
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

THE SENATE

Wednesday, 23rd January, 1980.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings, on Wednesday the 23rd January, 1980, at 2.40 p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir ARNOTT CATO, M.B., Ch.B., LL.D., (President); His Honour Senator the Rev. G. ANDREW HATCH, M.A., (Deputy President); Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, B.A., LL.B., (Minister of Information) (Leader of the Senate); Senator O'BRIEN TROTMAN, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office); Senator M. E. COX; Senator H. F. G. ROCHEFORD, B.A.; Senator H. R. LINTON, LL.B.; Senator K. E. HINDS; Senator Miss O. A. LYNCH, B.A., Dip. Ed.; Senator K. R. HEWITT, B.Sc., C.A.; Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, B.A.; Senator J. D. S. MACKENZIE; Senator Miss M. I. StC. BLACKMAN; Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM; Senator D. H. G. HUNTE; Senator J. A. CONNELL, LL.B.; Senator the Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Labour and Community Services) and Senator R. E. BRATHWAITE.

ABSENT

Senators R. L. FIELD; AARON TRUSS; and C. I. E. DEANE.

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I am happy to have been afforded the opportunity this afternoon before we move formally into the business of the Senate to say a few words in recognition of what I consider a most important honour. I refer to the honour conferred at the end of last year on Senator Cox, and at

the same time to wish to join in my comments a member of the Other Place, Mr. Reynold St. Clair Weekes.

Those of us, Sir, who were born in the late thirties and who had an opportunity of living and growing up in the forties, would be particularly pleased that these gentlemen have both been honoured even though their areas of service which Senator Cox and Mr. Weekes were giving were not quite the same in that Mr. Weekes was giving his at the local government level whereas Senator Cox was giving his at the national level. At that time we had the opportunity to see Barbados being transformed and being transformed largely because of the efforts and the sacrifice and dedication of men who had the vision to understand that although the tunnel was dark, at the end they would find light.

I mentioned, Sir, that I was born in the late thirties, more precisely I was born in 1937 which still remains, I think, the most significant date for the history of this country. I am not given, Sir, to believe that the date is significant for any additional reason. It was in that year, Sir, that Barbados got into the act as part of a movement started in 1935 and indeed going on beyond 1937. What I call the movement is the popular expression of discontent, of resentment, of not being able any longer to put up with conditions which were in fact sub-human. We are dealing with an age when agricultural workers earned nine pence or 18 cents a day, when we had deplorable housing conditions, when educational opportunity beyond the primary level was scarce, when unemployment was the order of the day, when in order to vote you had to qualify by way of income or property, when you could have a chauffeur going to work late a morning and being prosecuted under the Master and Servant Act, when an employee at Easy Hall Plantation would go to Edgecliff on a day when there was no work for him at Easy Hall and as a result be prosecuted before the Courts and be fined 84 cents which was almost a week's wages under the Located Labourers Act. We are dealing, Sir, with grim times and that, Sir, was the day in which a band of war-

riors under the Progressive League, one of the most significant warriors being Senator Cox, another one whom I hope the country will also honour, or let me put it this way, one hopes that he will accept an honour some time shortly. I am referring to Frank Walcott because beyond doubt there is no more significant trade union leader in these parts. The Progressive League with its three arms, the Friendly Society, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Labour Party, took to the challenge of the conditions of the time. It was not the first organisation and these were not the first men to have dealt in terms of challenging the conditions of the time. We must remember the efforts made before them. But for the first time we had an organisation of party and union which proved able to tackle with outstanding success the problems of Barbados, and therefore those of us who grew up particularly in the Forties, at a time when legislators were not paid, at a time when to become a member of Parliament was not only difficult for several reasons, but one risked if he were a professional man not enjoying the kind of clientele by which he would normally expect to make a decent and satisfactory living. One risked all sorts of things as a result of seeking political office in those days, and this, Sir, is the kind of atmosphere within which persons like Senator Cox came forward to make their contribution. It was a day so completely different from today that those of us who enter the public arena today cannot in any way claim to be coming forward in the same way and in making the same kind of sacrifices which persons who came forward at that time were required to make.

Mr. President, one of the outstanding things which that movement has been able to achieve has been to give this country a certain stability and responsibility in public life, a reputation for honesty and integrity in public life. Indeed, there is absolutely no doubt, Sir, that when one looks around the Caribbean one understands how much the good name of Barbados is owed to contributions of Senator Cox and his colleagues at the time.

This honour, Mr. President, appeals to me particularly for another reason, and it is this. The kind of situation obtaining in this country for many years was such that one could only describe the country accurately as a society of privilege, a society of snobbery, a society of elitism. Young persons coming on today will not understand the extent to which that statement is true, because they are living at a time when there is so much more opportunity for equality, and there is so much greater mobility within the society, but for persons who were able to see the transformation taking place it is a real hard fact of life, and every time that honours have been given out in this country where they have been what we regard as honours at the highest level, because honour with the sole exception of Sir Learie Constantine, honours beyond the level of Knighthood are not conferred in this society, where honours

at that level are conferred, as far as I know this is the sole exception to what seemed to have been the rule that the recipient had to be either from the professional or business classes, and therefore it is particularly significant that Senator Cox who himself by his work did so much to remove barriers and to provide equality of opportunity, it is particularly significant to me that he should so be honoured.

I wish to go not very far but a little into the recorded historical fact in relation to Senator Cox. I believe, Sir, that the one that is most pleasant for me to recall would be looking at the newspapers after the elections of 1951 or after the elections of 1956, because it is only when I became a practising politician that I began to ask the question, how could it have been done, because Senator Cox not only topped the polls but topped them in a rather convincing fashion in the constituency then of St. Michael, which was at least three times as big as any other, and certainly more than twelve times as big as one particular constituency. In short, Sir, what I am saying is that Senator Cox whole political life is one of such outstanding performance that I think it reflects the kind of diligence and hard work that he put into everything that he wanted to do.

What I really wanted to refer to, when I said I wanted to refer a little to historical fact, is that I believe ought to be recorded, and it is this. Whenever one asks of the Ministers of Government, and one was talking to a senior public officer, whenever you ask of the Ministers of Government with whom he had served the answer always came back, the one for whom he had the highest respect and the highest regard was always Senator Cox. I believe that most of us in here have heard that countless times, I believe it is time for it to be in the official records, because we were dealing with a situation again in which colonials were not believed able to run anything, therefore you had to have a Bushe Experiment, an Executive Committee, and all the stages leading up to Cabinet Government.

It is a tribute to the Caribbean and to this country that in Barbados men of such outstanding mettle could be found to operate the Cabinet system, and indeed Cabinet Government in this country has certainly operated as an institution that belongs here. Senator Cox, during the period 1954, when Cabinet Government was introduced, to 1961, when he went out of office, served as Minister of Communications and Works and Housing, and then as Minister of Trade and Industry. We have to remember that the Ministry of Trade and Industry gave tremendous filip to the development of the tourist industry in those days. It was a Ministry which also legislated all the incentives that provided a jumping off for industrial development in this country. If we therefore wish to analyse the recorded fact at that level, we will find of Senator Cox's

performance that it was remarkable, and no Cabinet system can work unless it has Ministers of the calibre to perform and to perform at that level. It cannot work properly.

Mr. President, as I began, I said that I wanted to associate Mr. Weekes with the remarks I was making. I cannot clearly associate Mr. Weekes with the particular remarks I was making about Senator Cox a little while ago since Mr. Weekes' performance before he entered Parliament in 1961 was at the Local Government level, and Mr. Weekes not only involved himself in Local Government Affairs but also in matters relating to a Friendly Society — areas of work extremely important in the day to day affairs of people. And I believe that it is the career of someone like Reynold Weekes that makes us understand how very important Local Government was to this country and what a serious mistake it was when the system of Local Government instead of being modified was abolished, because what we now have is an attempt at the national level to deal with problems which need the kind of personal attention and understanding which is precisely what Local Government is about, and as a result of its abolition we have now transferred to the national level every conceivable kind of problem, and politicians operating at that level have to find ways and means of treating those problems. So we find that Mr. Weekes would have been a much more effective politician if operating at the Local Government level — not that he has not made a valuable contribution at the national level — but I am making the point that because he was blooded in that way when he came to the national level he was able to improve the quality of the contribution because he was able to bring matters that did not make the headlines into office with him.

Mr. President, I wish for once not to say that I do not intend to speak long, because I believe that when there is such an outstanding occasion somebody at least ought to risk being told: "Sit down, we know it all already, so you do not have to say more." Just let me mention that I am not a person who particularly believes in honours but I recognize that every country does have some way in which it honours its citizens. And what I consider important is not whether I believe in honours or not, whether Imperial Honours are an appropriate way of honouring an individual or not; what I believe is the important question is whether when an honour is bestowed the community as a whole understands why it is bestowed and agrees that the person ought to be honoured. I believe it would be true to say that the honours which we are talking about this afternoon are honours which the community, insofar as I have heard persons speak, considers fitting, appropriate and most deserving. That, Sir, is what I would consider to be the yard stick by which we measure the utility of any system of honours and we would like to strike that cord whenever we honour our citizens.

In closing Mr. President, let me say that I believe this is the last occasion on which we will have any Imperial Honours, and in fact it was the Constitutional Commission of which Senator Cox was himself Chairman that recommended that the system of Imperial Honours, so far as they affect Barbados, should be replaced by a system of national honours. The question may therefore well occur to some why we did not keep back this one until the introduction of national honours. What I would like to say is this, I do not mind at what time the honour comes, so long as it is richly deserved; and as far as Senator Cox is concerned my only regret is that it was not done before. A service is there for all to see and it is a record of which everyone can be justly proud, and I want to congratulate Senator Cox not only on receiving this award but I take pride in being a countryman of such an outstanding person.

SENATOR J. A. CONNELL: In a sense, Mr. President, some men are greater than honours. In a certain sense the value and dignity of a given honour appreciates with its bestowal on certain men and women. I think it was for this reason that Senator Kennedy addressing a gathering of his compatriots to honours the late Sir Winston Churchill said: "We are met here to honour a man whose honour needs no meeting." So it is today with Senator Cox and Reynold Weekes. In a way I think that the bestowal of these two respective honours on these two men tends to enhance the value and importance of the honour. I say this because the contribution that they made to the society in which they live is a historical reality and they would have been outstanding men even if the honours had not been bestowed on them. That is not to say that I do not believe in national honours. I believe that a nation should honour its outstanding citizens, if only to inspire new confidence and hope in succeeding generations of younger people to make their contribution towards the improvement of the society. I think also that it is human nature to want to be loved and appreciated for good deeds done for one's fellowmen.

Many indeed are the roles that lead to the rendezvous of business. The few persons who arrive at this point of view come by divers path. Some come by way of teaching, training the young fruit to grow and shaping a new generation to bear the weight of responsibility of carrying on with civilization, some come by way of the priesthood, some by way of politics, medicine and law. Some come simply as anonymous good samaritans who are kind to their neighbours. But however they arrive at the rendezvous of greatness, they all wear the badge of outstanding service to their fellow men.

So it is today, Sir, with Sir Mencea Cox and Mr. Reynold Weekes. I think on this occasion, we should put behind us the partisan division and recognise outstanding contributions to our country. Sir, we live in an

age, in which it is fashionable to become a politician, but those who do and there are many, are forgetful about two important truths about the political experience. The first one Sir, is that the politicians today as ever, perform an indispensable function to the society in which he lives, moves, and has his political being. The second is that in many cases where the politician is being most bitterly criticised, he will have been found upon inquiry, to be holding up a mirror upon society for it to see itself. After all, he did not appear out of limbo somewhere suddenly the day before he became a politician. He was born. His mourning are the mournings of society. It seems to be that much of the criticism overlooks this fact.

It is also important on occasions like this to remember that men like Sir Mencea Cox and Mr. Weekes made their contribution by dint of considerable personal sacrifice both in terms of their individual selves and of their families. Few persons who are not involved in active politics can begin to appreciate the demands that are made on the person in his private life. He has no private life. He must be available constantly at the beck and call of all those whom he serves. I think it is only fitting when men have made this sort of contribution that we should recognise it. There are some wags Sir, many of them contemporaries of Sir Mencea Cox who say that an outstanding honour, though it is, that it is to some extent a consolation prize. They say that there was a fatal slip betwixt the cup of leader of his party and this, and that this honour now comes as a consolation prize. I say, away with this sort of talk. Disregard it. Today, let us share the honour with Senator Cox and congratulate him. I would prefer Sir, to have congratulated him on having received the highest honour that Barbados could bestow.

I must remark on the uneasy coincidence that some three members of the Commission set up to consider national honours and the national table of precedents have themselves been honoured by traditional British Honours. Having said that, it in no way derogates from the enthusiasm with which I congratulate Sir Mencea Cox and the esteem with which I hold him.

He was a member of the working class of Barbados who elected to enter the struggle at difficult times to improve the conditions of the working class people because in my discussions with him, even to this day, he is proud to number himself among the working class people of Barbados. As I began by saying Mr. President, in a way men are greater than honours in a sense in which the honour appreciates its value and dignity for having been bestowed on certain men. This is nothing new. This sentiment is as old as men and women in the society. It is for that reason, that I would like to quote the famous Latin Poet Horace who posed the rhetorical question "What honours Caesar can a grateful Rome, a

grateful Senate give to make thy work through future days emblazon on our records live?"

Mr. President, through you, I would like to say to Sir Mencea Cox and indeed Mr. Weekes in the Other Place that even if these honours were not bestowed upon them their names would have been emblazoned on the most impressionable of all records, namely, the hearts of the people with whom they serve with such distinction. Thank you.

SENATOR MRS. E. LYNCH: Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this stage of the proceedings unnecessarily, but I noted that the Hon. Minister who gave us such admirable exposition on the career of Sir Mencea Cox also confided in us that he was born in 1937. I suppose I do not want to make a guess about the age of my colleague on this side of the Table but you may realise that I am a bit nearer to the generation of Sir Mencea Cox than either of these and as I sit here on Wednesdays and look across at Sir Mencea Cox, his face brings back to me so many memories of a period of history which was remarkable for sincerity and courage of a kind which young people of today cannot understand.

One of the important services which I think that persons like Sir Mencea Cox can still render to this community is to be a source of information of a kind not found in the history books. When young people can say that Barbados has not changed much within the last forty years, it means that we have somehow not passed on to them a great many of the anecdotes, the stories, the bringing to life of our national heroes I call them, because in the days when Sir Mencea Cox entered the House a person like him had to be heroic to undertake the task. He does not know what an example he was to people like me who were slightly younger and who could appreciate the sort of courage that he was showing, courage which at that time we dared not show, and it was really the performance and example of people like him that encouraged us to write sometimes to speak sometimes and to stand firmly sometimes. They were great examples.

First of all they inspired confidence in simpler folk. The politicians of today have a lot to learn about how to talk to simple people. You had only to hear a Cox a J.T.C. Ramsay, the young at the time Mr. Frank Walcott and people of that kind. I remember especially Mr. Critchlow of Guyana and to hear these people talk to simple people. Now these politicians instructed and lifted the people of the working class; they did not insult their intelligence. There are times when I listen to political meetings today — I do not go anywhere but my village is a popular place and so I can hear without leaving the house, and sometimes when I listen to some of those speeches, I say I wonder whether the simple folk listening know that their intelligence is being insulted.

The politicians of those days taught the people; they taught them the value of the vote, they helped to give them a sense of worth, they tried to instil in them that it was only by the use of the vote that they could change the conditions which then existed and they showed them an example of dignity. I can still remember Sir Mencea Cox. I usually met him coming over the O'Neal bridge as he walked from the party offices in Fairchild Street to come across to the House, and you could not help feeling proud that among people regarded as ordinary folk we had produced such an extraordinary example of good manners, intelligence, dignity and honesty.

I suppose that he has failings but I was not close enough to him to know them, and so what I knew of him as I said, as a young person, I found inspiring, and I still find it inspiring, and as I sit and look across at him sitting opposite me I think how lucky I have been to sit in this place with him. Now as I said, the presence of people like Mencea Cox gave me a certain amount of confidence to the working class, but to the community at large it was an assurance that these people could produce the material necessary for representing their country, and so a Labour Government became possible, and I note that the Hon. Minister said how gradual this change was, and how it was necessary for us to go through all those stages. I think that that is in a way a tribute to the Barbadian, that he made the changes so gradually that he was able to see where the country was going, to test the people who were going to take over the reins of leadership, and the country produced a party which was a blend of the intellectual as well as those people like Mr. Cox who knew so well the needs and aspirations and the feelings of ordinary folk.

It is a fact that they did so well that made it possible for the country to proceed along that road and eventually to produce a Cabinet Government which was labelled labour. Sir Mencea faced his responsibility very seriously. I always saw him with something under his arm and I think now it must have been a copy of Hansard or some book of that sort. He really did apply himself to doing his job well, doing his homework well, and he faced his responsibilities honestly and courageously.

I couple with him another gentleman a Mr. Frank Deane, who later graced the Legislative Council. He was famous for his thought and I think a sort of note of high morality. Mr. Frank Deane was another gentleman from among the simple folk who held his position in the Legislative Council, and I think he was the first person of his kind to be appointed to the Legislative Council somewhat later, I don't remember the exact date, but somehow I have always coupled these two persons, Sir Mencea Cox and Mr. Frank Deane in the Legislative Council.

I did not know Mr. Weekes from the Other Place as well as I know Mr. Cox, but he is spoken of as a person who has remained in his neighbourhood and who had given a great deal of personal service to the humble folk around him. I agree thoroughly with what the Hon. Minister said about local government because it is becoming increasingly clear that we need to do something to revive the spirit of concern for one's neighbourhood; the spirit of neighbourliness and of that compact neighbourhood which we previously had in what I call the mixed neighbourhoods has been disappearing, and I think it has left a serious gap so that it is difficult to convey to simple folk or to provide simple folk with enough opportunities for the kind of active participation which is the real essence of democracy.

It is hard to convey to them that they paid something more than register a vote or show extreme loyalty to a party. I think we have to give some attention to this spirit of neighbourhood which Mr. Weekes has so well exemplified. He does understand that being a legislator means more than taking part in the process of passing legislation, he has retained this sort of personal touch and he does understand what it means to serve the humble folk around him. I think that we all agree that he richly deserves his honour, but what I have noticed about him, to speak on the occasions I have met him, was that he was able to rise above narrow party feeling. He is friendly, he is pleasant, he does not have any sort of spirit of acrimony which unfortunately so often appears where there are tense party loyalties. I think he is to be commended for being able to reach across party lines and show a good spirit of comradeship and friendliness with whoever he has to meet. This also is something I think which we should value.

Now, in my day many West Indian islands were surprised that Barbados could produce a Trade Union and a Labour Party, because Barbados was thought to be so terribly conservative that they could not possibly do something of this sort, but it was done and it was done as I pointed out not by what we call class struggle in these days, but rather by a using of all the talents which we had in our society. People at many levels contributed to the progress of the Labour Movement in Barbados.

Now, I trust that once again Barbados will produce politicians with this crusadean zeal, with this courage, with this integrity. I trust that it will once again produce young journalists, writers, leaders of groups as happened in our time to support a progressive movement, and that once again we will be able to recall, as one poet has written, "the flaming faith of those first years."

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, I think it would be expected that I should join in paying

tribute to the honours which have been conferred on our colleagues. Like the last speaker, I have not had much association with Mr. Weekes in the Other Place, though I have known of his work and have met him from time to time and always found him to be friendly, and I think that the tribute that has been paid to him by those who knew him better than I do should be well deserved.

However, as perhaps the person in this Chamber who has served with Senator Cox for the most time, I think it is only fitting that I should join with the others in expressing my satisfaction to know that he has been honoured in this way. I support all the statements which have been made about the quality of the service which Senator Cox has given to the people of Barbados. I am particularly happy to know that he has been able to live long enough to receive adulation at this time of his life from so many quarters in Barbados, because I shared with Senator Cox those agonising moments when vicious campaigns were conducted against him to destroy his political career, and I was happy to see that in spite of all that, he was able still to come back with that spirit of generosity and offer his services to the people of Barbados without any rancour or re- crimination, that he was able to still conduct himself with that aplomb and in that upright manner which was characteristic of his manners when he held office in this country.

I am happy to know that after all these years people can still look back with pride and say that of all the Ministers of Government Senator Cox was one of the most outstanding. That is one of the great satisfactions I know that Senator Cox is able today to look back and see that people have been able to appreciate the quality of the service he has given to Barbados. I know of his love for the people of this country and his own people, because I shared with him some of the work which he put in to preserve the fabric of the Barbados Labour Party. I have no hesitation in saying a party which has striven to uplift the masses of this country to a realisation of their worth which could not have been done without the calibre and the support of men like Senator Cox and those band of people who worked with Sir Grantley Adams in those days. I know the work that was done to keep the Barbados Labour Party alive and a force in this country, and I am happy to know that it is under the aegis of the Barbados Labour Party who after 15 years of sojourn in the wilderness has been able to come back to run the affairs of this country to the satisfaction of so many people in this country, and that they have been able to honour one of their own sons who has given such outstanding service to this country. I am happy to have been able to share with him that honour and to congratulate him and to wish that

he lives many years to enjoy the respect and the honour which he has received.

SENATOR K. E. HINDS: Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege and an honour for me to be able to stand here this evening and offer along with other members of this Chamber congratulations to Sir Mencea Cox. I see Senator Cox as a model politician. I too happened to be born in that time when the wind of change was blowing, I happened to be born in 1937, like the previous Senator, and to be exact, the 29th April, so whenever I talk about the politicians that I know, Senator Cox would be among the first politicians that I have ever heard of or at least active at that time, or seen in action.

In my early days of attending political meetings — and I started at an early age — it was always Senator Cox who youngsters like myself wanted to hear. Even to watch him standing behind the microphone was something to see. And when I talk about a model politician I mean a model politician. I think a lot of politicians today and people who aspire to being politicians should try to emulate people like Senator Cox. He has always carried a certain amount of dignity into everything he did. He has even managed to dignify the honour which has been bestowed on him. He has always been, even though a great man, a humble man and seldom do you find today people who have made a contribution or have attempted to make a contribution even near to that of Senator Cox carrying with them the humility which goes with greatness. This is something I would wish that young politicians try to emulate.

As for Mr. Weekes, like many other hon. members, I have not been too close to Mr. Weekes over the years, but one thing I would say for him is that even in our own party circles whenever the name of Mr. Weekes comes up in discussion complimentary things are always said. I can say here that I have never heard any of our party members talking about Mr. Weekes in the same way as I have known them to talk about some members of the other side. There is something about Mr. Weekes that causes other politicians, even though they might be on opposite sides, always to speak well of him. I have heard members of the Barbados Labour Party talking about going on tours with Mr. Weekes and how he has always been a useful and cooperative person. I have never heard anything bad said about him in Barbados Labour Party circles, so I would assume — as Senator Lynch has said — that he was one who always reached across party lines to make sure things were done in the true spirit of cooperativeness and with the amount of reasoning which goes into making anything a success, especially when you have opposing political views. So I would like to join with other hon. Senators in congratulating Mr. Weekes. I know of his contribution to the country but I cannot say that I have had any real ties with him over the years.

But if I can get back to Senator Cox, I would like to say in closing that I am happy to have had the privilege of serving first in the Party, and in a wider sense in the same Chamber as Senator Cox; because when I first knew Senator Cox little did I dream that the time would come when we would sit side by side in a Chamber that had to make the laws of the country. I never imagined such a time would come and I am happy to stand here this evening and join with others in congratulating him, and I feel as honoured as he to be able to stand here and join with others in congratulating him.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, I am of course too young to know first hand of Senator Sir Mencea Cox's contribution to this country, and of course the historical records are not in Barbados for one in my position to know exactly and precisely the great contribution we have heard that Senator Cox has made to this country. One would have to glean such information from the Hansard Reports, and even then one is not likely to get a true measure of all that Senator Sir Mencea Cox did for his people and for this country. Such as I have learned about him was learned during the last three years while we sat together in this Chamber. I have always been an admirer of his contributions, especially when he goes back in history and tells us of what prevailed before, and I have always been appreciative of anything he had to offer and of the cool manner in which he delivered himself.

Looking at him today I am told that when perhaps he was a man of my age he was indeed a force to be reckoned with, not only in terms of the valuable and positive contribution which he was able to make in his particular office, but also in his manner of living. If you watch the man and see the very way he dresses one can tell that Senator Sir Mencea Cox, even though he hails from among the masses, is a man of class. Today we see people walking around asking for votes and you cannot tell who they are. They do not portray anything, do not have an image, do not have any class. I don't think that can be said of Senator Sir Mencea Cox.

We have heard that he has always been willing to put his country before himself, that he was devoted to the profession of politics. That was something in those days because it was then largely an unpaid profession, and as other Senators have said, one entered politics in those days at great sacrifice to oneself.

I therefore am very pleased to be able to associate myself with the remarks made concerning Sir Mencea Cox. I am indeed happy that this honour has been bestowed on him and I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in heartily congratulating him.

So far as Mr. Weekes is concerned I know him a bit more personally. Not only do we hail from the same parish, not only have I travelled on Commonwealth Parliamentary business in the company of Mr. Weekes, but I do not believe that it is well known that my own father and Mr. Weekes have been friends from a long time ago and each used to be regular visitors at the other. Even nowadays, Mr. Weekes still visits my father. In that way I got to know him well.

Mr. Weekes has always been interested in assisting ordinary folk of St. Philip wherever he could, not only the people of St. Philip South because he was a representative up there long before they had single member constituencies. He was a representative in St. Philip in the days of double member constituencies. The two representatives had to represent all the people in St. Philip. It is only recently that he has restricted himself to the people of St. Philip South, but he has always been helpful to the people of St. Philip and he has always been clamouring for assistance for the people of St. Philip. As my friend and colleague in the Other Place said, he devoted a lot of time and attention to little things that meant a lot. What my colleague did not say was "to little people." I would like to add that. Mr. Weekes did a lot for the small man in St. Philip. He has always been arguing for him and seeking assistance for him from the time of local Government right up to national Government.

It is a sad thing Mr. President when the time comes that those who have made such a great contribution on behalf of their fellow men have to vacate the scene to younger and probably stronger persons, and perhaps the time has come for Mr. Reynold Weekes. But never let it be said that Mr. Reynold Weekes does not deserve the honour that has been bestowed upon him. I certainly will not say so now nor in 1981. Like Sir Mencea Cox, if anyone deserves the honour that has been bestowed upon him, it is Mr. Weekes. I know that he will be justly proud of it, as he was indeed proud of being appointed a Justice of Peace which enabled him to grant extended assistance to the people of St. Philip South.

The particular honour that has just been bestowed on him will not in itself assist him in helping the people of St. Philip, but it will serve to show that those who come from the bottom of society as it were, and achieve great heights, the heights that persons such as Sir Mencea Cox and Mr. Reynold Weekes have achieved will not go unnoticed by other persons in the society and therefore it is with great satisfaction that I express my sincere congratulations both to Sir Mencea Cox and Mr. Reynold Weekes. My only regret is that I could not today say Sir Reynold Weekes. Thank you Mr. President.

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: Mr. President, I thought I would like to join in the congratulations which

have been extended to Senator Cox and to my colleague Mr. Weekes on the recent awards in the New Year Honours. My recollection of Sir Mencea Cox began when I was a school boy somewhere in 1954 or 1955, I became interested in the matters of the House of Assembly and had an opportunity to observe the Government of that day at work and also the Opposition. I think it was primarily after 1958 when I visited the House of Assembly I saw Sir Mencea Cox at work in those days when Sir Grantley Adams left and went to the Federation. Mr. Cox, as he was at the time, was the greatest defender of the Government on the floor of the House of Assembly, when you had an opposition with men like Mr. Cameron Tudor, Sir Theodore Branker, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Crawford and Mr. Smith before the Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow joined it, it was no easy task for him to have to constantly defend the Government. Despite the fact, that my allegiance at that time was with the Opposition Party, on the 5th December, 1961 about 5 o'clock in the evening when the result of the St. Michael seat was declared, I felt sad that Mr. Cox as he was then had not been able to hold his seat, but the time had come.

His contribution will go down in history, as well as, Mr. Weekes' contribution. To us they are the grass roots politicians. I am particularly happy that they have been honoured because the tendency in Barbados today is to clamour for people who have had the opportunity to be a lawyer or doctor or some kind of profession. Mr. Weekes and Sir Mencea Cox were not in that particular area. Nevertheless, they gave outstanding service and worked well for the country. I think that Mr. Weekes was a Vestryman, Church Warden, and as we know he is also a Parliamentarian. I think everybody in this country would agree that he has worked well and his interest was primarily in taking the small man who had a problem to any particular department of Government, whether he was in Government or Opposition to try to find out what was the problem in order that that man might not be turned around by some of the persons in this society. There is a saying, that what is for a man he will get.

I believe that a lot of persons in this country thought that Sir Mencea Cox should have been elevated at an earlier age to greater heights but the society being what it was and being what it is Mr. President, he was debarred from going on through no fault of his own to the rightful position which he should have occupied in 1958 in this country. But today he has been knighted and to him I say well done. Your record of service to this country has been exemplary and I hope that in the years to come, you will be able to continue to serve your country whether in the political field or whatever field it may be.

I think too Mr. President, that Senator Linton thinks that Mr. Weekes is going. I do not know for what

reason he would express his sentiments in here this evening that the time has come for Mr. Weekes to go. If he does go Mr. President, I believe that in some other capacity he too would be able to serve this country. Those of us who are young cannot help but call upon the older people from time to time for information.

When I hear Sir Mencea Cox in debate in this Chamber refer to the days of 1937 and I realise now that they are two other Senators referring to 1937 this evening in a different light, but when I hear them refer to 1937, I will not quarrel with it. I came in 1940. I would have to continually refer to them for information and it is only by talking to men like Sir Mencea Cox and Mr. Weekes that we can get a true picture of the struggle that went on in this country in 1937. It is because of the struggle that went on in 1937 that we are around today to carry on.

I would like to personally congratulate Sir Mencea Cox on his achievement and I would also like to extend my congratulations to my colleague Mr. Weekes.

SENATOR MISS M. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, as one who remembers this country in the late Twenties and early Thirties and who knows of the struggle for progress, it gives me very great pleasure to be able to congratulate both of these gentlemen. While I may have been perhaps very much shielded from the circumstances of a great number of the population of the country, I was nevertheless sufficiently interested and sufficiently concerned about matters in this country that I took myself into Queens Park and attended a sitting of the Moyne Commission, so that I am very familiar with what was happening in the country at the time and the struggle which was going on for improvement of the lot of working people, and so it gives me very great pleasure to be able to say to two people who have worked well and faithfully for the working people of this country "well done".

I knew Mr. Cox perhaps only as a figure, as a politician in fact. Mr. Weekes I knew very much better and I would like to pay tribute to the very earnest and sincere work which Mr. Weekes has done for the people of St. Philip for many years. For those of us who knew him in St. Philip, the days of the Chiming Bells Friendly Society and the work which he did for the very simple people in all sections of St. Philip we will always remember. I would like to pay tribute to these gentlemen and say that it is a wonderful example which I hope the young people of this country will see that in fact it is possible for them to strive to achieve and be recognised without trying to break the codes in the structure of our society and our own mores and values. To them my very hearty congratulations. May they both enjoy their awards for many years to come. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, we have heard very fine speeches so far and some of them were by persons who were privileged to have known Senator Cox when he was younger. This afternoon while we are paying tribute to Sir Mencea, I would like to make it quite clear to those persons like Senator Linton who will claim he is under twenty-five that it is not only Sir Mencea who is being honoured this afternoon, but it is the large number of working class people whom Sir Mencea represented in the Other Place and indeed whom he still represents today. And I wanted to take just a few minutes to look at his track record, because without a quick look at his record, we do not understand why such a glowing tribute is paid to the man.

I want to look at just a few specifics. A few weeks ago we opened a new air terminal and good things were said of several people, the newspapers made one big grand stand show of the new building, and somehow, Sir, we seemed to have forgotten then that all that tourism is today it is what it is because of the man Sir Mencea Cox. It was Sir Mencea Cox who as the country's first Minister of Industry in 1958, I believe the Ministry of Industry started in 1956, was the man who piloted things like the Tourist Board and gave birth to the Development Board as it then was which is now IDC; and those persons who now work in the hotel industry and in other areas of the tourist industry must realise that today's tribute is in some way to do with them. Those persons who work in the several factories around Barbados must understand, Sir, that manufacturing in Barbados is what it is today because of people like Sir Mencea Cox.

One Senator spoke of the little man, but what did Sir Mencea do for the little man? (A VOICE: He is a little man.) He is a big man. It takes a big man to do things for his people. There are several thousands of persons for example who work in the public sector and who now look forward to their pensions and their gratuities when they retire, but prior to 1960 those persons had no pensions, no gratuities and were left at the mercy of the state after working for several years in the public service, because in those days, even though what is known as the establishment, the monthly paid public officers, teachers, doctors etc. had pensions, and whereas they were looked after by the Ministry of Finance as it then was, there was no institution of Government which took care of casual workers, the road menders, the unestablished staff like carpenters, masons, and it took Sir Mencea Cox as Minister of Labour at that time, not Minister of Civil Service, to see to it that pensions were provided for casual workers in the public sector and the large numbers of persons who now serve on the unestablished staff, and now they can look forward to their gratuities and pensions thanks to Sir Mencea Cox.

We come to the opening of the Flour Mill which is on reclaimed land which represents some extension of the

Deep Water Harbour. Without realising that without the vision of Sir Mencea Cox and the work he put in prior to becoming Minister of Labour as he then was in MCW in 1955-1956, there would have been no Deep Water Harbour, hence no Deep Water Harbour, no extension to the Harbour, no flour mill; but these seem to be forgotten somewhere and it is necessary for us to remind the younger ones like Senator Linton that it is people like Sir Mencea Cox who gave us these things. And you will notice, Sir, whom he represented. It was the casual workers, the unestablished staff, and while he was striving for pensions for the unestablished staff and casual workers, he did not take time off to get pensions for members of Parliament as he was in Parliament. That says something for the man.

Those who would pay tribute to Mr. Reynold Weekes, just let me say that Mr. Weekes' shoes are big shoes; they have left a big imprint all across St. Philip and those persons who would seek to step into the prints have to get very big shoes. I do not know Mr. Weekes as closely as Mr. Cox, but I know of his record, and his record is, if not the sort of record which would make headlines, it is certainly the sort of record which means a lot to a lot of people and I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Weekes in his honour. Thank you.

SENATOR J. WICKHAM: Mr. President, in joining with the previous speakers in congratulating Sir Mencea and Mr. Reynold Weekes, I merely want to say that it is amazing how often events cast their shadows before them, and I recall thinking when I first heard of Sir Mencea how noble a man Mencea Ethereal is, and it seems to me that those Godfathers who had the wisdom to bestow that name must have known that it would one day be adorned with a knighthood.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: Sir, it must be somewhat embarrassing for Sir Mencea to have the congratulations that have been offered to him this afternoon, and the one occasion when I saw him nod his head inadvertently in approval was when Senator Trotman referred to the pensions which he had negotiated for the casual labourers in Communications and Works and the Road Board, which is indicative of the priorities which Sir Mencea has set for himself, I believe, throughout his contribution to public life in this country.

Below the things that have been said about him, there is one factor which has not been drawn out but I believe was in people's minds, and certainly in Sir Mencea's mind, and this is that much of what he has contributed has been based on his strong Christian faith. I believe that it is this too that gives the lie to a contribution that Senator Connell made when he spoke of the undoubted cynicism within the country about politics. Sir Mencea Cox is a politician about whom

even a cynical society cannot be cynical, and I believe that this is basically because of his tremendous commitment to the Christian faith.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Hon. Senators, after the large number of encomiums that have been showered on Sir Mencea and Mr. Reynold Weekes this afternoon, there remains very little that one can add. But I must say what a great pleasure it is to me to associate myself with the tributes that have been paid to these two gentlemen, and more especially from my point of view to Sir Mencea, a man whom I have known for a considerable time and with whom I was associated in political life over a tremendous period.

I knew Mr. Cox when he first thought of offering himself for political service in this country. As a member of the Executive Committee and the Executive Council, I was associated with Mr. Cox in the work of what eventually became the Cabinet of this country. As Senator Lynch has pointed out, that was a transition stage, and the contribution that Mr. Cox and the others who were associated with him at that level laid the foundations for the easy swing into Cabinet Government that we have in this country today.

Mr. Cox was a devoted worker, a very hard worker, a man who had dedication and determination to overcome every possible obstacle, and there were many. Any civil servant of those days will tell you that Mr. Cox was a most outstanding Minister. He did his work, he did it honestly. Mr. Cox bore a great deal of the burden of Government during the years when Sir Grantley went to the Federal Parliament. I believe that it must be a source of great gratification to Sir Mencea to listen to the tributes which have been paid to him today and previously since his honour was announced, and to feel and know that he is esteemed by so many people in this country, because Mr. Cox in spite of the contribution and the sacrifice which he made in the years during which he served in the Other Place, has known defeat, he has known the vicissitudes of political life, and he has borne those vicissitudes with dignity; he never lost his courage, he never lost his loyalty. He has survived to come again to make his contribution in this Chamber, and more recently as the Chairman of the Constitution Reform Committee.

I am very happy for Mr. Cox, I believe his political career can be an example to any aspiring young politician. I believe his work can be an inspiration to those who lack some of the economic and education advantages that other people have, because he has shown what courage and hard work and determination and dedication and loyalty of purpose can do. I sincerely hope that Mr. Cox will live many more years to continue his contribution to this country and to enjoy the high honour which Her Majesty has bestowed upon him.

I associate in my remarks Mr. Weekes of the Other Place. Other members have a greater insight and more personal knowledge of Mr. Weekes' work than I have, but the record is there, his record in Local Government and his record in parliamentary Government is there to go down in history. I have had a closer association with Mr. Weekes on the Parliamentary Association and I've known him to be an extremely keen parliamentarian, a great lover of what the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association stands for, a great upholder of parliamentary democracy as we understand it and as we like it in this country.

I join with all other members in extending my heartiest congratulations to these two gentlemen.

SENATOR M. E. COX: Mr. President, first of all I thank God that He has preserved my life to see the day when I could receive an honour so distinguished as this. Secondly, I thank the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet for having recommended me to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen for this honour, and thirdly, I thank the many people — good people, I should say — of St. Michael who, when in 1944 I stood before them for the first time — I was seeking election — took me in their bosom and they gave me a resounding victory, 1644 votes as 896 to my nearest opponent.

I also thank the many people throughout this Island — the two ethnic groups — who gave me their moral support.

Mr. President, I was born to the parents of James William and Charlotte Matilda Cox of Chapmans Village, St. Thomas, the one a shoemaker and the other a huckster as they were called. In our home the criteria laid down included truth, honesty, good manners and good behaviour; and if those criteria were broken you could refer to that part of the Bible which says: "Spare not the rod and spoil the child." Regrettably today, Sir, it seems this idea now works anti-clockwise: "Spoil the child and spare the rod."

After attending elementary school under Mr. Prince William Jones — the father of the Rev. Ivor Jones — I wanted to be an engineer. I have a brother who is three years older than I who lives in Trinidad and is an engineer.

I mentioned earlier that my parents belonged to the Plymouth Brethren — my father used to preach and my brother in Trinidad is a preacher; and I am not, but I have nothing against; as a matter of fact I used to tell people from the public platform and otherwise that my politics are based on Christian ethics, as anyone who reads the Bible should know.

As a boy in my parents' home I met a man from the district whose name was Monterose Gill and who had spent some twenty one years outside of Barbados; he had a shop and used to tell us of his difficulties abroad – segregation etc. Then there was the late Dr. Cummings who used to come to our village canvassing for a seat in Parliament. And there was a school master named Gladstone Smithwick who used to speak out in favour of some sort of political and economic transformation of the country.

When I came into town to be an apprentice at the Barbados Foundry – incidentally I must tell you Sir, that I had to walk nine miles in the morning and had to get there at 6 o'clock and nine miles to go back home. In Bridgetown there were two movements at the time – the Marcus Garvey Movement and the O'Neal Movement – and when I got the opportunity at night I would go around and listen to what was going on and what I heard inspired me a lot because it was talk about improving the lot of the down-trodden people of this country. And let me say that not only black people were downtrodden but whites also; there were white clerks working for \$20 a month who had to wear collar and tie. Then I left the Foundry and was driving motor cars. The last job I had was at Peirce's garage, at the place now called Mottley House. At that garage I had the opportunity of going into the office of Mr. H. Walter Reece, a good friend of mine, and I heard quite a lot of legal and political talk. This was at the time when people could not vote unless they were working for at least £50 a year or had land, etc. But when clerks could not vote and while the work that I chose at the time appeared to some – and still does appear to some – to be menial work, I was glad I did menial work because I was able to vote and a lot who did not do menial work could not vote. So I asked Mr. Walter Reece to register me and he did so, and the first opportunity I had at voting was the very first time that Dr. O'Neal won a seat for the city of Bridgetown. But when the elections came near and Mr. Reece asked me to vote for Mr. Laurie Yearwood, a Conservative, I told him I could not do it, that I was voting for Dr. O'Neal. He asked me why and I told him Mr. Yearwood would be going to the House to represent the wealthy. Let me say there were some wealthy black people too and perhaps more unkind to blacks than some of the whites. However, I was not dealing with colour at all. Mr. Reece then told me the vote is yours and you can do what you like. So the elections came and I gave Dr. O'Neal what was called a plump vote and he was able to beat Sir Harold Austin by one vote and become Senior Member for the City. I claim that my vote made him Senior Member.

But my employer did not like my talk, and perhaps he did not like my dress either, and soon after I got the roadside. But I was never daunted or afraid and I made up my mind that I would not seek a job again. I had a

few dollars – not many – and through the help of two good friends – Mr. Tim Hewitt and Mr. Stanley Linton – I got a car and started in my own business. I am still that, thank God.

I should say that at this stage I was surprised at the second election of the good Dr. O'Neal that the canvassers who canvassed at the first going down came back at the next election with imitation ballot papers asking me to put an X against Mr. Harding and one against Dr. O'Neal but I did not obey. I must confess that Dr. O'Neal ran a very bad second. I do not want to say anything more at this stage on that. I was fortunate some time in 1933 or 1934 to have been able to see a man with some books in the Lower Green on the ground for sale. In taking one of those books, I saw "Democracy and the Nation" written by J. A. McDonald. It gave the history of the man who was my idol Abraham Lincoln, a man who fed people of my dispensation. After reading that book on persons like John Browne, George Browne and all sorts of people who were in the struggle and who were shot supporting the cause, I was forced to go to the library to get more books to learn more about Abraham Lincoln's life and so on. I want to say, whether it may sound sacrilegious or not that his life to me is very close to Jesus. I still have that book and no one could purchase it from me for a million dollars.

There came a time when, following up this political thing, disturbances took place in 1937. At that time Sir Grantley Adams who was Mr. Adams at the time went to England to put the case for the people of Barbados and came back only to find that he had no seat in St. Joseph. There and then I went straight into it. I went to St. Joseph and spoke on the platform. I had three cars at the time. I lived at Lightfoot Lane and I put those cars at his disposal on election day and I want to assure you, Sir, that I did not even allow him to pay me for gasoline. The real struggle started.

We had an attorney-at-law by the name of Hope Stevens, a Kittitian who lived in the States for a number of years. He came to Barbados and founded what was called the Progressive League. I was very glad to associate myself with an organisation such as that. The late Christopher Augustus Brathwaite was the President and the late Sir Grantley Adams was the Vice-President. That organisation flourished. People were glad to be associated with something which they felt would deliver them from the bad conditions under which they lived at the time.

I played my part. Some days I worked at the office making members until my hands ran cold. Then I would take the late Sir Grantley Adams and some other members to Benthams, St. Lucy, Oldbury in St. Philip and all around. I would speak also on the platform. When the late Dr. Cummings and Mr. Crawford and some others be-

came members of Parliament in 1940 I kept up the work of St. Philip. At that time it was almost 100%. I used to go up there on Sundays with a man named Mr. Conliffe who lived up there but lived in Bridgetown at the time. We would spend the whole day up there checking and making members and so on.

Later on, there was a struggle for the lowering of the franchise, incidentally in those days, I used to go to the vestry where they had nominations. I used to get the opportunity to say a few words at times condemning the system as it existed. After the franchise was lowered from £50 a year to £20 some time in 1943, I decided to get nominated at the Vestry as a candidate for the House to get an opportunity to speak as long as I wanted to speak, to be as critical as possible for the system that existed and then I would withdraw as a candidate but Sir, Mr. Cools, Mr. Tommy Miller and few Civil Servants at the time who used to meet at Mr. Cools' place suggested to me not to do it that way, but to be a candidate. I did not agree but the time came when the late Dr. Cummings one day suggested to me that I should contest the St. Michael seat. At the party headquarters one night the President of the Party, the late Sir Grantley Adams said to me that I should contest St. Michael. I refused. Later on I was issued with an ultimatum that I either contest, or I would not be running for any where. I agreed. Mr. President, I went forward at that election, I campaigned, most of it was done on the platform.

Mr. Cools, Mr. Miller and those gave me all the support necessary. I remember telling the people in Queens Park just immediately before the elections, do as Christ told Peter, cast the net on the other side and they would find fish abundantly, and I was elected, and Mr. President, when the House was inaugurated for the first time and I sat in my seat before the inauguration I prayed to God — this would sound to some people like old-fashioned, but I was brought up in it and I believe in it — that he give me wisdom and understanding so that I may do that which is just and right to the people who sent me there. I believe I succeeded, and therefore, Sir, from there on I carried some nine or ten addresses or so to Parliament the same day. There were mud holes all over the parishes, no proper roads, no water in any of the parishes where the people lived, all pipes out against the road, no light, no anything, and I tried my best to get things done.

It would take me too long to mention the many things and the many conflicts which I have had and the oppression which came on me for the manner in which I used to speak. I was outspoken in all my dealings. I remember, Sir, when in 1946 we were discussing the Estimates, and going through those Estimates I saw that

the Government was spending more on forage for a police horse than a postman was getting as a salary, and I spoke out against it, and an executive member told me that Governor Blood was very worried over it, but I know soon after that a postman got much more than two horses, cantonniers who used to get ten got fifteen shillings a week, and the thing started to snowball right round. There are many many instances which I could bring and those civil servants who worked and who attended meetings at Government House, I remember a white gentleman Walcott who was the Clerk; I do not know if he is still alive, but whenever elections came up he used to ask me what he should do, and I would say do as you are accustomed to doing. He said, you have treated us good, you have fought for us left and right. I say I have never been opposed to increasing salaries or anything for anybody, and indeed I have always initiated and supported increases for and in every shape and fashion. My conscience is clear; I did my best for the suffering people of Barbados, and I am sure that all those civil servants who worked with me in both Ministries of Communications and Works and Housing and then Trade, Industry, Tourism and Labour I am sure know that I have always done my best to improve the lot of Barbados.

On the tourist side as my colleague here mentioned, I established the Tourist Board and the last Resolution I took to the House in 1961 was for \$½ million to give to the Board to develop tourism. I was able to go to England on several occasions and convince the transport executive directors to reduce the recruiting age of persons whom we sent up there from 21 to 18. I told them we had a lot of children coming out of school who would not qualify for clerical work, and if we did not find something for them to do they would just waste away, and they granted me that favour and reduced the age to 18. At one time those persons had to find 25% of their passage money and the Government would stand 75%. When I took over I immediately told the Government to abandon that system and to lend these people the whole amount because they used to find difficulty in getting that 25% of the money. There are many many things and it would take me years to minute what I have done, and as one member said, I think it was the President, I was dedicated to a cause. I never thought of myself. I always thought of the people, and I am thankful again that I am here.

I thank His Honour the President and hon. members who have spoken and those who have not spoken. I am satisfied even though they have not spoken that they are not dissenting from what has been said by those members who spoke. I can assure you, Sir, like that great idol of mine when he was even elevated to the Presidency of the United States of America, he always said that he was one of the common people and he would always be one

— President Abraham Lincoln, the best the country has ever had, and the one closest to him is the present President, President Carter. That is my estimation having gone through as many as possible. I have tried my best. I think in my earlier days before I was in Parliament I was actually invited to take some secondary lessons and so by Herbert Seale who was the Secretary of the Progressive League at one time, a dynamic man, and I did what he said. I did get some English in my head, got some Latin, some French and some Spanish. I even had a little of what Senator Hewitt has, and I must confess that it was a great help to me. I was able to understand a lot of things without which I do not think I would understand during my years as a Minister in the Government.

I want in closing to thank all those civil servants who worked with me. I understand that my work was a success, but without their help and guidance at times it would not have been. We got along very well and I used to say as Abraham Lincoln used to say; whenever I got through well with some items in the House of Assembly, the next day they would give me praise and I would always tell them that it is not mine alone, the praise is for all of us. When it is condemnation it is for me. That is how I did it.

That is how I viewed it, and that is what I learnt from Abraham Lincoln. I am thankful to all the members, I am thankful to all those who wrote me congratulatory letters, all who telephoned me — and there were many — and they were of the two ethnic groups. I am thankful to everybody who assisted me, and I again thank you, Mr. President and members, for the kind remarks you have used this evening, and I would like to assure you that the honour will not in any way change my lifestyle, I just cannot change. I am thankful for it but it cannot change me, and while I remain humble I shall never be servile.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to lay the following documents:

- (1) Report of the Accounts of the Auditor General's Department for the year ended 31st March, 1978;
- (2) Immigration (Students) Regulations, 1979;
- (3) Statement of Instruments adopted at the 64th and 65th Sessions of the International Labour Conference held in Geneva from 7th to 28th June, 1978 and 6th to 29th June, 1979, respectively;
- (4) The Passport and Trade Documents (Fees) (Amendment) Order, 1979;

- (5) Statement showing net Customs and Excise Receipts for the months ended January, February and March, 1979;
- (6) Statement showing net Customs and Excise Receipts for the months ended September and October, 1979;
- (7) Statement showing net Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended 30th November, 1979;
- (8) The Special Development Area (Heywoods-Speightstown) Order, 1979;
- (9) The Special Development Area (Spring Garden-Fontabelle Road) Order, 1979;
- (10) The Special Development Area (Deep Water Harbour Extension) Order, 1979;
- (11) The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1980.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the following:

- (1) A Bill to amend the Holiday with Pay Act, Cap. 348;
- (2) A Bill to provide for the registration and control of Land Surveyors in Barbados;
- (3) A Bill respecting the demarcation of land boundaries and related matters;
- (4) A Bill to amend the Occupational Training Act, 1979 — that is standing in the name of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman — and indeed the Bill to amend the Holiday with Pay Act also stands in the name of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman.
- (5) A Resolution to approve the Special Development Area (Deep Water Harbour Extension) Order, 1979;
- (6) A Resolution to approve the Special Development Area (Heywoods-Speightstown) Order, 1979;
- (7) A Resolution to approve the Special Development Area (Spring Garden-Fontabelle Road) Order, 1979.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded in the Minutes that the Bills have been read a first time.

THE TREASON ACT, 1980

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I do not propose asking for a break at the point unless members feel strongly on the matter, since it is our intention to offer only one Item this afternoon, that is the Treason Bill, and to leave over the other item the Visiting Forces Bill, till next week. However, if it is the feeling that we ought to break I will.

Mr. President, this Bill, as it says in the Objects and Reasons, would be to repatriate the law relating to treason. As you know, there has been a great deal of activity in the area of reform of the laws, and also repatriation of legislation, because it is one thing for persons who generally understand what the law is to regard repatriation as being of no importance, whereas for most people what would in fact be desirable would be if the laws could be so codified that it would be relatively easy for almost anybody to get some idea, even though one still had to rely for expert advice on professionally trained persons, as to where to find the law and roughly what it says. In other words, a man may not know much about the details of the law relating to larceny, but at least he understands that to steal is a criminal offence, and at least he has some notion as to what it means when you say that somebody has stolen, even though to a lawyer certain technical conditions may not be fulfilled and it may therefore not found to be larceny within the law.

It is for this reason therefore that from time to time you will find that legislation which applies to us because of our former colonial status, laws which in many areas have been the result of our Colonial status, we have found it necessary to look at them and where necessary to update them and bring them within the body of our national law. This is the case with the law of Treason and there is perhaps one point about this treason Bill which excites some attention, and that is that for the offence of high treason there is the death penalty. Since I am not a believer in the efficacy of the death penalty, I believe I am in a good position to be putting forward a Bill which has as one of its punishments the death penalty. All that it means is that we will have to take a decision whether this country should have the death penalty or not. It at present exists as part of the laws of this country. Therefore if the more serious offences involving loss of life call for the death penalty, the death penalty will exist until Parliament in its wisdom takes the decision that the death penalty should be abolished. It is for this reason that the death penalty is retained for the offence of high treason but not for the other offences coming within this Act.

The essence of the crime of treason is that it is based on allegiance. Allegiance is owed to the Head of State by those who are citizens or those who enjoy the

protection of the State, even where that protection is given by way of travelling, e.g. an alien travelling with a Barbados passport. The crime of high treason is one of two categories of treason, the other being petty treason; but petty treason is really not distinguishable from murder and therefore Section 6 of the Offences against the Persons Act Cap. 141 of this country abolishes that distinction. High treason is a breach of faith due to the monarch; petty treason, which is more of a holdover from the feudal system, involves the murder of a person to whom one was inferior; in other words, the vassal and the Lord, the priest and the bishop. But that distinction no longer exists in our laws.

There is one other point I forgot which shows how archaic the point is, and that is that it could also apply where a wife slew her husband.

The law of Treason is confined to various limits by the Treason Act of the United Kingdom of 1351. The point here is the matter of allegiance. All citizens of Barbados owe an allegiance to this country. Aliens travelling in possession of a Barbados passport owe allegiance to this country. Aliens living here and therefore under the protection of the Crown owe allegiance to this country. However, an ambassador here does not owe allegiance; that is why instances involving treasonable activities by an ambassador would make the ambassador *persona non grata*, and he would be asked to leave the country but he would not be arrested and charged.

There is also an offence known as misprision of treason an offence punishable by imprisonment at the discretion of the court. This offence involves a person who knows a treason is being planned or committed and does not report the offence to a Justice of the Peace or other appropriate persons. But the real distinction in the Bill lies between high treason and petty treason, high treason being punishable by death whereas ordinary treason is not.

I think before I sit I should look briefly at what are the offences which constitute high treason: to kill or attempt to kill the Head of State. On this point there is some change in that section 2(a) of the Bill refers not only to the monarch as head of state but also to the Governor General or any person performing the functions of Governor General under the Constitution. The reason for that is we are recognizing the reality of the fact that while the Queen is virtually the Head of Barbados, the person *in situ* ought to be recognised by the law in the same way. "Anyone who does bodily harm to any person referred to in Paragraph (a) tending to death or destruction...." That is a narrow way of the offence of high treason; it used to be much more than that. "Anyone who levies war or does any act preparatory thereto;" one who "assists the enemy at war with Barbados or any armed forces against whom Her Majesty's forces raised in

Barbados are engaged in hostility whether or not a state of war exists between Barbados and the country whose forces they are."

So you will see that under the offence of high treason, the personal aspect of it is kept. What we have done is that we have brought the Governor General as the Head of State in the day-to-day sense within that ambit of personal protection but we have not kept the old formula which would have created a much wider offence. Originally the offence included "one who does any bodily harm tending to the death or destruction or maims or wounds Her Majesty or imprisons her." So what we have done is to limit the ambit of the offence of high treason.

I think you will agree that in this day and age it would be a bit much to maintain as high treason the restraint of Her Majesty's persons, so we have modified that significantly. As regards the other aspects of it, quite clearly if you owe allegiance to the country and you levy war against the country, if you owe allegiance to the country and assist an enemy at war with the country, this would be an offence of high treason.

I think, Sir, that clearly there is nothing there that one ought reasonably to object to. As for the offences, these are the usual offences you find in this kind of legislation. I wanted to make these two points because they both represent vast improvements in the law of treason, one by recognising that if the sovereign is deserving of personal detention, one must be the person who is institute. Secondly, that we have removed from the area of high treason the mere restraint of the imprisonment of Her Majesty and replace it with a more reasonable provision "doing bodily harm". Doing bodily harm tended to death or destruction.

Mr. President, Sir, I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed, that this Bill be now read a second time.

SENATOR JOHN CONNELL: Mr. President, Sir, I must confess at being very disturbed at this piece of legislation. I listened in vain to the hon. Senator who introduced it trying to make out a case for it. I think, that when the Government comes down to the Senate with a case like this, they should make a case for it.

He began by saying, Sir, that there is much activity in the area of repatriation of legislation. This seems to be the case he made out, that it is important to take legislation out of the English Statutes and bring them home to independent Barbados. I submit that that is not enough, one must look at the legislation. This is legislation that is multiplying the cases in which capital

punishment can be inflicted on persons. If the hon. Senator admits to difficulty in agreeing with capital punishment, why, therefore, is he bringing down a piece of legislation which has as one of the penalties capital punishment? Why is that legislation not postponed until the death penalty is removed? At least, why is it not postponed until the nation can have a thorough going debate on the question of capital punishment. It is in this context that I used the expression of multiplying the cases for the use of capital punishment. I am saying why create by this Act of repatriation other instances in our law for capital punishment? What is the urgency for it? How many cases have we had of high treason in the 300 years of Barbados' history? Is it a pressing necessity in Barbados to have a law of high treason? Parliamentary time in my submission, can be better spent filling the void of social legislation, family, labour, and community legislation. Why are we having frightening pieces of legislation? The Defence Force Act, The Defence legislation and now the Treason Bill and certain other frightening features of the Integrity legislation. I am saying that the Government's priorities on behalf of legislation are wrong. No case is made out for bringing any treason Bill which claims to repatriate the law of treason to Barbados. I am against the principle of bringing this piece of legislation at this time anyway.

My friend, the Leader of the Senate is going to reply by saying that this law existed already and that they do not in any way increase the number of instances, but I am going to ask Hon. Senators to look closely at Clause 2(d) and to ponder the implications of this Clause. It not only states "assists an enemy at war with Barbados" but it goes on to say "assists any armed forces against whom Her Majesty's forces raised in Barbados are engaged in hostilities whether or not a state of war exists between Barbados and the country whose forces they are." Would that cover the St. Vincent situation or a similar such situation? Would it not cover a situation, Mr. President, of which forces are raised in Barbados to be used elsewhere even in a case where a state of war does not exist between Barbados and the country whose forces they are? What is the purpose of Clause 2(d)? My friend, the hon. Leader of the Senate did not dwell on that. He gave us a general introduction based on repatriation. He gave us to understand that they have reduced the area of application of the former law of treason but he has not dwelt on Clause 2(d). I am suggesting to Hon. Senators not to agree to the passage of this piece of legislation in this form.

When only a few months ago this Senate had to consider the Bill to establish the Defence Force, I spoke against it and I dwelt on some of the possible implications. I do not know how many Senators then considered that within a few months this armed force was going to become a very important issue, not only in Barbados, but in the Caribbean. The point I am making,

Sir, is that legislation passes through these Chambers which has considerable potential for political harm and we need to consider it very carefully by examining every line and every word, before we allow this legislation to pass. This is one such piece of legislation. "Assists any armed forces against whom Her Majesty's forces raised in Barbados are engaged in hostilities whether or not a state of war exists between Barbados and the country whose forces they are."

In a situation not dissimilar from what occurred in St. Vincent, if a person is giving aid and assistance to defend a cause and they have to oppose Barbados' forces there. That situation falls within this.

It is so loosely drawn that it could be considered to fall within this, and I am suggesting that we should not lend ourselves to supporting legislation like this and run the serious risk in the not too distant future of seeing legislation that we pass used in a way that we did not anticipate that it could have been used.

Now another aspect of this Bill that I would like to draw the attention of Hon. Senators to is the offences of treason created by clause 3 of the Bill. They are basically intended to deal with different situations, Mr. President. Clause 3 (a) (b) deal with situations of what lawyers call overt acts, some physical act apart from speech. Clause 3(a) speaks of force or violence and clause 3(b) speaks of making available to an agent of another state any sketch, plan, model, article, note or document of a military or scientific character etc. Now these require overt acts. You must do something, use violence or make some document available, but the others, Sir, Clause 3(c), (d), (e) and (f) are clauses that are created to deal with words. Clause 3(c) says "instigates any person"; clause 3(d) says "conspires with any person to commit high treason"; Clause 3(e) says "forms an intention".

I want Hon. Senators to ponder the significance of the legislation they are being asked to pass. I hear a voice emanating from the direction of the Hon. Leader of the Senate saying read on. I accept the challenge. Let us look closely at Clause 3(e). It says:

"Everyone commits treason who, in Barbados forms an intention to do anything that is high treason or that is mentioned in paragraph (a) and manifests that intention by an overt act."

Now, Sir, he shakes his head triumphantly, but I invite him to pause and to turn to clause 6 on the next page where it says: "Where it is treason to conspire with any person, the act of conspiring is an overt act of treason." Ponder the significance of that. It says if you

form an intention that you commit treason provided there is an overt act. Then the innocent person looks for the overt act and is told that the very act of conspiring constitutes the overt act. I am saying that they are making the mere use of words treasonable.

Only yesterday, Sir, I happened to be reading Macaulay's History of England dealing with a not dissimilar proposal before Parliament in the time of the Stuarts and the historian adverts to this same point and the implicit danger of making provisions wherein people can be convicted only for the use of words, and he says very eloquently and very significantly that it was this sort of provision on which our Lord Christ was brought before the Sanhedrin. He said his blameless life afforded no other possibility for reproach than a charge of words. He refers to it as the greatest judicial murder ever committed in history. You see, this is one of the serious dangers about legislation of this nature. How do you know what is a man's intention? One of the famous judges of the common law said the devil himself knows not the mind of man. In courts every day juries are told that you can only tell the intention of a man by looking at what they do to evince this intention, by looking at the overt act, yet this Bill provides that the mere act of conspiring constitutes such an overt act.

Now, Sir, if you look closely at clause 10 it says: "No person may be convicted of high treason, treason or misprision of treason upon the evidence of only one witness, unless the evidence of the witness is corroborated in a material particular by evidence that implicates the accused." So two witnesses, not even two witnesses necessary. An independent piece of circumstantial evidence which is considered as amounting to corroboration. Now you know when we pass legislation in 1980, Sir, it may fall to be considered before the courts in 2010 under quite different circumstances from these. We cannot say, Sir, that it is a matter entirely for the jury, leave it to the jury, you can always trust the Barbadian jury; we must ensure that legislation that comes before this Parliament is of such a nature, quality and kind to ensure that the human rights of Barbadians are respected and protected and not easily invaded and violated. We live in an age in which much discussion about human rights takes place. The idea is that these attributes which are recognised and enforceable in courts of law are regarded as extensions of the human personality. All of the discussion about human rights today has to do with an enhanced appreciation of the value of the human person and of attributes attaching to him or her, because he or she is a human person. We must be careful in this Honourable Chamber not to be seen to be paying lip service to these important concepts and values. We must ensure that when legislation is presented by any Government in this Chamber which is likely to infringe human rights that all loopholes in the legislation must be carefully blocked and closed. I do not

regard this legislation as such a type of carefully drafted legislation. Not only can heated partisan feeling in a time of crisis produce the necessary two witnesses, but a state of hysteria can be created in the country in which juries can go to the jury box believing that it is their responsibility to look after the security of the state.

We have to be careful that the legislation on which persons can be brought before a jury in the future is of such a kind that no frivolous charge can lead to a person's freedom being restrained for life or for many years. I am suggesting, Sir, that the hon. members of the Senate should ask that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and be carefully examined line by line to satisfy themselves that each line, each word is sound and not likely to bring injustice to present or future generations of Barbadians.

I think, Sir, that I have given the Hon. Senate an indication of my feelings on this piece of legislation. In conclusion I wish to summarise the points I have made, that, first of all, clause (d) deals with a situation which is rather different from the three preceding subclauses; indeed it is clause 2(d) after the word "Barbados". I take issue with the words: "or any armed forces against whom Her Majesty's Forces raised in Barbados are engaged in hostility whether or not a state of war exists between Barbados and the country whose Forces they are." I am saying that we must be satisfied about the reach of these provisions. We must satisfy ourselves who are likely to be caught by this net that we are creating legislatively, and I am suggesting that a situation such as happened in St. Vincent can lead to the invocation of the provisions of clause 2(d).

I am also saying that those subclauses of clause 3 which make it treasonable simply to use words need to be carefully examined. I am submitting that they are loosely drawn and that the Senate should not allow them to be passed in their present form.

Those are basically the two objections that I am making to this piece of legislation, and I am also objecting to the enshrining in our legislation of provisions for the application of the death penalty. If you haven't made up your mind on the death penalty, if you are saying that there is need for a national discussion and debate on the question of the death penalty, let us postpone this legislation until such time as we arrive at a national consensus on that point. What is the hurry for the repatriation so-called of these offences? The Hon. Minister should satisfy the Senate that this is a matter of urgency. If he says that in principle he is against the death penalty, why not postpone it? In any case, what is the necessity of it? How many persons until now have been suspected of committing treason? Why not leave the law of treason where it was, in the limbo of forgotten things, and proceed with urgently needed social legislation

in vital areas of family law, labour and community legislation? That is my position on this point, Mr. President.

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, I am amazed at how the Hon. Senator who just sat has stretched his imagination to bring in the situation in St. Vincent into this legislation and the words he has quoted purely because it happens to be topical at the moment, and because so much talk has been made.

I am not perhaps worried as to whether it is the correct time at which the Government should seek to repatriate the law of treason. Perhaps it may be the right time to have people's minds directed to the idea that there are cases when people are liable to be charged with treason, because the fact that at the moment people are liable for committing acts of treason but they don't know perhaps that they are liable because the law is enshrined in Acts of the United Kingdom. It might be a good time in conditions that are existing at present to let people know that there is something called treason or there is an act of treason that people should know about. I do not know if this was in the minds of the legal luminaries when they decided to repatriate the law of treason at this particular time; however, in reading this piece of legislation I cannot see how the situation of the recent things in St. Vincent can logically be stretched to include clause 2(d) which says "are engaged in hostility whether or not a state of war exists between Barbados and the country whose Forces they are." It obviously infers that the armed forces must belong to a country, and where you have insurgence against the legitimate forces of a country, I do not see how you can stretch the meaning of these words to suggest that that can correspond to what is going on here in this law. That is amazing to me.

Also, the question of an intention. The Act particularly says that the act must be manifested in an overt act, and certainly the Hon. Senator cannot tell me that conspiracy is not an overt act.

Conspiring must mean sitting down and working out a conspiracy. On the question of the death penalty and why we should have one, perhaps the hon. Senator has good reason for suggesting that we need not consider this at this moment. I do not know why it is that at this particular time the Attorney General has decided that we must repatriate the laws of Barbados, but I think to use the wording of this Act to stretch it to bring in the point the hon. Senator has made is the use of semantics and I do not agree with him at all.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have listened and have reached in vain but cannot for the life of me understand what is Senator Connell's argument with Section 10 of the Bill. I can understand the other points he is making even if I dis-

agree with them and dismiss them as having little substance. In my view Senator Connell knows better. He knows that before the mere utterance of words can constitute a conspiracy there must be a whole lot of other circumstances and therefore it is not fair to suggest to this Chamber that because it says in the Act, section 6 "Where it is treason to conspire with any person, the act of conspiring is an overt act of treason" means that section 3(d) is to be interpreted as being an offence of mere words. It says there that if a person "forms an intention to do anything that is high treason... and manifests that intention by an overt act...." I contend that these words have a very clear meaning.

The point about Section 10 is a simple and straightforward one. If Senator Connell wants to contend that there can be no circumstances in this country where evidence may become unreliable, he may contend that and nobody can challenge him on that point; and that goes for everything, not only the law of treason.

I think we have to legislate for a country as we know it and as we have reasonable grounds to believe it to be, and I cannot for the life of me see what is the real objection to Section 10.

Senator Rocheford took the point of section 2(d) where Senator Connell wants to know if that could cover the St. Vincent situation. My reply is, "Suppose it can, what is wrong with that?" It is a Clause that is designed for circumstances where someone is assisting an enemy at war with Barbados or assisting armed forces against whom Her Majesty's forces raised in Barbados are engaged in hostilities. Where people are engaged at war with Barbados and you assist the enemy, is there something wrong with that? Similarly, if you assist armed forces that are engaged in hostilities with Barbadian forces, why should the Barbadian forces only be protected if Barbados is at war with that country? Why should our soldiers not merit protection against treasonable activities merely because Barbados is not at war with a particular country, when the essence of the kind of treason, as I know and as Senator Connell knows, is a breach of allegiance?

Senator Connell in his opening remarks came very near — I think he actually said it — and that is how the idea came to my mind that he knows better than that — when he spoke of this being the cause of multiplying cases where capital punishment can be inflicted on persons in Barbados; because he came very near to suggesting that to leave treason as the law of Barbados but existing under the British statute and to leave it as a crime punishable by death in Barbados is not the same as putting it on the Statute Books as a crime punishable by death. It seems to me if you leave it

there as a crime for which the death penalty can be applied is the same death penalty as if you put it on the Statute Book. I cannot see it as a different kind of death penalty unless we are talking of whether death is by the gallows, or guillotine or firing squad, etc. Apparently, according to Senator Connell, to leave it there punishable by the death penalty is all right but if you are going to bring it on to the Statute Books you must first decide if you are going to have the death penalty. Suppose we are going to have the death penalty, where will it be then? Wouldn't it be the same position of multiplying cases where capital punishment can be inflicted, as he said? To me it is very straightforward.

I do not believe in capital punishment, but I went out there and ran for a seat and believed I should have one. But what gives me any right to believe that because I do not believe in capital punishment that is the mode of the country? There are a lot of people who will vote when the time comes and I may think I know how they will vote; but in matters where you allow conscience votes you do not know how the voting will be; a lot of people you would not think are firm believers in the death penalty. Are we going to hold up legislation because we feel at some point the country should sit down and debate the death penalty?

Let us look at the situation. If we pass this legislation and tomorrow we have a debate and we are no longer to have the death penalty that legislation would be void.

It makes no difference at all whether we have the debate now before passing the legislation, or later. If you have the legislation to clean up and repatriate why not do it? What is the reason for waiting? It is not as if this is a Government that is not bringing down progressive legislation. This after all, Sir, is the Government of the National Bank legislation, the Insurance Corporation legislation and of the Occupational Training legislation. We have been bringing down legislation covering a wide range of areas. It has been an extremely activist legal department. Therefore it is no point at all to suggest that time could better be spent than bringing down other legislation than be repatriating the treason Bill. The Bill has to be repatriated at some time, Sir, and we are doing it now.

If there is to be a vote on the death penalty, we will have it then. Senator Connell knows that this is a matter on which he is free and in a position to initiate debate. Debate on the death penalty does not have to come from the Government. Why is he waiting on us to bring it down? If he feels like I do he will have my vote as a matter of conscience.

I think, Sir, those are the points which the Senator seemed to be making. I believe if I run through them quickly he was making a point on having a debate on capital punishment first. I believe that I have shown that the two things do not belong together. Bringing down this legislation does not hold up any legislation.

I believe that I have shown that it is not correct to say that Clause 2(e) was creating an offence of mere words. The form of wording here is quite specific and has real meaning. I believe there are no other points to be dealt with.

May I ask one question before sitting. Is Senator Connell really suggesting that it is worse to repatriate the Bill and to abolish as a crime of high treason imprisonment or restraint of Her Majesty than to keep the law in its present form where the restraint or imprisonment of Her Majesty will be a crime of high treason punishable by death, because that is also what Senator Connell is saying.

The motion that the Bill be now read a second time was put and agreed to with Senator Connell voting no.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move that the Senate do now resolve itself into a Committee on this Bill.

Mr. President left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee, Senator the Rev. Andrew Hatch in the Chair.

On the motion of Senator K. Hinds the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate was resumed and the passing of the Bill was reported.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow the Bill was read a third time and passed with Senator Connell voting no.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn until this day week at 2.30 in the afternoon.

The question that the Senate adjourn until 30th January, 1980 at 2.30 p.m. was put and agreed to, and Mr. President adjourned the Senate accordingly at 6.00 p.m.