St. Michael South West waiting in the slips, woe to His Honour the Speaker at that time if he stops him. It is only a natural thing, Sir.

I believe that the Speaker has served us reasonably well. I am not saying that he has always been right; it would be nonsense to believe so. Some of his judgments and rulings can withstand the test of time and also are equal to the rulings of any court that I have seen. I have not always agreed with all of his rulings, and that is why a couple of days ago I intervened in the interest of this House, but you saw the fractious manner of the Rt. Hon. member who brought this motion. He does not believe that anybody can advise him. He has been lord of the manor for so long. He giveth and taketh away like the Lord. He does not want to take advice. He came in here with one view; he wanted a confrontation and there was to be no sensible compromise and rationality in looking at the issue before the House.

I am appealing to members, let us bring back sanity and rationality. We have had a good thrashing of these issues. I wish everybody a happy Christmas, peace be unto the House, peace be unto the Speaker; let Christmas charity into your hearts. We say prayers every day. How many members after the prayers have been said remember the things that we have said and get in here in the interest of the House in maintaining the dignity of the House and the role of the Speaker in seeing that our proceedings go properly? Within five minutes all that sometimes is forgotten. I am really asking the Opposition to try in the new year to see if we can have a different approach to these issues.

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

Noes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. SIMMONS; Mr.x WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ODLE – 12.

Ayes: Dr. HAYNES; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. TAITT – 3.

10.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Notices is the instant order of the day.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay a Message advising of the absence from Barbados of His Excellency, the Governor General during the period 25–29 December, 1980. I will mention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that during the Governor General's absence, Sir Arnott Cato, President of the Senate, will act as Governor General.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the Third Actuarial Review of the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme.

I also beg to lay the Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1979.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Select Committee on the Integrity in Public Life Bill, 1979.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes the business of Parliament for this year. I would like, Sir, on behalf of the Government to extend to you, Sir, to His Honour, the Speaker, the Staff, Members on the Other Side, Sir, the Seasons Greetings and I hope, Sir, that next year when we resume, after of course, now that we have all vented our feelings in this matter, Sir, that we will come back after having embodied the spirit of Christmas and goodwill.

We have a very heavy legislative programme when we resume to perform, Sir, and I look forward to the co-operation of all members on this side and I look forward to the co-operation of all members on the Other Side.

I think that it was a very good thing that we were able to conclude this year giving the Other Side the opportunity to let off some built-up steam which they seemed to have had for a long period of time.

I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, January 13, 1981.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to pay special tribute to the Staff of Parliament who under some extremely difficult circumstances, administratively and otherwise, have had to work continuously and they have performed well under the circumstances. I am wishing them and all the other hon. members the compliments of the season.

We hope they will come back next year refreshed, and willing and ready to continue in the spirit they have exhibited. It is our wish that they will have a blessed Christmas and if peradventure the bell should ring, we will look forward to meeting the others out in the hustings where they have not been doing quite as well as they continue to allow themselves to be but that, notwithstanding, I feel it is proper that we should end the year in that one moment of non-contentiousness which

allows one to wish one's colleagues the best for Christmas. They might as well have a good Christmas, Sir, for next year is going to be very difficult, Sir, especially for all members on the Other Side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And for my part Mr. Speaker would wish to join with me in wishing the Staff and members of Parliament a very happy Christmas and we look forward to renewed but friendly and vigorous contest in the new year.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, January, 13th 1981, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the Sitting accordingly.
10.30 p.m.