

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 19th January, 1956.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 13th December last have been printed and circulated, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following:—

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st December, 1955.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$10,890 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 61, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$230 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 62, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 63, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On behalf of the Hon. Premier: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On behalf of the Hon. Premier: Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax.

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House in Committee of Supply at the next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS the Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, was read a first time.

FEDERATION

Pre-Federal Reports

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called without losing my right to speak, I am going to make a suggestion with respect to the first Order of the Day which is to move the adjournment of the House to consider the three reports of the Pre-Federal Commissioners on Federation. As our Delegates would like to hear anything that is said, I suggest that we take the Reports separately and deal with them in that order so that a more beneficial debate would ensue.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I cannot agree with that. We are the only Legislative Assembly doing what we are doing today. This is not a motion as to whether we are accepting a particular Report or not.

The House having expressed its desire at a previous meeting that hon. members should have the opportunity of expressing their views on these Reports, we have made it possible to do so. Without saying more, it is noticeable that no other colony has debated these Reports.

It is not a question of our taking action on these Reports except in a broad general way with respect to the modification which is suggested in the Fiscal Report. It is merely because Government anticipated that the House would wish to discuss these Reports that this motion for the adjournment to do so was set down. I repeat, without saying more, that we are the only persons who are doing it. This is not to say that we do not agree that opportunity should be given to hon. members to give their views on these Reports. Let me say that the only thing which we are sure will be discussed affecting these Reports is such modification as may appear in them of the principles laid down in the 1953 Conference, but these are matters which will be discussed in the West Indies by a Committee sitting on these Reports.

I am sure that hon. members will agree that no useful purpose will be served by discussing these Reports one by one. What should be discussed by the House is exactly what the House feels about the whole question of Federation, and as these three Reports are in our hands, hon. members can make any comment they may care to make on them, and may say whether any principle which arises out of these Reports should be accepted or not, without any motion being made as to whether this House agrees or not. It is for that reason that I have thought that the best way to deal with this question would be to move the adjournment of the House so as to have a whole talk on Federation without putting a specific motion to deal with it. In short, I hope members will say that you should agree to this and to that and so on without any formal motion being made.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that I did not expect that any motion or Address would be made. What I suggested was merely for the sake of a clear cut discussion for the benefit of our Delegates on each of these Reports.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the adjournment of the House to consider the three Reports of the Pre-Federal Commissioners on Federation.

3.25 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House so that there may be expressions of opinion on matters of Federation affecting those three Reports by the Pre-Federal Commissioners. In moving this adjournment, Sir, I hope that hon. members who come in to this debate will give expression to their views because I should like the Delegates to hear all that hon. members have to say.

I would like them to hear all that the Government may be saying; I would like them to take part in the debate, and like them to realise that one of the most important debates that has ever taken place in the whole history of either this place or the Other Place is the present debate; because if matters fall out as we expect, there will be no return for five years at least from the decisions to be made

next month in London. I will say, although you will always find a non-Barbadian who will throw at us that we always find ourselves unique — but I will say from the outset that any decisions we make, any expression of opinions made by this House as representative of the views of the people of this island, and which they will be telling their delegates to put forward as the expression of those views are bound to be, in respect of the future of Barbados, more momentous than any decisions taken in any other Legislature in the British Caribbean Area that is going into Federation. That is not a Barbadian boast. I do not anticipate a change, but unless in some respects an almost revolutionary decision is taken next month, we are going to lose infinitely more than anybody else, and we are abandoning more, if we have to abandon the principles of which we have been able to boast for more than 300 years. At the outset of a debate of this sort, I will remind hon. members that I shall endeavour — and I feel sure that every other member will endeavour — to be as cold, careful and non-controversial as I can be; but I will be lacking in my duty to Barbados if I do not draw attention to the fact that even on the floor of this Chamber things have been said, and I hope will not be said again today, that may be intended as a shaft against the Labour Party or against myself. They do not hurt us, but they most emphatically have hurt Barbados, and they make it more doubtful as to what Barbados will achieve in this coming Conference. Sometimes, it is sheer malice, sometimes it is thoughtlessness or carelessness. This morning the *Barbados Advocate* newspaper said they are waiting to hear the Government's views on matters which Mr. Manley and somebody else have made clear. There is nothing that Mr. Manley has raised that has not already been raised, either at S.C.A.C. or the 1953 Conference or at the Freedom of Movement Conference in Trinidad by the Barbados delegates. There are things we have raised, stuck out for, got some of the other islanders to vote for to come along with us, and we have not got any praise — not, of course, that we care for the praise. Personally, I say it without the slightest hesitation that abusing this Party or me personally, does not hurt it. For ten years, we have been subject to abuse and it most undoubtedly has hurt Barbados; and if I, in a debate of this sort, said all that has been told me and written to me affecting the position of Barbados, hon. members and other persons, even those who are guilty, all who indirectly have been pushing down the prestige of Barbados, will themselves be ashamed. I want no praise I repeat, but you will find that as to these essentials which Mr. Manley is pressing so much, Barbados has fought for from S.C.A.C. to today. When the Daily newspaper which is supposed to be a liberal newspaper says they are waiting to hear Barbados' views on it, say, God help us. Hon. members will remember that in considering this House's Resolutions in 1953, before the Conference, points were made which Sir Archibald Cuke and myself later stressed firmly — and in some cases got carried — but we got no credit for it. "Tell us what you are going to do" say our critics when all of us here for two years stressed everything that might lift the Rance Constitution from the depths of being a glorified Crown Colony system to a proper Federal Government. We have more to lose than anybody else. I repeat, what I said in 1953. The only thing Barbados has to gain is forming a West Indian nation and fighting for other places in the Caribbean to which our people can go. We have nothing material to gain, and we are having, through the majority vote against us, our cherished right to tax ourselves, diminished. I say

what may seem to be hard and contrary to what I said that I will endeavour to be cool. No Barbadian does Barbados any good if instead of boosting Barbados, he always attacks it in the Press and, unfortunately, even on the floor of this Place. One thing only you might blame us for—those who have attended conferences in the past. It is that except in the 1953 Conference we did not push as we might have, probably through false modesty, the claim for Barbados to be at least the temporary Capital of the Federation. We were as Barbadians, excessively modest; but even down to 1953 we had the majority of the other territories with us that Barbados should be the temporary Capital. That feeling has deteriorated considerably in the year 1955. I am still optimistic on that point, but our chances are not as good as they were a year ago. Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like first before refreshing the minds of hon. members as to what we have done, to say this: inasmuch as in 1953 delegations went to London and revised the S.C.A.C. Report and made an exhaustive examination of that Report section by section, and reached a measure of agreement, but delay ensued, it is now considered especially bearing in mind the history of the two or three years immediately preceding 1953, that this Conference should be a conference of plenipotentiary powers, and that there should not be any going back to legislatures, unless some major point of policy is discussed and adopted on which the legislatures of the territories have not previously expressed an opinion. 3.35 p.m.

I shall probably at some time, with the permission of the House, read what this House sent us to fight for in 1953. We fought for those things, and we succeeded in getting some of those things, and this House approved of them in principle. We got what, to Barbados, was of supreme importance; for the reasons which we gave, we got the question of emigration, immigration and deportation taken from the Concurrent List and put on the Exclusive List because we felt that with the set-up of political Parties in the West Indies, it was possible for the Federal Government never to pass or at least for a long time not to pass, certainly not within the first five years, legislation over-riding the restrictive legislation of some of the Territories. I mention that to show that this House has already gone on record as to what it wants and the Delegates in 1953 succeeded in most of the things which this House wanted.

Honourable members will remember that in 1953 the Colonial Office had been after us for over a year, and we were the last to reply as to what our views were as to S.C.A.C. As a result of a Message to this House, we appointed a Select Committee which went into S.C.A.C. and made a Report suggesting what things the House wished to have changed in S.C.A.C. and adding that again we agreed in principle with Federation, but there were things which we wanted taken out.

While we were still debating what should be our attitude towards S.C.A.C., the Colonial Office virtually made up our minds for us. I told the House how I had endeavoured to get what the House itself afterwards agreed with and felt all along, to get a Conference in the West Indies before we went to London. But that was prolonged: we made an Interim Report and before we could finish, the Colonial Office announced that they intended to hold a Conference in London. We had perforce to agree, because the other Legislatures agreed, and the view of going to the London Conference prevailed.

In spite of letting myself open to the accusation of not speaking enough as to the Government's view,

I shall be brief because, as I have said, I take it that this House has already firmly expressed its views as to Federation. We have fought for all of the things which the House desired to see. We succeeded in some of those things and I have no doubt that in those matters in which we did not succeed, the House is still of the same opinion, and the Delegates will also be of the same opinion. It is however doubtful whether, in spite of what is still most important to us, although we shall fight for it, we shall get a reversal of the decision taken in respect of the Reserve Powers of the Governor General. I find it difficult in view of what I have just said, to say much more. I invite the House, bearing in mind Mr. Manley's points, to express their views. Bearing in mind what I have said in respect of the question of dual Ministries, which is a departure from the Jamaica point of view—Mr. Manley's point is a departure from that—I should wish to hear the views of the House. We fought hard and got that compromise in 1953, not two Ministers, but a seat and a Ministry. I repeat, as to those points we have fought for we have succeeded in some and failed in others.

I invite honourable members to be very careful not to irritate the Delegates of some of the smaller islands, because it is easy to say what is true but what is not necessarily expedient, facing a Conference of this sort. But I will say this: any measure which has been accepted as part of this proposed Constitution which falls short of the type of Constitution which we would like to see, has been the fault of the West Indies who have not, in the majority of cases, clamoured for as much as they should have. Nothing so far has been pushed down the throats of the West Indies by the Colonial Office; they have emphasised that they have left it to the West Indies to create their own Constitution to the extent that the existence of grant-aided Colonies, made it necessary for H.M.G. to suggest in the course of debate, that their position should be taken into consideration. Not all of us fought as we should have fought to have the Reserve Powers of the Governor General reduced to a minimum.

I do not propose, I repeat, to take these points one by one, but I do wish in what I say now initially, to make it quite clear that whatever can be said in this Parliament or in the other Parliament, West Indians have never let down the West Indies in clamouring for the best Constitution. We have had to take a majority vote in a matter which is to us of the most supreme importance—the writing into the Constitution that the Queen in Council can make laws for the area. That is anathema to a Colony which exists with representative institutions. We have fought against that and we will continue to fight against it; if Barbados and Jamaica are the only two Colonies to fight against that, I give the House the assurance that those two votes will be registered.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not read the Interim Report, but I will remind the House by reading, with its permission, how strongly we then put forward our views in our Final Report to this House. This Address to His Excellency the Governor reads as follows:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Acting Governor*

The House of Assembly has the honour to refer to His Excellency Sir Alfred Savage's Message No. 2, 1952 on the subject of British West Indian Federation and to state that the House has reviewed the Report of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee, which, as it has affirmed in

a previous Address to Sir Alfred Savage, it accepted as a basis for discussion on the form that the proposed Federation should take.

The House of Assembly has the honour to make the following comments on the Report and expressions of its views on the subject.

"1. The House reaffirms its acceptance of the principle of Federation.

2. The House is of the opinion that the Federal Constitution should follow the Australian model and the units should retain such powers as they do not specifically agree to give up. In this it concurs in Paragraph 21 of Chapter II of the Report, but the House feels that Immigration, Emigration and Deportation should be included in the Exclusive List and not the Concurrent List as set out in Paragraphs 6 and 7 of Chapter II of the Consolidated Recommendations."

3.45 p.m.

I was accused when the Freedom of Movement Conference was about to take place of putting in something that might wreck Federation. The hon. member who made that accusation forgot that this was the view of the House when we went in 1953. There is no reason to depart from that, but we have departed a bit in order to get something done.

Paragraph 3 reads as follows:—

"3. The House feels that it will be essential to the success of the Federation for the Government of the United Kingdom to give financial assistance by way of a grant and or a loan; but nevertheless, it strongly endorses the recommendation in the Report that there must be no direct and general control of the economic and financial affairs of the Federation by the United Kingdom Government."

All that Jamaica is saying is that you must give us more than you promised to give two years ago.

Paragraph 4 reads as follows:—

"4. The House agrees with the establishment of a bi-cameral Legislature but feels that the members of the Senate should be elected for a period of five years by the elected members of the respective local Legislatures. The House feels, too, that there should be no time-limit to residence as a qualification for election to the House of Assembly as recommended in the Report."

We did get the Conference to agree that members of the Senate should be elected for a period of five years but it was recommended that the Senate should be appointed by the Governor-General. I do not think any honourable member of this House would agree with that.

Paragraph 4 continues as follows:

"The House is of the opinion that for the first five years, and thereafter for such a period as the Federal Legislature should enact, members of the Federal House of Assembly should be permitted to remain as members of the local Legislatures and Executive Councils or Executive Committees. The House considers that the Speaker of the Federal House of Assembly should be elected from its own members.

"The House does not agree with the proposed allocation of seats and recommends that Barbados should have 6 representatives."

With respect to Barbados getting 6 representatives, we did succeed on that. I will also say that Jamaica and ourselves succeeded in getting that compromise that a representative can be a member of the Federal House of Assembly as well as retain his seat in his local Legislature but not as a Minister in both. He can be a Minister in one and an ordinary member in the other.

Paragraph 5 reads as follows:—

"5. The House feels that the Executive Body should be called, not a "Council of State," but a "Cabinet". This Cabinet should contain no officials and should be nominated by the Prime Minister."

"6. The House considers that discussion of detailed financial provisions should await the holding of the proposed London Conference."

"7. The House is of the opinion that the question of the site of the Federal Capital should be reconsidered at the coming Conference."

We also got that done. Instead of Trinidad being proposed as the site, there was that farcical suggestion which was not seriously taken that Grenada should be the Federal Capital.

Paragraph 8 reads as follows:—

"8. The House of Assembly feels that Item (d) of Paragraph 40 of the Consolidated Recommendations in Appendix V to the Report should be modified and that Item (h) should be deleted from any proposed legislation as unnecessary. The House can never agree to the insertion of Items (c) and (d) of Paragraph 42 of Appendix V in any legislation by Order-in-Council affecting Barbados."

We have discussed this matter which we will have to discuss again. There were two things which were quite unacceptable to this House and the Executive of the day. One was giving the Governor-General positive powers on taxation, and the other for the Queen-in-Council to have power to make laws for the good Government and order of the whole area. As I pointed it out then and as the House agreed, it would be absurd to say that if, say, it was reported to the Secretary of State for the Colonies that there was a row in the area—not in Barbados—the Queen-in-Council should make an order prohibiting the Assembly of more than 12 people in Barbados. We got that eliminated. This House will never agree to the insertions of Items (c) and (d) of Paragraph 42 of Appendix V giving power to the Queen-in-Council to legislate for us in financial matters and by Order-in-Council to pass laws affecting the preservation of laws and order in Barbados.

Paragraph 9 reads as follows:—

"9. The House feels that the Federal Constitution should provide for full self-government in all the internal affairs of the area which is under Federal administration.

"The House of Assembly respectfully requests Your Excellency to forward copies of this Address to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies and to the Heads of Government in the other Caribbean Territories covered by the Report."

I have reminded the House of this Address which was passed by this House in January 1953 in order to remind hon. members that that has been our stand then and I do not suppose for one moment that anybody in here would back down from that stand. The only addition which I am going to make to what I have just said is to remind hon. members that when it seemed that Trinidad and ourselves would not come together on the question of Freedom of Movement, that when we expressed our opinion in this House, apart from what two hon. members said about its being nonsense, this House agreed that we would not go into Federation unless the principle of Freedom of Movement was accepted and made part of it. Then, using the language of the Barbados House of Assembly, a Conference was called in Trinidad and it is common property what we decided there, and how we got over 50 of the Clauses to restrict persons removed by the Trinidad Legislature.

I will say briefly that I hope it will not be necessary for me to say anything more than that the main modification of what we have agreed on so far and what things are likely to be discussed will be found

in the Fiscal Commissioners' Report. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is not in his place so that I could hear the views of a practising lawyer, especially the hon. member who visited Trinidad and who has had strong views to make on the Constitution of the Judiciary of the Federal Supreme Court. I do hope he will come and give expression to his views and that other hon. members who also have strong views on it would express those views.

3.55 p.m.

As regards the report on the Civil Service Commission, Sir Hilary Blood recommends starting in a very small way, largely on the grounds of economy, and building up. This is a far cry from what so many West Indians hope to get, — Dominion Status immediately; therefore we expect honourable members to speak as freely as they are accustomed to speaking in this Place on a recommendation of this sort. The Fiscal Report is the most important of the three reports, and I do not think that the other two Commissioners will feel annoyed if you agree that the Fiscal Report is a master-piece, compared with the others. The Fiscal Commissioner has made certain suggestions. He was asked in his terms of reference to direct his attention to this point, because to us in 1953 at that conference, although we said a percentage of all Customs Revenue (in itself a doubtful expression), it appeared that there had not been sufficient thought given to all of its implications, and that if, as the majority decided, you were going to back down on the 25% suggested as a means of financing the Federation, you would then probably not have enough finance. Jamaica and ourselves, I am glad to say, have, at any rate since 1953, seen eye to eye on nearly everything of importance, that has arisen at these Conferences. I have no reason to doubt that it will continue next month. Jamaica and ourselves pointed out that anything more than 10% or at the outside 12½% Customs Revenue would put back considerably the programme of social reform in our respective units. The majority compromised on 15%; but as Sir Sydney Caine pointed out even 15% was not enough and is not a departure in principle from what we decided in 1953, but a modification; that instead of having your 15% plus 50% of your Revenue as reserve, you should have taxes on specific items. He mentioned those items of common consumption that are most often the greatest Revenue-producing items in a Customs Tariff.

Now, I realise, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House must have given much thought to this. I wish them to express their views so that those views can be put forward as those of the Barbados House of Assembly when the delegates go to London. The history of all Federations show that sooner or later a Federal Government will impose income tax, because unless you happen to be a wealthy State or Province, you have got to go to the Federal Government for assistance, and no Government is going to give anybody assistance unless strings are attached. The general feeling today is — and Sir Sydney Caine does not go against that general feeling — that Income Tax will come. But we are going to write into the constitution "definitely not in the first five years." I do not think that anybody at this Conference will wish to alter that. We have to expect and remember that our history teaches us that sooner or later Federal Income Tax is going to come along. I suppose most of us wish it will not come in our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have not wearied the House, but I have taken the matter as seriously

as possible. I have endeavoured to anticipate any suggestions that this House, the general public or the West Indies does not know what Barbados is thinking on any point. Hon. members will remember that I promised to be non-controversial but the spirit of Adam in me prevents me from keeping quiet about it. There was a huge laughter when I said who can go, but that there is only one vote and that that vote would be mine as Leader of the Delegation. Hon. members laugh because some are always on the verge of laughter; they may be serious on their death beds. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Do not talk about death; that is one thing you do not have control over. We will have to pray for you.] There are certain fish in the sea for whom the bait does not even have to hit the water before they bite. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You are not any bait; you are not a fisherman.] I hope I did not give the impression of being too longwinded, but it is far more important for the Government to hear the views of other members. When I consider that this House in 1953 reached a decision of all the important points I see no reason to depart from it. That is the policy of the Government and if any specific point is put to the Government this afternoon or even may be tomorrow morning, the Government is prepared to give a straightforward, frank and full reply and to express what is the point of view of the Government. Always remember that the Government (this is going to raise another laugh) pays attention to what the Opposition says, even if it has nothing in it. [Laughter]. I suppose I ought to be a comedian. If I can produce laughter so easily, I should be able to make a living on the stage. Any question as to the view of the Government, which are the views reflected in this House from time to time, anything which hon. members may not be sure in their minds about, I never question. I go so far as to suggest that this debate may not finish by midnight, and we have to finish it tomorrow. I am prepared to hear everything that hon. members may say, because, in respect of an attack made on the Government, on this particular point the stronger we are, the more it is possible for the delegation to say every single member on the delegation agrees with this, and the more effective that argument would be.

4.05 p.m.

We have done it in the past. If there is any particular point that hon. members of this House wish to have emphasised, I ask them, I appeal to them, to make their points and they will be sure not only will they be heard and passed on, but they will be used, in order to put the case for Barbados in the best possible way. I do make a final appeal before I sit down that, however tempted we may be to say things which are true and may not be expedient, if those things are going to have an adverse effect on the possibility of Barbados getting the Federal Capital here, I invite hon. members to do as I have been doing, that is, refraining myself from saying those things in public, at any rate. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for five minutes.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Premier has been comparatively brief in this matter, and one therefore looks forward to some comment from the other member of the Delegation from this House.

[Mr. LEWIS: He is a sleeping Delegate] [Laughter]. Before I go on to the core of my remarks, I want to say that at some times it is very difficult to take the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seriously. He has asked us to refrain from any offensive remarks which might have the results of interfering with the selection of Barbados as the

Federal Capital, and yet he himself referred to the selection of Grenada in 1953 as farcical. Whether he likes it or not, Grenada considers herself to be the ideal site for the Federal Capital. Therefore there is no reason why he should offend Mr. Gairy who is on the Delegation, and who will have to vote for the Federal Capital, by saying that the suggestion as the use of Grenada as the Federal Capital is farcical. That must offend Grenada. I hope hon. members will not follow him and pass remarks which are bound to be considered as offensive, and at the same time pretend that we are trying not to be offensive to the other Colonies which will comprise the Federation.

Before I reply to one or two points which the Hon. Premier has made, I want to make this suggestion first and foremost. In all these discussions and Reports on Federation, the title of the Federation is "The British Caribbean Federation." All of us know that this Federation envisages eventual self-government, and therefore I think it is inappropriate for the title of the Federation to include the word "British." There is no likelihood of our having an American W.I. Federation, because the American Colony of Puerto Rico is self-governing and the Virgin Islands are too unimportant. The French Caribbean Colonies are now a part of Metropolitan France and the other Colonies are already autonomous. There could be no question of a Nigerian Federation being called the "British Nigerian Federation," and in the case of the Gold Coast, another Colony which is approaching independence, nobody could envisage the Gold Coast agreeing to being called "The British Gold Coast Dominion." As a matter of fact, so determined is the Gold Coast to dissociate itself entirely from every vestige of its past Colonialism that they intend to change the name of the country to Ghana; they have eliminated the name "Gold Coast" entirely.

I am suggesting at the beginning of my remarks that the nomenclature "British Caribbean Federation" connotes a nexus with Britain which is entirely out of consonance with independence. Of course we intend to remain in the British Commonwealth of Nations, but, at the same time, let our independence be signified both in political fact and in everything else. Therefore, I am going to suggest that the Barbados Delegation should consider some other title for the Federation.

As I have said earlier, it is unlikely that there shall be any other Caribbean Federation, and therefore we may just call this Federation the "Caribbean Federation." Speaking for myself, I should prefer if we were called "The United States of the West Indies." I should like the unity implied in Federation to be ever uppermost in the minds of West Indians, and I am sure that other people could think of a better title. However, in my modest opinion, I believe that the title "The United States of the West Indies" has something to commend it. In any case, Mr. Speaker, we should never agree to the universally used term, "The British Caribbean Federation." It was alright when we were Colonials to be called "The British West Indies;" if you are self-governing, you are self-governing. You could not have "The British Dominion of Canada" or "The British Dominion of South Africa" or "The British United States" after they became independent. No more should you have "The British West Indian Federation" if the West Indies have Dominion Status.

4.15 p.m.

Now, I want to pass on from that very briefly to the Report of the Fiscal Commissioner to which I am very very sorry to note so little attention has

been paid by the Hon. Premier. Apart from the fact that the question of finance is the most important factor in this Report on Federation, in this report is also dealt with the alternative method of financing the Federation; and the Hon. Premier had to be prompted by the hon. junior member for the City to make some reference, brief as it was, to the likelihood of eventually financing the Federation from income tax. Originally, the S.C.A.C. Report proposed that the Federation should be financed from Customs Revenue and now the Fiscal Commissioner, Sir Sydney Caine, has gone further and recommended an alternative method of deriving the Federal Revenue.

Now, the Hon. Premier said that the history of Federations is that eventually all Federations get around to collecting revenue from income tax and that he endorsed the view that no Federal Government will be willing to give assistance to one of the Units comprising the Federation unless it can of course have some say in the manner in which it raises its revenue, or words to that effect. I approach this question in an entirely different manner. I believe both the S.C.A.C. Report and the Caine Report are basically wrong in suggesting that Customs Revenue or Consumption Taxes should be used to finance the Federation, because, in the first instance, the moment a Federal Government is independent on Consumption Taxes or Customs Revenue for its finance, it means that everytime the Federal Government wants more money it can only get it by raising the cost of living in the units and that will place an unproportional burden on those who are least able to bear it; therefore, as time goes on, it is bound to become more unpopular. The moment your Federal Government has to get money by increasing taxes from year to year which can be derived only by increasing the cost of living to the masses of the people in the area, it must tend to increase the unpopularity of the Federal Government. Therefore, I am inclined to the view entirely different from that of the Government's Spokesman, the Premier, who in an aside almost suggested that he hoped it would not be financed by income tax in our lifetime. It is manifestly fair to finance the Regional Government by indirect taxation, therefore, it came strange to me to hear the Leader of the Socialist Government in Barbados expressing the view and almost praying to his gods, if he has any, that the resort to income tax for financing the Federal Government may be postponed at least in our lifetime.

Let us get this in our minds clearly. One cannot forget that in the S.C.A.C. Report it was first suggested, that Customs Revenue should form the basis of financing the Federation. Both at Montego Bay and in the selection of the Delegates for S.C.A.C., it was impossible at the time to get the authentic voice of the West Indies because we had a very limited franchise operating in the area at the time. There was no Adult Suffrage in Trinidad, the Leewards, the Windwards or for that matter in Barbados, so the Delegates at Montego Bay and those on the Standing Closer Association Committee were in many cases not those who would have occupied their positions if you had Adult Suffrage earlier in the West Indies; and if you were to look at the roster of delegates who would be meeting in London in February you will see how the introduction of Adult Suffrage and the granting of a greater voice in the conduct of affairs to the masses of the people in these colonies have fundamentally interfered with the type of delegation which we now have. In other words, Mr. Speaker, because S.C.A.C. or the Montego Bay Conference agreed to financing the Federation from in-

direct taxation, it does not necessarily follow that the representatives of the various Legislatures which are now going to the London Conference will agree to financing the Federation by increasing the cost of living of the large masses of the people in these islands.

It is to be hoped that among those meeting in London in February, there shall be found a sufficiently large number of people who will be willing from the start to see to it that the greater portion of, and eventually all of the Federal expenditure comes from direct taxation.

I was very pleased with the hon. junior member for the City for his introduction of this matter and I was naturally disappointed at the rejoinder made by the Hon. Premier.

4.25 p.m.

I can only assume that the Premier is satisfied with all the financial proposals contained since he has made no objection to any. I object very strongly to the proposed method of financing of the Federation. The important thing in a discussion like this is not so much the details, as the principle governing the source from which they get their finance. But certainly, there are other phases of the financial report which require a little detailed attention. Now, the Fiscal Commissioner claims that the Capital requirements which include Parliament Buildings, Supreme Court, and General Offices, the Governor General's residence, Prime Minister's house, and other temporary buildings, and land will cost in the vicinity of £2,100,000. Now, this is a revised estimate of the original cost. At the time of the S.C.A.C. Report, I think the cost was little over £1½ million, I think £520,000, and of this amount it was expected that the British Government would give £½ million.

Now, I cannot assume — and neither does the Fiscal Commissioner — that the British Government will give in the same proportion now that the cost is over £2,000,000. Later in my remarks I will of course, get to what we expect from them, but for the purpose of argument and contending the recommendation of the Fiscal Commissioner, one has to do like him and refrain from the assumption that the grants from Her Majesty's Government towards the cost of financing the Federation will now be in the proportion as it was at the time when it was a mere half million pounds.

Now, it does seem strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Fiscal Commissioner could recommend and expect to be taken seriously, that the Federal Government of these small, undeveloped, poverty stricken islands, some of which are still depending—as he knows—on grants from the British Government in order to equate Expenditure with Revenue, should spend £1,200,000 in Parliament Buildings alone, £480,000 for Supreme Court, over \$2,000,000 for general offices, \$720,000 for the Governor General's residence. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, \$¾ million for the residence of the Governor General.

I am one who will agree with the contention that he has to be housed in a manner befitting the dignity of his office, (and that he will be the focus for all the entertainment in the area and all that sort of thing), but the buildings they are putting up in Bay Street now (which we cannot afford to put up and for which we have not got as yet the total cost), I believe, under \$½ million. So far as the House knows we are not spending more than \$½ million on the Ministerial Buildings in Bay Street. Am I to assume you need a bigger building, a more magnificent building than that merely to house the Governor General and his wife, presumably no children and the staff. It is the height of absurdity. [A VOICE: How do

you know he would have no children?] When I say probably no children, I mean you are not likely to appoint a young man with a family as Governor General. These appointments go to people of matured age with children already married and so on. Only a simple minded individual will contend that. (That is not important. What is important is the question of suggesting that we can afford to spend this money on the Governor General's residence.

We have got to bear in mind that although we are only part of the Federation, we have to contribute to its cost of establishment and its cost of operation and the money is to come from somewhere, and right now, from Customs Revenue and Consumption Taxes; and when the hon. member has to pay more for an article he and the people he represents have to consume, he will realise the importance of the matter we are speaking of here today. I say, Sir that is too elaborate. The Prime Minister will get a \$120,000 house and you go on in like manner. Now all this will mean is that this West Indian Federation will be forever in debt, when you spend over £2,000,000 purely on buildings regardless of the fact of how much is given by the British Government. If the British Government makes you a gift towards the cost of the building, they are going to give you that much less for something else, or nothing at all; so that we want the minimum amount spent on the cost of these buildings in order to get as much money left in our hands to put the Federation on a proper economic basis. It is fool-hardy, it is absurdity to the nth degree, to talk about no reserve powers and Dominion Status and what not, if you cannot finance a Federation yourself. And I say that I personally cannot agree with the recommendation of the Fiscal Commissioner for the Capital requirements, and I am of the opinion that the delegation which represents Barbados will be well advised further to consider these figures and to submit appropriate reductions where necessary. Similarly, sir, with the Federal Headquarters expenses. I really do not think that hon. members will agree—I hope I am wrong—but to judge from the exhibition made by the Premier and from what he had to say, far less than too little consideration has been given to the important aspect of this matter, and to the highly absurd recommendations of the Fiscal Commissioner. These are his estimates for the expenses of the Governor-General: his salary will be \$28,800; or £6,000 a year; duty allowance \$12,000, and contribution to the cost of service in residence of \$9,600, so that the total emoluments of the Governor General per annum would approximate £10,500 a year.

4.35 p.m.

If that is not the height of absurdity, I do not know what is. I sincerely hope that there will be some voice in London in February to tell the Colonial Office and Sir Sydney Caine, if he is there—well, I want to be parliamentary. [Laughter]. If the salubrious climate of the West Indies went to his head and had him feeling very happy with the world, or if as he went around the islands the aroma of our intoxicating beverages had some slight effect on his mental capacity, we are willing to forgive him; [Laughter] but let him get down to earth and consider the type of Colonies and the financial position of the Colonies with which he is dealing. We cannot afford to pay a Governor General total emoluments of \$50,000 a year. I took the trouble to ascertain the remuneration paid to Governors of American States with comparable population to what this Federation will have. Perhaps this West Indian Federation will have a population of less than three million; as a matter of fact the S.C.A.C. Report has put it at less than 2¾ million, but I am willing to concede that

now it might have reached the three million mark; although that is improbable with the marked exodus in recent times of West Indians from every Colony—from St. Kitts down to Jamaica—to England.

The State of Alabama has a population, I understand of three million people, and they pay their Governor \$12,000 a year. Florida has a population of 2,771,000 and they pay their Governor \$15,000 a year. Kentucky with a population of under three million, pays their Governor \$10,000 a year, and of course, a free house. It may be, of course, possible (but I have not been able to find out) that they get a small extra allowance for entertainment, but \$10,000 and \$12,000 in comparison with \$50,000! And mind you, Mr. Speaker, the annual revenue of these States is infinitely more than the total revenue of all these islands which will comprise the Federation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, New York State with 15 million people—more than five times the amount of this proposed Federation—pays its Governor \$50,000. The richest State in the world is New York State with 15 million people and it pays its Governor the same amount of money which the 3 million underfed, under-nourished and poverty-stricken people in the West Indies will have to pay their Governor General. If this is not the most fantastic proposition which has ever been made to the people of these islands, I do not know what is. And the same thing applies to the entire cost of running the West Indian Judiciary. I am reminded, Sir, that even the British Cabinet Ministers only get £5,000 a year, and the Prime Minister gets £10,000; but the United Kingdom has vast resources for its size and area, and it is the most highly-developed country in the world. There is no other country of similar size which has resources comparable for its size with those of the United Kingdom.

Sir Sydney Caine knows fully well that at the same time he was writing his Report, we had Delegates in England begging for an economic price for bananas, copra and citrus, because among other things it was impossible for us to compete with similar commodities produced by some of the bigger countries; and he has sat there in cold blood and put himself on record as recommending that we should pay this abnormally high remuneration! In the early days when I was much younger [Mr. LEWIS: You have a good memory].

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I was much younger, when we were talking about Federation, I remember quite well that the idea behind Federation was that by bringing the West Indies together, you could economise on the Administration. That was the slogan in vogue at the time. If you read the speeches made at the Dominica Conference in 1927, called by the late Mr. C. E. A. Rawle, if you read what was said by the Barbados Delegates (Mr. Charlie Elder and Mr. Sainsbury) indeed in every speech made and running like a motif through the Conference was the suggestion that by Federation you could cut the top-heavy task of administering these islands in the West Indies.

Within recent years, in talking about Federation, it seems to me that the original idea has gone completely by the wind; and you will find in 1955, that the Fiscal Commissioner appointed by Great Britain has it so completely out of his mind that he is suggesting that we should pay these abnormal salaries to the Governor General, and to the Judicial Officers and some other Officers of the Federal Government. I can only come to the conclusion, and I want the West Indian Delegates to be aware of it, that there is some desire either *ouvert* or *couvert* to place such financial burdens around the neck of the

new Federation that we should never be able to stand on our legs, and we shall always be dependent on the British Government.

4.45 p.m.

I could have understood if Sir Sydney Caine had suggested firstly, certain economies in the present cost of administration. Now I am willing to concede that the present remuneration of the Colonial Governors in the West Indies is extremely high — much higher than it should be. There is no reason why a Federal Government should perpetuate such a costly error. The way I feel about it is this: with Federal Self-Government, with insular Self-Government and a Governor-General, I do not see why you need still in each of these islands a Governor and a Chief Secretary. The Governor of Barbados today, and in Jamaica to some extent, is to all intents and purposes a figure head. When we have a full responsible Government he will be more of a figure head. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we need to carry the cost of a full-fledged figure-head in every colony, and a Chief Secretary, and then this extravagantly priced Governor-General at the head of it all, when in truth your country will be run by your Federal Government from your Federal Capital and when you have autonomy in your units? If you have to obtain, as is expected, a Federal Governor-General, all that you need in these colonies is a Lieutenant Governor who should embrace in his capacity the duties of Governor and Chief Secretary. Even as it is now in Barbados, the Governor is merely useful to preside at meetings of the Executive and what not, and of course, see to it that irresponsible Governments may not run amuck. Of course, the Governor has certain over-riding powers vested in him. But the Chief Secretary in his absence invariably fills the Bill quite capably; and my contention is that with the acquisition by Unit Governments of more autonomy, and with the granting of Self-Government to your Federation (or something near to it) you can dispense with the services of a Governor and Chief Secretary in each colony and save some money by so doing. You can save about £30,000 a year by amalgamating the offices of Chief Secretary and Governor in the West Indies and changing the title of them to Lieutenant-Governor. Then the head of the Secretariat can perform the duties now performed by the Chief Secretary.

I am not at all in agreement with the modern conception that Federation will not bring about any reduction in the cost of administration in these islands. I would like to stick to the original idea that by amalgamating the territories and by unifying the administration some reduction in the cost of administration can be effected. I see not even the slightest suggestion of that in the Fiscal Report; and that is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have taken a little time to refer briefly, I hope, to some of the proposed expenses of the Federal Headquarters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member think that statement of his is right, bearing in mind the terms of reference of the Fiscal Commissioner?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The terms of reference according to the Commissioner require him to work out as precisely as possible "in the light of the Report by the Conference on West Indian Federation (Cmd. 8837), in particular paragraphs 25, 26, 30 and 33 to 41 thereof, of the Plan for a British Caribbean Federation (Cmd. 8895), of the Reports of the parallel Commissions established to examine the Federal Civil Service and the Federal Judiciary, and on the assumption that the Federation will provide for the establishment of a Customs Union for the West Indies on the lines recommended by the Commission on

the establishment of a Customs Union in the British Caribbean area."

Well now, it may be true that the terms of Reference restricted him to the making of recommendations to implement the recommendations of those Reports, but his normal authority went further than that. As a matter of fact, you will recall he took it upon himself to recommend a fundamental alternative in the method of financing the Federation. While S.C.A.C. Report suggested Customs Union revenue exclusively, he took it upon himself to recommend other fundamental alterations; and in the same way he did that, I am of the opinion he could have criticised, perhaps in passing, any financial recommendation contained in these previous Reports which he thought were too heavy for the islands to carry. I can see no reason why in a Report of this sort he could not have said that in his opinion he thought the salaries for the Judiciary, for the Executive, for the Governor-General and the Legislature were too high and suggest certain recommendations for retrenchment which may or may not be adopted by the West Indian plenipotentiaries when they meet in London.

4.55 p.m.

So that, Sir the main point of your contention might be that the West Indians themselves who served on the S.C.A.C. and who signed the Report also rendered a great disservice to the West Indies. But there is no reason why on more mature reflection the plenipotentiary delegates could not reconsider any previous financial recommendations and make the appropriate amendments. Now, that also could be said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the proposed salaries for the Judiciary. You are going to have the Chief Justice and three judges, other staff and so on, and the total estimated cost per annum of the Judiciary (I am reading on page 12 of the Fiscal Report) will be \$146,720 a year; we are expected to impose that upon the present cost of running the insular Judiciary. I do not see why the Hon. Premier should express the desire that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy should comment upon these proposals, because we understand that he himself is also a lawyer, and it seems to me that there is no reason why he should not have enlightened the House with his own views on the matter, and then leave it to any legal member of the House, if he were so desirous to add his quota. I am not at all sure in my own mind that we shall need for this small area a Federal Chief Justice and three judges when we already have the West Indian Court of Appeal, and when other colonies already have other Appeal Courts which we have not got; in Trinidad for instance, there is a Court of Criminal Appeal; there is none here in Barbados. And then in any case there is always finally the British Privy Council to which they can refer. On the face of it it does appear unnecessary to impose this extra judiciary burden on the existing Court of Appeal because I take it that the West Indian Court of Appeal will be a Federal Court, and you can widen its scope to include

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member saying that the Courts do not absorb the West Indian Court of Appeal in the Federal Judiciary?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not sure whether it does or not. If that be the case, apparently the Fiscal Commissioner and myself were thinking alike. I had not read the particular recommendation and I did not see why we should have both; but if he recommends the abolition of the one and the substitution of the other, then we are on common ground.

Now, to pass on from there, sir, I am in complete agreement with the proposal which has been

contained in the Manley Memorandum that the Federal Government should be completely responsible for development in the area, and this was where I want to suggest very seriously that the question of aid to Federation by the British Government comes in and should occupy a very prominent place. A point in the Manley Memorandum is a reconsideration of the question of what financial assistance the British Government will give the newly established Federation, and I sincerely hope that by that is not meant merely financial assistance towards the cost of establishing Federation. You will remember that I said earlier that the British Government had agreed to give £½ million towards the total estimated cost at the time of the Federation of £520,000; and I am saying now that I hope when they talk of opening this talk of financial assistance, they do not merely mean a bigger grant now that the capital grant has been estimated at over £2,000,000 (and not £½ million): because as I said earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is useless to talk about self government and dominion status in under-developed countries, and when some of our colonies are still depending on this annual grant-in-aid. What we want for this constitution is a sufficiently large sum of money to enable us to implement political advancement economically: in other words, to be able economically to bear whatever is envisaged or involved in self-government, and this for me is almost the most important question in the entire issue of Federation. 5.05 p.m.

That for me, Sir, I repeat, is almost the most important question in the entire Federation, because if after all these years of complete dependence on British Imperial strings, we were cut loose, so to speak apart from a small grant towards the capital cost, and a small grant in aid to Colonies which cannot balance their budgets—we will never get anywhere. That is not what has been done in the case of other Colonies getting full self-government from the Mother Country. Shortly after the Montego Bay Conference, the Chief Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Bustamante, now Sir Alexander Bustamante, made a suggestion that it would cost nearly one hundred million pounds to develop the area, and put it on its feet economically. A number of people laughed at the idea; since then a World Bank Mission reported that Jamaica alone would require \$160 million to develop it as it should be developed. Now if we cast our minds back to 1950 at the time when the Commonwealth Ministers met in Ceylon and formulated what is known as the Colombo Plan to develop South East Asia, you will remember that the Commonwealth Ministers in Ceylon agreed to the expenditure of over £1 billion 868 million in six years to develop the Countries of South East Asia with a population of about six hundred million; so that it works out at an average of about \$3 million for every million people.

I want to suggest that the Federal West Indies, although primarily the responsibility of Great Britain, as I shall show later, is a matter which is also of deep interest to the rest of the British Commonwealth, if not to the rest of the world. There is no reason why international agencies like the World Bank, and so on, and the United States Government itself should not offer a tangible sum of money towards the common pool of West Indian development. But I think it is the first responsibility of Great Britain, and secondly that of the entire British Commonwealth, to assist in our development. They expect us eventually to take our rightful place alongside them in International Councils; they will expect our support in International issues, and they will expect us to co-operate with them whenever the occa-

sion arises; and I say that it is to their benefit, indirectly perhaps, to have a strong, stable and prosperous West Indies. In my opinion, while we are entitled morally and politically to expect appreciable financial assistance from Great Britain, the West Indian Delegates should endeavour to impress upon the minds of the Colonial Office in London in February that in our approach for an appreciable sum of money to develop these Colonies, we suggest that Australia and Canada and the other Dominions of the Commonwealth should also be asked to contribute their share. If they can find money to the extent I mentioned earlier to assist Countries in South Eastern Asia, from whom they expect almost nothing -- and they were not even sure that sooner or later those Countries would be completely Communist and outside the fold of the free world -- so much the more should they assist in putting on its feet an area which morally and spiritually has always been, and will always be, tied to them and which in times of national crisis will be expected to pull its weight along with the free countries of the world.

We are not less important than Burma, Siam or any other country in South East Asia: as a matter of fact, in some respects we are more important. But it seems to me that the consciences of the countries which comprise the free world could only be aroused to exert themselves on behalf of dependent peoples when and if it appears that Communism is getting a foot hold. That is why I have been moved to say that it would be a good thing for the West Indies if we had a strong Communist movement in these parts; British Guiana benefited at least in having the threat of Communism there. It seems to me that the only thing to make the American Government and the British Government wake up and realise that people want their economies strengthened is to be faced with the threat of Communist domination in some area which they regard as important to their own military salvation.

At this stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.20 p.m.

On re-assembling,

FEDERATION C'TD.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment I was making a few remarks with regard to the need for ensuring the maximum economic stability of the Federation and ventured to say, apart from the fact that it is morally wrong to give the new Federation part of the Capital cost of its establishment only, what we in the West Indies need is a large amount of money to be used exclusively for development purposes without any string attached to it. I noticed somewhere this morning (I think it was in the Daily Newspaper) the suggestion that we can hardly expect to have the grants-in-aid to the small colonies which need them continued without giving the reserve powers over finance to the Governor-General. You will remember that paragraph 76 of S.C.A.C. Report

has this to say in regard to the legislative powers of Her Majesty's Government.

"Having regard to the inescapable responsibilities of Her Majesty's Government arising out of the problems of defence, international relations and ultimate financial stability of the Federation in its external relationships, it has been thought necessary to provide that, in certainly carefully defined circumstances relating to the foregoing, His Majesty in Council should have certain overriding powers of legislation sufficient to enable those responsibilities to be discharged."

In other words, we are reserving the right to the King or Queen—as the case may be—in Council to have financial powers over financial matters. Well, now, on the face of it, it may be argued that if they are going to have to continue grants-in-aid and certain other financial responsibilities, that they should have the final say in economic matters; but I agree with those who submit that this should not be the case. The Federal Government cannot make any progress unless it has complete control over all economic matters in the area. If there must be reserved powers over it, then we can as well better not bother with it. Imperial interests are bound to clash with Federal interests and we know which will suffer. We must have complete control over all economic matters; and as I have said earlier, the Delegates should with one voice call on the British Government and the Commonwealth also to participate in the setting up of a large fund solely for the purpose of the development of the Federated West Indies.

We need a Federal Development Board and a Federal State Bank, both financed from this fund, for the economic development of the territory. What so far have we got out of the British Government to assist us in our economic development? We may not be able to make out a case on purely economic grounds for demanding this assistance, but certainly on political and moral grounds we are entitled to it. There is no gainsaying the fact that we have been in our time of inestimable benefit to the United Kingdom. I believe that the West Indies delegation in London next month should insist, as a means of getting this contribution, on the moral debt which Britain owes to these colonies. Since the War and even during the War years we have had C.D.C. and C.D. & W. operating in these parts. C.D.C. has done very little for the West Indies.

5.55 p.m.

They found nearly £100,000,000 to throw away in East Africa, and in the Ground Nut Scheme, and I think they have spent a little money in British Honduras, Jamaica, British Guiana and in the Bahamas; but by and large the West Indies have gotten very little assistance from C.D.C., and in any case, Mr. Speaker, what we have to bear in mind is that the British Government itself made it perfectly plain that C.D.C. was established primarily to help British consumers. The original idea behind C.D.C. was not to industrialise the colonies as an end itself, but to procure certain articles of consumption and raw materials for the United Kingdom consumer which Britain could not afford to buy elsewhere. Any economical development which resulted was purely incidental, and that is why for one reason the West Indies can show no visible benefit as a result of the establishment of C.D.C. C.D. & W. while it was established to improve certain basic conditions in the West Indies roads, water facilities etc., was not in itself established to promote economic development. It was supposed to provide improvement in basic conditions which would of course, later assist in any plans for economic development; but development and welfare is one thing and economic development is another.

What should result from the London Conference are these two basic things: (1) complete political independence, and (2) the assurance of all the financial assistance we want in order to put the economy of these countries on a sound basis. I was reminded this morning of a quotation made by Sir Winston Churchill himself a few years ago as regards the duty which Britain owes the West Indies: "Our possession of the West Indies like that of India gave us the strength, the support and especially in capital, the wealth at a time when no other European nation possessed such a reserve, which enabled us to go through the great struggles of Napoleonic Wars, the keen competition of commerce in the 18th and 19th centuries and enabled us to establish our leadership in the world in the way we did." That is an open secret. It is true that within recent years other parts of the Dominions have passed the West Indies by in consequence of their wealth; countries like Canada, India and Africa with their greater wealth assumed more significance than we. The British owes the West Indies a great deal. It was here they learnt the art of colonising. As a matter of fact the supremacy which enabled them to dominate the world was built up and begun in the West Indies. Some historians go as far as to say that Nelson acquired the strategy which enabled him to defeat France and Spain in the Caribbean. So far as his other relationships to the W.I. in relationship to the aside I just overheard, are concerned, I understand he married a coloured woman in the West Indies and then deserted her in London for somebody else's wife. We commemorate it by giving him status in Trafalgar Square.

But as I said, Sir, I should like to think—and I hope I am not fooling myself—that the Report of this Conference in London will give us the heartening news that all these things have been accomplished, that we are at long last on the road to the sort of development which would enable the people in these colonies to live like human beings and to maintain a tolerable, decent standard of existence. Britain has to be reminded that for close on two centuries, if not three, she paid such an uneconomical price for our products that the masses could not even buy shoes, and were prohibited from buying cheap Japanese shoes. The same British Government was underpaying us for our products up to 1937 when we had the Disturbance; and agricultural labourers were still getting one shilling a day; and it was said to the people that they could not pay any more because they did not get a proper price for sugar. But what happened? Did the United Kingdom Government not hold a Conference in Ottawa and ban the same cheap Japanese goods from coming in here? People getting one shilling a day were, as a result of the Conference, prevented from buying shoes from Japan and other places outside the Empire and were forced to pay five and six shillings for Canadian shoes. Her Majesty's Government was not conscious at all of her obligations, but strove only to protect the Empire manufactured articles which cost the people in the Islands five and six times as much and which they were unable to buy.

6.05 p.m.

I am not arguing that the Japanese shoes were not cheaper than the British, but the British people found that the people of these Islands could get shoes, and they took the opportunity not to give us more money, but to keep these shoes out. We have been used as a dumping ground for their manufactured articles on the one hand, and on the other, as producers of the raw material, they wanted it at the cheapest price in order to compete with other parts of the world with the goods they manufactured. All down through the years, that is the part we have been

playing, and there has never been any *quid pro quo*. In my opinion, now that we have them in this position only through pressure of world opinion, (and they themselves want to be able to stand at the United Nations and say: "We have freed our Colonies") now that we have them there, and they are as anxious to give us as we are to get an advanced status, let us take advantage of it, let us remind them of the debt they owe to us and make them understand that they cannot give us national status without giving us the means of implementing that status economically.

I cannot think of any period in the whole history of the West Indies that the West Indies have benefited economically from their long association with Great Britain. You will remember what happened since the war with our sugar. They bought our sugar and sold it to Canada and in one year alone they made £6 million from the re-sale of our sugar to Canada. I think that in 1951 we got for the first time our share of the difference on the sale of our sugar to Canada. If I am wrong, I hope I will be corrected; but I think it was something like \$300 thousand. Some hon. members say that it is more than that, but I can be corrected. Even now our sugar price is not what it should be, and the Delegates need to remind the British Government about these things. They need to be reminded that in 1939 they were afraid to publish the Report on conditions which their own investigators found in these parts, as they were so shocking. They sent out a Commission to investigate the conditions in the West Indies and could not even put in print for the world to read what conditions they found and which had led to the Disturbances in the West Indies. This is less than 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

These factors and others entitle us to a certain amount of consideration — at least to more consideration than merely saying: "We will give you the capital cost of the Federation and, may be, lend you some money for other reasons if we can see how you spend it." I have said in this Chamber before and I repeat today, that when the Americans gave Independence to Puerto Rico and the Philippines, that was not the manner in which it was done; they were given amounts to maintain their independence. They had the same guaranteed price for the products which America took for a guarantee with, of course, annual revision, and what not, and a continuance of the financial assistance which they got before. That is what the West Indies are entitled to. I make no mention at all today of the contribution of the West Indies to the dollar pool. We do not know yet if we have earned three times, or four times or ten times as much as we have got; but we know that we have contributed immensely towards the strengthening of sterling; and I make no mention of the big sterling balances in London for the Colonies. All I am saying is that purely through our past relationships, we are entitled to a certain amount of financial assistance, and I am very glad to be able to note that — if not in Barbados, elsewhere in the West Indies — there are people who are determined to see to it in so far as lies in their power, that we are not, as it were, turned out like beggars in the street.

6.15 p.m.

If we can get self-Government, if we can get a proper Federal Development Corporation, there is no reason why in the foreseeable future the West Indies should not be as prosperous an area inhabited by as contented a people as any country in the world. None of us, I hope, look forward to the necessity for large numbers of our people to be running to America, the United Kingdom or elsewhere in search of work. No self-respecting nation would want that. At this time we welcome their

departure because there is no other alternative: and in the case of many of these who have emigrated we hope that they will acquire new skills to come back home with in years to come.

When the Parliamentary delegation was here sometime last year, in a discussion with them, I got the assurance that they were deeply concerned with the possibility of development of the West Indies in order to make it no longer necessary for West Indians to run to England in such large numbers. Both of the major British Political Parties which were represented by the Delegation declared that they would support any suggestion for large-scale development in the West Indies in any island. At the moment, I am preparing a memorandum for submission to them for large-scale development in Dominica—a memorandum which I have already discussed with the Administrator of Dominica, the Planters' Association, the Merchants, the Legislators and the Press of that colony. There is only one Press in that colony that is worthy of mention, and the other bodies and myself had a very long discussion on the matter. I say again that the British Parliamentary Delegation which came here last year was only too anxious to get the proposals for West Indies Development in the area. In my opinion, Dominica offers the best scope for large-scale Development which would provide employment for an appreciable number of West Indians from the surrounding areas. Let me say that today the Leeward Islands are losing their population hands over fist. Quite recently, one newspaper referred to Montserrat as the City of the dead. The newspaper article intimates that Antigonians, Montserratians, Dominicans are going to the United Kingdom in hundreds, and there is nothing to be done at home.

I shall be very surprised, if proper plans are submitted to Her Majesty's Government for a West Indian Development Fund if they will turn it down, because they themselves are concerned with this large scale emigration of West Indians to Great Britain. They do not like it. We are British Subjects; therefore they cannot stop it. Even if we were to become a British Dominion tomorrow, the same thing will go on: and I believe we have got to the stage where it is the fault of the West Indian leaders themselves because they have failed to make out a case to Great Britain for assistance, and on the other hand they have failed to stress proposals for the development of the area. Now is the most favourable time for getting what they want in that respect. In a way one would have to welcome a Federal approach to the matter, because in many of the units, unfortunately, there is no one with the approach to this matter which the circumstances warrant.

Your Honour will recall that not many years ago, the Evans Commission recommended that Her Majesty's Government should have spent between \$60 million to \$100 million to develop British Guiana and British Honduras in order to settle large numbers of Jamaicans and Barbadians and others from such places. Neither British Guiana nor British Honduras will be in this Federation; and it is also true to state that in Jamaica and Barbados there is still a surplus population and the British Government has not spent a single cent in any area to develop it. If the report had been put into effect, we would have had this \$60 million or \$100 million spent in the area and it would have been reflected because it would have been absorbed by our surplus population. These are facts when we talk of becoming a self-governing nation and getting dominion status. Are we going out of the British embrace to find ourselves on our own without any prospect of develop-

ment? I know our position is such financially that we can get an appreciable loan today. I was checking up on the sterling assets of the British West Indian colonies in London and I have found in securities and what not that our assets amount to £123 million. These assets are quite good enough to get a sizeable loan for development when we want it.

But, I say Sir, we want more than a loan; we want money and we are entitled to some money. It is not enough to get up, as the Hon. Premier has done and say that we have to wait and see what the British Government will do in that respect. That is not the right approach at all. The right approach must be that we have got along—not entirely by a pleasant association with Great Britain; and that while we intend to retain our association with Great Britain and will remain bound by all the ties that bind us, we expect Great Britain at the same time will discard her obligations to us in matters of financial support. We are now on the march to nationhood. These islands may be said to be giving birth to a new nation and the Delegates at the London Conference would be the midwives. [A VOICE: Poor Children!] Somebody said: poor children! We neither want an abortion nor a premature birth, nor a miscarriage nor any of those things which are common to pregnancy. [A VOICE: Well, you want infanticide.] An hon. member has said something of infanticide but I want to say that we know how dangerous it is to interfere with the process of gestation.

These can be attended by serious consequences and all we can do, Sir, is to hope that these midwives will see to it that we are delivered of a lusty and healthy child which will in the process of time come to maturity and take its rightful place among the other countries of the world. I hope the Barbados delegation, no less than the other Colonial delegations, will approximately acquire themselves and provide our unborn generations with an opportunity to thank us for what we did at this time.

6.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, after a thorough study of these Reports, our Party is still a 100% behind the Federation and all that we are going into. Let it be clearly understood by the delegates attending this Conference, this most important conference, that we still wish Federation to be a reality and we do hope that at this conference it will be a reality; no further postponement. And I do hope that they will have no difficulty in implementing the many things that this House of Assembly has discussed not only today, but on previous occasions. We do not wish any less constitutional powers for the Federal Government than we enjoy today. As a matter of fact, I do not see how anyone, not even the small islands that have not made any constitutional advancement, would want to go into Federation and to retard or bring back those things that we have gained over a long period of time. I think too much stress should not be put on the constitutional powers alone. The Premier, if I may say so, is inclined to give that too much priority. I think he should pay a greater attention to the economic development of the area, and what we are to get by that means out of Federation. When he said that the one thing we are to gain out of Federation is nationhood, I think that is really taking the other advantages too lightly. If that is the only thing we are going in for today, I think many of us will even hesitate at that alone. It is something, it is a great thing; but with our growing population and being bound as we are on a little island—as you know today in a business or

in political development — there is no place for small units. In businesses, you find amalgamation of groups to further their interests and to cut down their overhead expenses, and for that very reason these units are coming together. Colonial Development and Welfare came here some twelve or fourteen years ago and by their methods have shown us the benefits of regional Planning; and by giving us the experts they have in various fields been able to do something for this island that we could not do for ourselves. Separated, we were too poor to employ the experts and we could never have got that research which they have put into the field of endeavour in the West Indies, either in agriculture, fisheries and other fields. This Federation is to me a taking over of these services that they have begun and we should realise that it would be a real set back to the West Indies to allow it to fail. But, Sir, that is beating the track all over again, and it is not really dealing with the three Commissioners' Reports. The most important of the three Reports, is the Fiscal Report, because it sets out very clearly and more exactly what it is going to cost us than any previous survey has done; because he has jumped the cost of the Capital Expenditure for the Federation from £½ million to a little over £2 million, and to my mind I think he is still very conservative about it. I am shocked at other members who seem to think that the cost of these various buildings is extremely excessive in its socialist set up, but the Capital is the Headquarters for a young nation that is not being developed; and although I do not pay overdue regard for capital structures but to the people who inhabit them, nevertheless you must have a fit setting for this new nation that is now being born. When you go into these estimates, I personally think you may have to study back somewhat, but I would not be afraid to go and ask the British Government to start us off with the entire thing. The Financial Commissioner has stated that they have offered us £½ million towards it, but that was when it was supposed to cost £520,000, and I see no reason why, even if he could not do it, we should not ask for the same percentage on the £2 million that he has estimated. It would come so near to the £2 million that it would be becoming of the British Government to stand the entire expense. I also agree that wherever the Capital is established, the Government of that Unit should give to the Federal Government the land on which it is being sited. As a matter of fact, I expressed that opinion before I saw these Reports. It would not be beyond us if we had to fork up \$1,000,000 towards that foundation. Whoever might be fortunate enough to get the Capital there, I think it would be becoming, and the Commissioner has suggested it, and I agree, that the Government should give as a gift to the Federal Government a grant of the necessary land. Well, another point has been stated as to where the Capital should be and where it should not be, and why one person's claims is greater than another. I will leave that to the delegation; do not be afraid of anything thrown at you by other countries or other neighbouring West Indies colonies about racial discrimination of Barbados as being the reason why we should not get it.

6.35 p.m.

That has been stressed too much; I think it has been to our detriment and it has been enlarged upon by other colonies. I do not wish to stress it for publicity reasons, but I wish to remind the Hon. Premier particularly that Barbados led the Leewards and

the Windwards until a few years ago. [Mr. CRAWFORD: Who is leading them now?] I will tell you in what way we did it. It was cheaper for the merchants to buy goods from Bridgetown than to buy them direct from Halifax. We used to be to the Leewards and Windwards what London is to Barbados; we were the clearing House, and they did all their trade with Barbados. However, with the advent of the War and the bringing forward of controls, with the difficulties which we had with transshipment cargoes, we have lost what we enjoyed. It was not only the business communities, but the political leaders of other colonies looked to Barbados for leadership. They realised that we had an advanced Constitution and they looked up to us, but for the reasons which I have stated, we have lost a measure of that leadership. There is no reason why we should not regain some of what we have lost; but it is for the Government to take steps about it and make it easy for business to be carried on as it was carried on in the past. We can return to that; therefore, when capital is going to be made, as I understand it is going to be made, out of another feature, let that be somewhat the answer.

There is another question, the question of representation in both the Unit Legislature and the Federal Legislature. I have seen it stated somewhere, in the newspapers, that Mr. Manley had stated that unless there can be representation by Ministers in both Legislatures, let there be none at all. My sentiments on that matter would be that even if I allowed that representation in both Legislatures, it should only be for the first five years. However, on no account should a Minister in a Unit Government hold a similar office in the Council of State in the Federation. He cannot do justice to both, for the first five years will be an important part of the Federation. There is a lot to be done, there is a lot which we cannot see now, but which will develop. At the end of those five years, there will have to be some constitutional changes adapted to meet with the wishes of the Federation.

There will be cat fights and dog fights in this Federation with the Units falling apart, if we do not send people with a West Indian outlook. One thing is sure, we will never get British Guiana or British Honduras to come in at the present moment; but there is still the hope that if a success is made of the Federation, these two important territories will come in and share the cost of this Federation, and so reduce the cost to us and make Federation a reality, something which we hope to achieve.

The means of raising revenue by the Financial Commissioner is a departure from the original plans. He has seen the pitfalls in the original plan and he has removed them. If they were allowed to remain as they were under Customs, there would be some play between the Federal Government and the Unit Governments; they could deprive the Federal Government of its due share. I wonder if they did not consider allowing a percentage on the entire revenue and not on particular Units. In respect of Customs, if you left out anything the Unit Government could make a new method of taxation and deprive the Federal Government of that amount. Sir Sydney Caine gives the Federal Government a greater share of power to raise its own taxes and there are advantages in that. He also mentioned that the 50% Reserve seems to be unnecessarily high and will make for overspending by the Federal Government. I do not know why such a large amount of 50% should be left as a reserve. I think Sir Sydney Caine mentioned that 25% should be an ample amount. If you give a large reserve there is

the temptation to spend and misspend it. It is important that the Federal Government should have its own means of raising revenue apart from the Unit Governments and I cannot see any Federal Government which does not go into the realm of Income Tax. There cannot become any reality in the West Indies unless we have one standard rate of income tax throughout the area. We are a long way from that; our allowances will have to be the same and I am sure that there will be quite a squabble. However that will have to come; it will be a matter for the Federal Government to establish. It cannot be much for the first five years and they could unify their methods of taxation.

There is one point in connection with the Judiciary which no one has mentioned here, but I will touch on it. The Commissioner has changed somewhat the previous plans for the appointment of the Judiciary.

6.45 p.m.

Previously, it was felt that a Judge should have at least 15 years' practice at the Bar either in the West Indies or in the United Kingdom before he could be appointed a Judge. I think the Pre-Federal Judiciary Commissioner has changed that somewhat and appointments to the Federal Supreme Court can be made by way of the Judiciary system lower down the line. If we are to have the best and we need it, I think the British system of appointments is by far the best. They do not appoint Judges who have a little experience at the Bar; they must have a successful practice at the Bar. By that means they are able to select Judges qualified in the different branches of the Judiciary. You may have a great Criminal Lawyer who in his later days may feel like retiring from the Bar to accept a position on the Bench and such a lawyer can be so appointed to the Judiciary. With a Judiciary so established, you are assured of having the best brains and the variety which would lend for good judgments to be handed down. I think the Hon. Premier must have paid some attention to that matter. He did not mention it in his introductory remarks, and perhaps in his reply he can express to the House his feelings on the matter.

There is also another minor matter which I want to draw to the attention of the House. It is by way of asking for information with respect to the Federal Income Tax which will be levied by the Federal Parliament on its own members. I could not get the information clearly from the Report as to whether the income from that would go to the Federal revenue or whether it will just only be assessed by the Federal Parliament and then the income turned over to the unit to which the member belonged. In other words, as I understand it, when the Federal Government fixes its own rate of Income Tax, will that revenue be kept by the Federal Parliament or will it be returned to the respective places of domicile of the Representatives and the Civil Servants?

Finally, I wish the Delegation which is going off to London shortly, my best wishes. I do hope, as I have expressed at the beginning, that they will be able to achieve the things for Barbados which we all wish. We do hope that this will be the last Conference, and that there will be no need for another Conference. Let this be the final Conference before Federation comes into being.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. I would just like to ask the honourable member one thing before he sits down. As regards the last point in which he asked for a clarification as regards Federal Income Tax, I will like to say that the Government itself would like a clarification because it has not been suggested in the Report. I would like

to know what the honourable member and his Party think as regards the matter on whether it should go to the country of domicile. There may be a suggestion that it may be paid to the country in which the particular representative or Civil Servant earns his money. I would like to know myself whether it should go to the man's place of domicile which may be Australia or Jamaica. If the honourable member would express his views on the matter now I would be glad to hear them.

Mr. GODDARD: As a matter of fact, I did not discuss that question with members of my Party but my view is that the Federal Parliament should keep that revenue; but the rate of income tax which the Federal Parliament will lay should not be less than that of the country in which it is established because it would create a great heartburn between the Unit and the Federal Parliament if the Federal Parliament were to tax members of the Cabinet and its Civil Servants at a rate less than that which obtains in the Unit. I cannot see any reason why the revenue from that should be returned to the Unit.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is true that whatever we debate on these three Reports today would be more or less an anti-climax to the matter, because the substance of what has been stated by the Hon. Premier at the beginning of this debate is that this debate in itself is not of much purpose because all of the salient points have already been covered at the previous Conferences and that the Delegation which is going to London has already taken care of those things which need to be noted; any points however which honourable members would like to raise should be more or less such points as would strengthen the hands of the Delegation. The Hon. Premier himself did not indicate that there were any points of reservation in these three Pre-Federal Reports nor did he say what are the views of the Delegation as regards the contents of the Reports; he left it open to the House to say what it feels like saying on the Reports so that the plenipotentiary delegates should hear whatever are the views of the House. It is good to hear that the House has been considered in that light but at the same time any reasonable person must come to the conclusion that that Delegation must have already made up its mind along certain lines and if there are reservations we should hear what are the reservations.

I do not think at this stage that the debate should have been reduced to the standard it reached in the speech of the Hon. Premier when he said the hopes of making Barbados the Federal Capital could be a reality if the Barbados Delegation would just go easy on their smaller brethren. If our hopes must be pinned on that, to me that is nonsense. He then went on to say that it was a farcical idea of putting the Federal Capital in Grenada. Now, he begins by using offensive remarks. If we do not agree that Grenada should be the venue of the Federal Capital, let us say why we feel so.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. The hon. member has misquoted me. I clearly said that the method of selecting Grenada as the Federal Capital was farcical. When I said that it was not the premier choice, I meant as regards the method of election. The whole House knows how Grenada was selected as the Federal Capital.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier never for a moment said anything about selection. He said the farcical idea of putting the Federal Capital in Grenada. If he says now that he means the method of selection, what is the idea of not saying what you mean. This famous way which the Pre-

mier has of saying something today and in less than 24 hours afterwards saying something different or coming back and saying: "I did not mean it in that way, I meant it in this way should cease is well known. Instead of his saying that it is a farcical idea of putting the Federal Capital in Grenada he should be prepared to say what would be his reasons against putting the Capital in Grenada. No one would be annoyed with him for saying what is his opinion on a particular matter. This House should consider this question without an insult to our brethren, whether they be big or small. When such remarks as have been made by the Hon. Premier are made, they can only injure our reputation and prevent us from getting the co-operation or whatever else we expect from others.

6.55 p.m.

There is no point in asking the House to consider debating this question and then insult your brethren, whether big or small, and then you yourself use the remarks that can only injure their reputation and make you lose co-operation from them. Moreover, what has been the idea of your saying sometimes in the newspaper when you are going to a Conference that the Trinidad Government is corrupt and all this? How are you going to get co-operation from territories to join with Barbados after saying the worst things about them? Talking about corruption, do not believe that places in this island are free of it. We have what is called a Vestry system which we are now trying to change, and in it there is more corruption than you can talk about. Do not let us believe that we are like Caesar's wife. Members of the Government have talked about the corruption in Vestries. There is no point in taking out countries and saying they are corrupt and that the Capital should not be there. The Capital is to be in some island in the West Indies, and we have reached the conclusion—and the delegates agreed—that we do not have to spend too much capital in creating a Capital. My objection to Grenada or other territories is that you will have too much money to create a Capital, and as the honourable senior member for St. Philip has repeatedly said, looking at the budget we at this stage do not want to spend extraordinary sums of money just in frame work; therefore, it is better for us to choose places that are already built up. We are not like Australia or America, vast territories that you can go to Washington instead of New York, to Canberra instead of Sydney or Ottawa instead of Montreal. One of the problems in Grenada is that you would have to build an airport. We know it is a fact that it takes you a longer time to drive from Pearl Airport to St. Georges than it takes you to get from Barbados to Grenada. Because of the winding roads through mountains it is very difficult, and the colony would not be provided with a means of building. In saying that we do not agree with Grenada—I said that not because I have anything against it—I feel that Grenada at this stage cannot provide the physical necessities to begin with, so that we will have a saving of money to spend on something else. If we are going to build a home and we do not have a lot of reserve, it is no use going to the furthest place you can find where there is no water, light, etc., build the home and then spend money in acquiring these services. And I am going to say that, and I am going to be very blunt; so far as the Capital is concerned, let us face the issue that it is our delegates and all the delegates who are going to decide where the Capital is going to be. Now I want to say this. I know today these West Indians are going forward even the delegation from Barbados, our own territory, to get the best out of Federation. Unfortunately,

I know that we are not going to get it. At one time the Premier was regarded as the best among political leaders. Today it is not so; and let us be frank about it. Yes, it was said by Mr. Manley because he was not then in power, and Mr. Manley and all of them looked to him for leadership. Unfortunately since 1948 and progressively since R.E.C. was formed, that high position which the Premier held is no longer so regarded by his fellow West Indians. Many of them said quite openly that he seemed to be more willing to do what the Colonial Office would like him to than to do what the West Indians would like him to do, because at the R.E.C. Meeting, which is a regional organisation, when the suggestion came for a local man to be Chairman, it seemed that he protested against that idea and would prefer Professor Beasley to be Chairman. [VOICES: "Shame"] He did not want to have people like Gairy. That is the feeling that West Indians have, whether it is wrong or misguided, and these are the same people who today you have to sit down with. These are the same people who are going to refuse you. I go further and say this. One of the difficulties we have today is that even at conferences, you cannot say that Barbados found its true place from representation at the R.E.C. Meeting, because the difficulty was that the Barbados representation did not seek to carry out what was regarded as the growing aspirations of the West Indies. What I say now is what the Premier can get up and deny. We sat at the R.E.C. Meeting in Jamaica and Mr. Bird got up and said that in support of Mr. Gomes as a West Indian Commissioner, that he is the West Indian with greater aspirations for the West Indies than the other West Indians. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want anyone to be eluded or have any silly notion that the Capital of the West Indian Federation is going to be in Barbados; it is dependent on the conduct of the Barbados Legislators and what they say. It is not going to work on the basis as if it were in our pockets here. There is no race between the big three, that is, Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad, because Jamaica has rightly stated that it is out of the race of the Capital. Do not let us begin by weighing the advantages of a Capital City because, if we do, we in Barbados will be regarding ourselves in that the only means of going into Federation, is because we have hopes of the Capital. Well, Federation means more than that. A Federation means what it means to the area and where the Capital is more a matter of financial importance than otherwise. What I say is this:

7.05 p.m.

It is what our Delegation can do at the Conference. It is not what somebody says behind you; you can bring a man from Australia or India, but if he is a nincompoop, nobody will send him to be the leader of anything. If he is a fool from a big territory, he will be regarded as a bigger fool; it is the personality of the man at the Conference which will count. If he is possessed of personality, he will always shine and those who do not have personality, with all the lights we put on them, they will not shine. I am not prepared to say anything evil of any of the territories; I will not say that it is farcical to put the Federal Capital in Grenada, or that it is ludicrous to put it in St. Kitts or imaginary to talk about Tortola. I am not prepared to make any statement of those territories in anyway; I am prepared to say that with respect to the Leewards and Windwards, they do not possess the physical requirements for Federal Capital. We do not have large fin-

ancial resources, and it does not matter where you put the Federal Capital; but you must decide on a site with the natural facilities. That should be the only basis of your argument.

I do not have to repeat what I have already said about Barbados in another light. I have said that for parochial or other reasons, it means more to the economy of Barbados if the Federal Capital is put here; but we have advantages and certain disadvantages. As regards those who believe that they have something to sell to this community, if you tell them that you are giving them the Federal Capital on the basis of more money or of raising the standard of living, well, you are telling that to fools. You can see how much the economy of a country will be improved by the erection of stone buildings. You are providing services for the area and you can see what that will mean. You do not bring industries by having the Capital. In Chicago you have the steel works and is not Detroit more valuable than Chicago? You do not go trying for a Capital on the basis that you have something to buy or sell; the Federal Capital is to be placed in some territory in the West Indies, and therefore you have to choose that territory. If you advance the argument that you are looking for the Federal Capital on the basis of what it will mean to you economically, you will look for the poorest territory, which means something to the future. You could go to Antigua and say that it is the most central of the territories; if you come from the North, you can go to Antigua, and you come from the South, you can go to Antigua. They produce sugar, cotton, etc., and it is a place which is infinitely poorer than Barbados; but you do not look at the Federal Capital from the economic value of the territory. If you go on that basis you will rule out Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad at one time because they are better off than other places.

I do not think that we can stress too much the question of the Reserve Powers of the Governor General. I remember in 1945 those persons who met here in Barbados in the C.L.C. and discussed this question of Federation. They discussed it when there was no question of Adult Suffrage or Ministerial Government, but at that Conference it was stated quite clearly that our position was that we were aiming at a Federation which borders very much on Dominion Status. Many changes have taken place since then and in all the territories there is Adult Suffrage; and as the honourable senior member for St. Philip has rightly said, the position of the Legislature has been so radically changed, that today the people who are going to the London Conference are altogether different from that of the composition which existed in 1945, or even in 1947 at Montego Bay. You can quite clearly see that the unit aspiration of the people has so much changed, that it reflects a different personnel altogether from the majority of those who went to the Montego Bay Conference. It all shows that we want to be in keeping with the growing aspiration of the younger generation. Do not believe that the younger generation in these communities is going to accept all that we have accepted in the past; you cannot resist that because with the greater spread of education and the greater demands for the things which the younger generation feels are its rights, there will not be this plain acceptance of what our forefathers believed that *ipso facto* you are divine, and nothing can be said about you. [Laughter].

7.15 p.m.

So if you realise that there is a growing aspiration of the nation behind you, do not begin to fool yourself that because of that you are in the same position as you were in 1896. You can see that every time you give the population opportunity to express its will, it advances. Today you are living in a nuclear age. This is not an age of living in the back; this is not an age of your asking a man for a lift and giving you a lift by putting you in the back of his buggy; you do not put anybody in the back seat in these days. It is not a question that once the person gets a lift, he does not matter that he is put in the back. Of course, there are still some people of today who are not aware of the growing aspirations of the people in their various territories and those people are going to have a rude awakening.

With regard to the question of freedom of movement, that has been spoken of already. I want to say that not only was the question of freedom of movement a request of Barbados but it was a request which none of the smaller territories was willing to accept. Let me say that I well remember that both the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture went to a Conference in the Leeward Islands at which Sir Clement Malone presided and the Hon. Premier knows that one of the biggest grievances of theirs was the question of making them a single unit. They strongly stressed that they were not going to enter into a Federation unless they entered as independent units. The Colonial Office wanted to sell the idea that they were too small to enter as single units and they were some Barbadians, not the Hon. Premier, who were willing to go along with that idea. I may say that those people were not in favour of Federation at first; they are now in favour of Federation, and as a matter of fact, they are regarded now as the champions of Federation. Those people were opposed to the Leeward and Windward Islands coming in as independent units of the Federation because those islands did not have money. They said that those islands were too poor. That argument has caused those smaller territories to regard Barbados as not their friend because they feel that in all of these things which were going on at the time, Barbados apparently was prepared not to support them in their coming in as independent units. It was expressed by some members of the Barbados Delegation that if the Windward and Leeward Islands came in as separate units—four in the Windwards and three in the Leewards to make seven,—that that will be seven votes as against one of Barbados and that that would put Barbados at a disadvantage.

Now, these same territories that possess seven votes are going to the decisive factor in determining where the Federal Capital will be. They are the important votes in the determination of the Federal Capital and you cannot ignore them. Big Trinidad, big Barbados and big Jamaica only have three votes between them, so you can see that there are only three against seven. Because that is so, the bigger territories must of necessity court the territories of these small boys for the site of the Federal Capital. This is one occasion which the small boys have some say in the whole structure of Federation. I saw that for a long time. I will venture to say that it depends on the combination between the two leaders of the Delegations of Trinidad and Jamaica. If the leader of the Barbados Delegation cannot get with the Leaders of the Trinidad and Jamaica Delegations and work out a *modus operandi* we must lose out as being the site of the Federal Capital. It depends on what can be worked out between these three people. It is clear. Anyone who goes around the West In-

edics can see what can be regarded as an alliance between the Chief Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Norman Manley, and the Chief Minister of Trinidad, Mr. Albert Gomes. It is not an unholy alliance. I do not know whether that alliance is due to their feeling that they have to provide the leadership and since they have to provide it, they are putting their heads together to see how best they can provide it with the structure.

With regards to the question of dual Ministries, which means that a representative can be a Minister of the Federal Parliament and also of the Island's Legislature he represents, I am saying that if the Barbados Delegation is going to London with that view, I am asking them to throw it through the window. What I think is in the mind of the Jamaica Delegation and is the reason why they feel a representative can be a Minister in the Federal Government and also a Minister in the Local Legislature is that they regard the Local Legislature as a sort of Vestry or Local Government; therefore there is no overlapping of the two institutions. But there is an overlapping; therefore a representative should not sit in the two Legislatures at the same time as a Minister in both. I do not agree with dual Ministries because it is not going to be practicable. It is nonsense to say that a man can be Premier of Barbados and Prime Minister of the Federal Legislature. It is an impracticable situation. It cannot work for the better, no matter how many people may suggest it. If Mr. Gomes and Mr. Manley have decided on that, the Barbados Delegation should say at the Conference that they do not think any member of this House is likely to support that idea. However, I understand that Mr. Manley has said that there was a misrepresentation of what he had put forward.

So far as the financial side of the Federation is concerned, I do not have the same stringent remarks to make as the honourable senior member for St. Philip, but I am going to say that I was a little bit astonished at what the Hon. Premier said when he opened: that he hoped that Income Tax would not become one of the methods of financing the Federal Legislature in his lifetime. That is becoming a pet phrase of his nowadays and what it means I do not know. It seems to me as if he has got some idea of how long he has to live. That is the only way you make sweeping statements as that. The substance of what he said astounded me because I really do not understand how in 1956 any Leader of any type of Government, Conservative, Socialist, Liberal or anything like that, can make a statement that the taxation basis of Federation must only be raised on the proposal of Customs Revenue.

7.25 p.m.

Now, he says that this Report of Sir Sydney Caine is an excellent document. Well, I do not like to speak in these superlative terms until I have given all consideration to everything. But there is a part of this Report by Sir Sydney Caine which shows that even the point raised on finance, though an excellent one, is not supported by what the Premier said, and it is a point on which I agree. I will look for the page in order to inform the House about the point I want to make; it is on page 32, paragraph 92, it reads as follows:—

"To raise the balance of revenue needed two bases of taxation suggest themselves as reasonably simple and equitable, a Federal income tax imposed as an addition to Unit income taxes or Federal consumption taxes on a restricted list of well-established

revenue earners, similarly additional to the customs or excise taxes levied by the several Units."

On page 33, paragraph 94, it reads as follows:—

"I have also to keep in mind that the London Conference, while agreeing to put income tax in principle on the Concurrent Legislative List, agreed that the Federal Government should not impose an income tax in the first five years. If it were not for that conclusion I should recommend that a Federal income tax should be applied as soon as the technical difficulties can be surmounted."

Well, that is Sir Sydney Caine; he is making it clear to you. And further in the Report, what he did state as a historical fact is the reason why in an older Federation like the United States of America, Canada and Australia, you did not have in the beginning a Federal Income tax, because at that stage when the Federation was born, income tax as a system of taxation had not evolved as a revenue-bearing source in itself. But that is astounding when in your own national taxation policy you advocate a policy of direct taxation as a means of supporting your revenue and your overall structure, and the mechanism of dealing with income tax can be dealt with in the same manner as customs tax. He suggested that the Federal Government should have the right to raise this, and the amount raised by them or by the Federation should be deducted in your local revenue, because it does not in the beginning carry a super tax on the customs revenue that your customs duty does. We are going to take into regard the idea of having too much money taken out at the very beginning, but so far as the principle on the type of taxation you are going to use is concerned, you should not say that you hope in your lifetime you do not have double income tax. Maybe you are saying that the amount you now give for customs will always remain adequate and you will never need to have anymore, so therefore, it is not necessary to go to Income tax, and as a method of policy you hope that income tax would never be used, because they are the two main units of revenue in the island. I am sorry to say that at this stage, if that is the Hon. Premier's mental approach, it will only be symbolic of his approach on financial matters that in these big things you can run them on the cheap.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of correction, Mr. Speaker. I said and I say again and every human being will say that if you make income tax concurrent the island's Government has to get this income tax. We all will hope that the Federal income tax will not be put on in our lifetime. If you have to pay two kinds of income tax, it will be a great strain; and our history teaches us that sooner or later your Federal Government is going to put on income tax.

Mr. WALCOTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems very good to income tax payers. We all pay income tax, but you do not pay income tax on the basis of making somebody fat; you pay on the basis that your income has reached a certain level. I will say that any man in the world who pays income tax must have an income first. Do you not think that the people getting 10/- a week would like to pay income tax? The Premier very well realises that the method of taxation within the Federal structure would not be at the same high rates, because the Federal Government would not need an income tax rate equivalent. Who would not like to pay two income taxes if you had to pay at the same rate? There would be nothing wrong tomorrow if from your income tax in Barbados, whatever it is — a shilling in the pound—you had to pay a smaller proportion towards

your Federal tax. You are not taking all of the revenue, but if we had to pay two sets of customs duty on the same item, it would mean that the Federation would cost too much to run. But he is suggesting that at the beginning he is taking some of the present revenue. He is not asking you to impose fresh taxes on the revenue; if the Customs duty is 10%, he is not going to ask you therefore to increase the tax by 25% and make it 12%. All he is doing is taking 25% of your 10% to run Federation. In process of time you will find that there are other items of things you can tax: fuel, tobacco, rum; things of that nature are always open to taxation. I do not subscribe to the belief that you cannot tax rum or tobacco, because you are taxing people's food; and that when you touch the people's food you touch the Almighty himself, and therefore, you bring down the Heavens. I subscribe to the idea of taxing these commodities; and if the Premier and the delegation are afraid to say so, you cannot have a cheap Federation. I remember buying a cheap horse to do work for the B.W.U., and before we got the cart for the horse it died; that is to show you that cheap things are not good; but that was only a digression. As soon as you are going to run a cheap Federation like a peddling shop, it cannot work—Just as I pointed out when the Ministerial system was started: two men working a four man Ministry; they came back and said it would not work.

7.35 p.m.

I may tell you this one thing: the Barbados Delegation has always been regarded as one which tries to cheapen everything in the West Indies. When others improve their rates, the Barbados Delegation wants to cut them down; and if the two Delegates from this House go to London with the hope that they can get them to cut down the expenses on the Capital business, then you will know what the result will be. I feel that if you are entering this Federation at this time, do not begin to believe that it will not cost you some money. I do not subscribe to the view that this Federal structure will prove in the long run what it means to the Government as an area; it is a question of what it is going to mean to us from the point of view of nationhood. To me this will mean so much to other West Indian colonies that the amount of money which we are spending now is money which will be well spent. Let the financial experts examine these things. I cannot go into details as to how the cost will be lowered because there are annual Estimates. Each time I go out of this island, I feel that I should be a member of somewhere. I think of India, Burma and Pakistan. If this Federation means that we can give our children and our children's children some hope that we are building a nation for them, well, let us do it. But I say, do not let us flounder on the rock of Colonialism. As Shakespeare has said: "There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune." They should not allow any aspect of Colonialism to prevent them from achieving that goal which we hope to achieve.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to some irrelevancies during this debate this afternoon. We are going to London to instruct the British Government on the type of Constitution which Parliament must write for the Federal Government of the West Indies. We are not now going to London to decide the things which we have already decided; we are going to tell the British people the Constitution which we will expect for a Federal Government. There are things which we should not expect. As regards the Reserved Powers of the Governor General, I should like to say that from the first debate on Federation in the Chamber, I have always heard the Hon. Premier object to these Reserve Powers of the Governor-General. That is less of a responsible Government than

that which we ourselves have. Today in his speech, I am not afraid to say it, the Hon. Premier made an admirable review of all we have discussed in this Chamber on Federation, and to oppose the type of speech which he made would be a hard thing to do rationally.

As I have said, no West Indian conference should agree to any Reserve Powers of any Governor General; you cannot give any one man, however wise he might be, or however virtuous he might be, such important power over a new nation and Empire. That is against all the principles of true Democratic Government. We cannot begin like that we may as well remain as we are.

Running all through the Report, especially the Caine Report, is this idea, and it is inescapable, that somehow the Federation must not be in any sense a financial burden to the British Government. The same thing ran through the S.C.A.C. Report; it is supposed to be a very wrong idea or unacceptable or impossible idea to expect any financial aid from the United Kingdom, and still expect the political independence for which we are asking. But we have a classic instance of a free Colony which gets far more aid from a larger nation than the West Indies ever got or hopes to get from the British Government, and that Colony is Puerto Rico. It is a free Commonwealth, and an independent one. It is as independent as any British Dominion, and yet the stability of Puerto Rico from every angle would be impossible without United States grants. The United States never dreamed that she should limit the independence of Puerto Rico because it enjoys certain financial privileges from the Washington Government.

A lot has been made of some remarks casually passed by the Premier to the effect that Grenada was a farcical place for the Federal Capital, or rather the selection of Grenada for the Federal Capital was farcical. Well, if Mr. Gairy is so narrow to hold Barbados up for such a remark, then he is not fit for the proposed Federal structure. If he is not beyond that, he is not fit for the proposed Federal structure.

As to the name of the Federation, I would advise the Delegation not to pay any attention to the question of the changing of this name "British Caribbean Federation." After all, there is no French Nigeria or French Gold Coast; when we speak of the Caribbean, there are several territories in the Caribbean, and how are you going to designate this Federation unless it is named "The British Caribbean Federation?"

7.45 p.m.

Sir, in this modern world and tomorrow's structure of nations; there is a tendency for Federal Agreement as year succeeds year. We know of the European Defence Corporation. That was a supposed Federation of Western Europe but it was destroyed by the French Government because the United Kingdom refused to be an active member for a very powerful supporter. What is United Nations but an attempt at World Federation? There is not such a thing today as absolute independence. If you are going to London next month with the idea that you are going to achieve absolute independence for the West Indies, that is a pure mirage of thinking. The very idea of your objecting to the term "British Caribbean Federation" is nonsense. To say "Caribbean Federation" is totally inaccurate. We are not going to receive Dominion Status; we are going to receive a Federal Structure. A Federal Structure is something on the way to Dominion Status, but we are not going to London for Dominion Status as yet; therefore any objection to the term "British" is unrealistic. If I may mention an instance, when I say that we need not look upon our Federation as absolute independence, let us take Cuba. The real in-

dependence of Cuba is seriously conditioned by the United States Sugar quota. No political realist can deny it; therefore we have nothing to be ashamed of by the term "British Caribbean Federation."

When it comes to taxation for Federal Finance, let me say that Sir Sydney Caine is worthy of suggesting that some of the revenue can be derived from income tax, although the S.C.A.C. Report only proposes Federal finance from Customs tax. Again, a lot has been said and regretted that our Federation will not be independent if it has to get grants-in-aid. When you really study how much will be collected from income tax to finance the Federation, you can only come to the conclusion that the amount will be small because there will be only a small proportion of the people in the Federation who will have to pay it. In any of the territories, the number of people who will have to pay income tax will be very small. The amount will be so small, particularly on the coming into operation of Federation that the Federal Government will easily be able to do without it at least for the first five years and I believe in many years to come. I think it was a wise suggestion by Sir Sydney Caine that the Federation should be financed in time to come by customs tax plus income tax and I think it should be adhered to.

When it comes to the siting of the Federal Capital, the Fiscal Report tells us that it should be sited in the territory in which it would cost less to operate. The Report says that it should be put in such a place where the cost of its establishment would be the least. Whether that would be in Trinidad or Barbados, I think that is a matter for the Delegates at the coming Conference to decide.

We have also heard it being suggested that there is not the necessity for a Federal Governor-General and a Governor of Barbados, but that there should be a Lieutenant Governor in the units. The question of whether we want a Lieut-Governor for the units is not a matter for the Federal Government to decide. We must bear in mind that Units of the Federation still retain certain substantial powers. This House will still be the all-important body for the Government of this colony. If we were to think that a Governor is no longer necessary, this House will have to say so. It would be an infringement on the part of the Federal Government to suggest any such thing to any of the Federal Units. Lots of people sit back and think that a Governor of a Colony has nothing to do. Any Governor administering a Colony must have work to do and I may say that he has much work to do.

Sir, another point was raised as regards the salary of the Governor-General. Before I elaborate on this point, I want to say really and truly, that I have touched on these things because I do not want it to go abroad that Barbados is entering something which is going to cost the people a lot more in taxation. Nowhere in the Reports have I read such a thing. It has not been suggested by any of the Pre-Federal Commissioners that taxation on the individual of the Federation would be in any way substantially higher. It is unfair to say so. There are certain taxes called consumption taxes and the proposal for the collection of federal taxation is actually less than the present levy of some colonies. I think that the proposed levy is much less than it is in Barbados today.

7.55 p.m.

Now, sir, as I was saying the Governor General's salary was said to be \$50,000. His salary is \$28,000 and two other sums are put down for duty allowance or entertainment fund which is absolutely necessary. Any West Indian would know that the Governor

General must have an entertainment fund for visitors from all over the Globe, plus a service fund, a fund to pay his actual servants. All these have been lumped together and called the Governor General's salary. It was mentioned that \$50,000 was the salary of the New York Governor, but the speaker did not say how much was entertainment fund or what we call duty allowance. These are inaccuracies which are apt to prejudice the policy of costing that is not actual; and we, in a mission like this should be less parochial than some people have been today.

Sir, I think I have made the points which I wanted to make and I for one would look upon the coming Federation as a means of growth and development for every West Indian. The Hon. Premier said in his speech that all Barbados will get is nationhood. In this respect, all is everything for me because without nationhood there are certain things you cannot attempt; without the sense of nationhood a people remains too backward too long. The psychological effect of nationhood is all and, and if all we get is nationhood we are getting everything.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If, Mr. Speaker, other members have made a blunder, the Hon. Premier has made the worst one. This is not an occasion to criticise Government, the Premier or any individual; that is my view of it, and you know well enough, sir, when I have to criticise, I criticise. It is an occasion for expressing one's views on this matter. Those of us who have agreed — and it is unanimous in this Chamber — that we should be in the Federation, felt at the beginning that with a careful study of our Constitution that Barbados had little or nothing to gain in the immediate future. But we felt, just as the last speaker has said, that it would not only be a matter of nationhood; but we had studied our problems here and we realised that when the Hon. Premier on the last occasion attended a Conference, he made it clear that we would never agree to any sort of Federation unless there was absolute Freedom of Movement. I have no compromise for that even if Barbados had to come out. Speaking for myself, any Barbadian interested in Barbados and not merely in Colonial policy, should have no compromise for any Federation which did not have Freedom of Movement. That is why I began by saying, although we have nothing to gain, although financially we are going to have a lot to lose, I envisage this: that, with the hope of British Guiana and British Honduras coming in, in the distant future of ten or fifteen years from now, our children, with freedom of movement and a country with the vast opportunity and potentiality as British Guiana or British Honduras, will have a tremendous lot to gain, provided that members of this Chamber express quite clearly to the Premier that there should be no compromise under any circumstances for Barbados in the freedom of movement. Any man who has read these Reports and studied them is bound to come to the conclusion that if he did this, he would be a traitor to this Colony and the people of the colony and the future of Barbados. It is at this stage, sir, that members would like an adjournment for dinner, and I am going to keep up with the custom. I therefore move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

ADJOURNMENT

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

FEDERATION—Cont'd

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As regards these Reports I would say that very few of us had the opportunity of scanning them, but I believe that we have taken the opportunity of going through the most important parts of them. I wholeheartedly agree with the view which has been expressed, that we have so little to gain from this Federation. If we think of places like British Guiana and British Honduras coming into the Federation in the not very distant future, then Barbados will have something to gain in the future from this Federation. We must have the unanimous view in this Chamber, that under no circumstances can we federate unless there is absolute freedom of movement for the people of this colony. Eventually we will gain very much as we seem to be the only Unit in the West Indies to be producing what the others do not seem able to produce as rapidly for the benefit of the nation as a whole. I do not think that the psychological effect means everything to us, although it must mean something to us.

The first question which is engaging the mind of everybody in this Island is the question of the Federal Capital. I do not agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the idea of having the Federal Capital here would not mean any economic advancement for the people of this colony. The hon. member has looked at the matter from the point of view of erecting buildings, which is something for the immediate future. However, those of us who think of our tourist development, must appreciate the fact that if you develop nature and the Federal Capital is placed in Barbados, at least that would be a means of encouraging our tourist industry; provided always that we are looked at as a nation, and we would not be subjected to the economic strangulation which we have now; provided also that Seawell would be a free Airport and we would not be subjected to airlines being allowed to go to Trinidad and Jamaica and Antigua, but as far as Barbados is concerned, they are not allowed to come here. If nationhood is going to mean that airlines can go to these other colonies, but "we will tell you what to do in Barbados," then I say "No."

I do hope that the Hon. Premier will note that very carefully, because he is famous for saying that he will note what the Opposition says, and he will agree or disagree with it. If we have the Federal Capital here, you cannot say that we must be subjected to a fifth-rate Unit and the other Units should have an International Airport; while we must be a pawn for BWIA or BOAC. I therefore disagree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter when he suggests that it would not mean any economic advancement for us to have the Capital here.

As I have said, this is not an occasion merely for criticising what the Hon. Premier has said on other occasions or what has happened at any Conference; this is rather an occasion, not just for criticising what another has said, but to take these Reports and say what we do not agree with in them.

Question number one is that while you will have powers plenipotentiary, we have every confidence that the delegates will fight and do their utmost to get the Federal Capital for Barbados. I do not know if that will be the view of all honourable members, but I feel that it is the duty of the delegates to try and get the Capital here in Barbados. We know that there are forces at work in the other islands to get the Federal Capital; we have seen it in the leading newspapers in the West Indies that

other islands want to get the Federal Capital. It seems that Jamaica is not over interested in getting the Federal Capital there; but it is abundantly clear that Trinidad is making a serious bid for it. One can very well visualise why that is being done, and we can also visualise that offering any adverse criticism of the delegates today might weigh heavily against Barbados. All we can say is that we hope that this will be an occasion when the Hon. Premier will be diplomatic enough to deal with the delegates of the other islands and try and let us get the Capital to be placed here. I am convinced that the establishment of the Federal Capital here will mean a tremendous lot to the people of this colony.

There is no point in rehearsing all that has happened from Montego Bay and up to this moment. We want you to know how the Opposition feels about this matter. I have no doubt that the other nation friendly to the United Kingdom, that is, the United States of America, would infinitely prefer to see, in the absence of any new-fangled political ideology, the establishment of the Federal Capital in Barbados rather than in any other colony.

The next item will be the capital expenditure. In this Fiscal Report, I must agree with the honourable junior member for St. John when he said that in reading through this Report the entire inference seems to be that you cannot expect to have all these rights and privileges and constitutional advancement, and still expect to ask Great Britain for the money or any substantial part of it, for the development of this area. When I read that Mr. Bustamante had spoken about £1,000,000 for the development of this Federal Plan, I really smiled and said that that sounded like Mr. Bustamante; but on careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that the Delegates from Barbados should take the stand that the United Kingdom should supply the entire amount for starting Capital Works, etc., of the Federal Capital. I say that, without trying to repeat what honourable members have said about our position with the British Government in the 17th, 18th, 19th centuries and even the 20th century. Having regard to the economic position which we occupy, as Mr. Churchill has said, I feel that that is nothing more than the British Government should do. I have always said that the people who thought they would fall for us, were thinking to the contrary; it is not a matter of the West Indies wanting Federation, it is a question of the British Government wanting us to have Federation, and saying that we should have Federation.

As a matter of fact, when I made remarks to that effect in this House on a previous occasion, I was challenged—I think it was by the Hon. Premier—and it was said that that was not true. Sir, you cannot kill me for my own belief; you cannot tell me what I must believe. I say again that it is the wish and the desire of the British Government that the British West Indies should be federated. It suits the British Government that we do so. If you read the Fiscal Commissioner's Report you will see why the British Government wants us to be federated. If the leaders of the British West Indies had been arguing for centuries for federation of the West Indies and the British Government did not want it to take place, there would be no federation. You are bound to come to the conclusion when you read the Fiscal Commissioner's Report and see what are the capital costs and all the other things for bringing into being Federation of the West Indies that it is the desire of the British Government that it be so. In other words, let me say that this is one time in our lifetime that we can say that Federation is thrust on us.

If you take the capital expenditure for Federation, as outlined in the Fiscal Commissioner's Report, you will see that the expenditure is something around \$10,008,000. We of the Opposition, and I think even members of the Government Party, will have to see to it that our delegates leave no stone unturned and that they fight every inch of the ground in order to see that this entire expenditure should be met by the British Government. If there is success in that, I will have no more to say on the matter, but if the West Indian delegates' attitude to that is "No" then one of the things which I would like to say is that when I made my debut in politics, I made it on the side of the Conservatives and here I am still on that side. Yet, I have watched the growth of Socialism in the West Indies. I have taken the opportunity to read some of the famous Socialists and I am at a loss to understand why this capital requirement for Federation should be what it is.

In dealing with this matter, I am going to refer to the leaders of the West Indies from Jamaica to Barbados. I was told at one time that Mr. Norman Manley was branded as a Communist but time has proved that he is just an advanced Socialist. Mr. Bird and Mr. Bradshaw who are the leaders of the Leeward Islands have reached that position through their professing to be Socialists. On account of their doctrine, they have been able to preach to all the masses of the bad conditions existing in their respective islands telling them how they are treated, and how they should live; and because of that, they were skyrocketed and elevated to that most coveted and exalted position of being leaders of the Leeward Islands. Let us look at our own country, Barbados. The Hon. Premier was said to be a Communist, but time has proved that he is not far removed from a Conservative.

Now, I want to ask this simple question. How can these Socialist leaders reconcile themselves to the things which I see in the Report of the Pre-Federal Fiscal Commissioner? Of course, we are not yet bound by them; we are only invited to discuss them. I cannot imagine Mr. Manley of Jamaica Mr. Gairy of Grenada, the Hon. Premier or any of the Socialist Leaders of the West Indies agreeing with them. I am not dealing with Trinidad because Trinidad has not got any set up of a Socialist Government. I cannot imagine any honest Socialist will go to London and say that because they agree to the federation of the three million people in the West Indies that they must provide a house for the Governor-General at the cost of \$720,000, which is nearly three-quarter million dollars. Let me say that every one of the leaders of the various delegations who are going to this Conference has people living in slums and huts and in the most deplorable conditions in which any nation can be living. I am not a Communist; I am not even a Socialist; I am supposed to be a Conservative; but I cannot agree that the residence of the Governor-General should be one to cost nearly three-quarter million dollars, taking into consideration the economy of the Federation. I do not want to relegate the Governor-General of the Federation to an 18 ft. x 10 ft. house and a backyard toilet; but I have seen enough of the West Indies to say that all the leaders from Mr. Manley back to the Hon. Premier of Barbados, would be the most dishonest set of people as Socialists to say that one man can live in a house costing \$720,000 because he has to govern three million people although they know that those people are living in the most deplorable conditions. If you go to Antigua, you will see the conditions in which

they live. It will be all well and good if Delegates say that if the British want such a residence for one of their people to live in, so long as they are going to furnish the money, of course they can build one for as much as \$1 million. I would prefer to see a residence being built for the Governor-General costing around £10,000; it is my opinion that no Governor-General should have any residence at a cost of anything more than that. You can see from the figure I have quoted that I do not want to relegate him to an 18 ft. x 10 ft. house.

9.15 p.m.

Obviously the man who is going to be made Prime Minister is going to be a Socialist. It is time for the people to know that all their leaders—from Mr. Manley back down—are Socialists. The first thing we agreed to is a house for the Prime Minister, but what kind of a house are you going to build for £25,000? I do not say that the Prime Minister should not have a house befitting the dignity of his office, but not for \$120,000. Can the Premier of Barbados with his plenipotentiary powers go to Government House and say that? How can we afford to build a house for so much money when out of three million people, less than 10,000 can feed themselves properly, and the rest are starving and hungry. I am not one of those people who believe in making a fuss and talking nonsense. Any of the stupid Socialists can come and say they want a house for \$120,000. Therefore, Sir, I feel that this whole thing of capital requirements, now that the belief is that the Leaders have been taken from among the people as this Report recommends, is to remove them from the people and draw that line between them; but he must be a socialist and have such conditions to live under. What it will come to, the Premier assures us, is that before he leaves Barbados he is going to pass anti-segregation laws or discrimination laws, whatever they might be, but as soon as you go and agree to this, you are upholding discrimination. They ought to go up there and talk about this even if the British Government is going to stand the expense, but I warn the Premier this is a matter which is to be gone into most carefully by the British Government. Now, I was not in here when the hon. senior member for St. Philip was making his speech, but I understand he had quoted figures dealing with the salary for the Governor General. I suppose all of us must live with some hope that our children will see a West Indian selected as a Governor General sometime in the future — the long unforeseeable future. Some of us will live with that hope; but even if that is so, do you realise, Mr. Speaker, that if you take the same report giving headquarters expenses, salaries, etc. that you are going to be paying from your Federal taxes, and I take it from income tax, \$50,000 for the Governor General? You know that is wrong! I really cannot understand it although Sir Sydney Caine said in here that he has actually reduced what was recommended in a former Report £18,000 to £10,000. Do you realise that \$28,000 for salary \$12,000 for duty allowance and other amounts to the sum of \$9,000, is too much? Do you realise, to be quite honest, that you are paying to the Governor General of the West Indies who will have a house possibly in Trinidad or Barbados, to govern three million people the same salary that New York is paying to their Governor with 15 million people? [A VOICE: We heard that already.] I am very glad to hear that he heard that already. To look in the records I find that in Alabama with three million people, the people decided to pay their Governor \$12,000 or \$14,000 a year. I know we have our own ideas in the West Indies as to the value of money

but when you really think of it, Sir, you cannot assume you are bringing about nationhood similar to that of the United States, a country which you hope, after you have developed, will assist anyone having the moneys to enter for the purpose of industrial development. When you really think that the political scientists of this country will realise that you are paying \$28,000 for salary, \$12,000 for duty allowance and actually paying the cost or service—all free of income tax—to a Governor of three million people, and they are paying \$14,000 to govern the same three million people in a state or country like Florida, where you have tremendous tourist resources, what help can we look forward to? I think, Sir, that the Premier should stress the point and persuade his colleagues of the West Indies, and I have every reason to believe that he will, to let us get the Capital in Barbados, and further I feel, sir, that they should persuade the British Government that the expense for the Capital requirements and further expenditure for the first five years should be borne 100% by the British Government. That is my feeling and that is the feeling of a number of members of the Opposition Party. That is how I feel it should be done. It is now time that they should represent us. I say this finally, we are fully conscious that Federation, while it has been agitated for nearly a century by West Indian Leaders, is nothing they are getting for themselves but something that the British Government is thrusting upon them, it is their duty to repay some of the money which, as Sir Winston Churchill has said, went to building the British nation; for indeed I can see, although no recommendation is made here about income tax, there will be a Federal income tax, and that will mean more taxation for Barbados. We have nothing to gain from the constitutional point of view; and therefore I think, as they are thrusting it upon us, that they themselves should in due course, for the first five years at least, carry the expenses: and the immediate capital expense should be borne by the British Government.

Now Sir, quite recently we have been reading of Mr. Manley's idea of people serving both as members of the Unit Legislatures and in the Cabinets of the Unit and Federal Governments. I suppose there could not be any objection to our expressing our views on that subject. As you know we have made ourselves quite clear ever since we discussed the S.C.A.C. Report, as to whether a man should serve in the Unit Legislature and in the Federal Legislature. We have always agreed that a man should serve in both; but as to whether a man should serve as a member of the Unit Government and also as a member of the Federal Government, we have always said that that should not be the case. If you look up the records, you will find that I said it would really be an admission that, after agitation for twelve years, you had in the entire West Indies presently no one ripe enough to take over the local Government or to send to your Federal Government. I do not remember what the Hon. Premier said when he was interviewed by the Press: but I think that at least for the first five years persons should be allowed to serve in the Unit Parliament as well as the Federal Parliament; but under no consideration should persons be allowed to be members of the Unit Government and also be members of the Federal Government.

There is a feeling that lawyers know everything and that the lawyers are the most suitable people for running the government. I do not subscribe to that idea at all; the lawyers are the most suitable persons for drafting constitutional governments and so on. I say this: under no circumstances should members be

both members of the Unit Government and of the Federal Government, because that is plain selfishness. To insist on that being the case strikes me that there is that feeling of political bigotry among some of the leaders of the West Indies; and that when they are removed from being mainly a part of the people, the progress of the West Indies will cease. Let me say this: when I am removed from people I will yet press for putting forward the progress of the West Indies. Mr. Manley has suggested that because they are lawyers they should be allowed to serve both in the Unit Government and in the Federal Government; they will find that there are youngsters who will come on and forge things faster than they could ever anticipate they could be forged.

I say that no useful purpose can be served in offering any adverse criticism. I think that we should refrain from offering any adverse criticism of Trinidad. We are reckoned as being among the 'Big Three', — Barbados, Trinidad and Jamaica — and we might find ourselves in the position that Jamaica and Trinidad become steeped in this matter because of their wealth and therefore without causing any undue offence we should be able to use sufficient diplomatic skill in dealing with this matter. Therefore I ask the Hon. Premier to use his influence to see whether we cannot bring home the benefit to Barbados in getting the Federal Capital placed here. Mr. Gairy, it has been said, has taken umbrage at some remark which has been made in Barbados; well, I would not be surprised if he did take umbrage, because Grenada has had very much in common with Trinidad. However, we have to depend on the skilful handling of the Hon. Premier, the ability of the British Government of lobbying, and the American persuasion to see that we get the Federal Capital here. I view the position quite differently from the hon. member who feels that the establishment of the Federal Capital here would only mean the putting up of some buildings and what not. It might be argued that for federal purposes, the very place in which the Federal Capital is set up, does not show any kind of prosperity, but we are federating the peoples of the West Indies, not the islands. There will always be that stretch of water between Jamaica and St. Kitts, between St. Kitts and Antigua and so on; that makes it unique. If you can get your Federal Capital here, with what we have to offer, our sunshine, our seabathing, our health and our opportunity for the development of hotels, it will mean a lot to us.

Before I sit down, I wish to say that it took a lot to persuade me to support Federation. I fully realise that in the absence of Federation you will find West Indian leaders who will bow to the Colonial Office and keep Barbados strangled economically. If Federation will develop these territories to the extent that we can speak with one voice about our economic development, then I say that Federation will be for me. In that case, if, as I understand Federation is around the corner, I am wondering, if they will still insist that our Airport must be for British Airlines, and we must subsidize the British Airlines and we must be relegated to a fifth rate colony. When the Hon. Premier brings in Anti-discrimination laws in the island you must not discriminate against anybody where the Airport is concerned.

9.35 p.m.

When you are putting our case, please remember that we are still separate units and it is your duty to get the most you can for Barbados. Everyone of the representatives of the other Islands is going there to try to get the best for themselves. I can quite envisage that for the first ten or even 20 years of the Federation that you will still have that

insular feeling, and the representatives of a particular colony in the Federal Parliament will still be thinking in terms of the particular colony to which he belongs and not of the West Indies as a whole, that they will not realise that they are ambassadors.

I wish the Hon. Premier Godspeed in this undertaking and hope that those who go to this Final Conference will be recorded in the pages of history for the sake of posterity. They will be considered by our children or grandchildren as the framers of a West Indian nation and what they do will live on. I hope the health of the Hon. Premier will keep up so that he will be able to press for the things which we suggest and which we feel are in the interest of Barbados. He should remember always that he has found himself in that position because he captured the imagination of the people through his being an avowed Socialist and it is for that reason that I say he should do nothing which would tend to make the people who are at the top as far removed from the ordinary people as it was in the days of Old Russia.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to refer to the very significant remarks of the Hon. Premier when he said tonight that this is one of the most momentous debates ever to take place in this historic Chamber. I quite agree that that is true: but I am sorry to see that there is such a lack of enthusiasm in members in a debate of this sort. It is certainly to be regretted that every hon. member is not in his seat and taking an intelligent interest in what is going on. But, perhaps, those who are absent feel that Federation is a foregone conclusion; they cannot add or take away from it; therefore they have kept themselves out of the debate. I am sorry if that is the attitude on their part.

The next thing which I am sorry about is that a debate of this sort should have taken place on a motion for the adjournment of the House. I suggested earlier today that this House should be moved into Committee for the consideration of these Reports and that we should decide beforehand to deal with them each one in turn. We could have led up from one to another and left the Fiscal Report for the last because it embodies the recommendations of the other two, due to the fact that whatever is proposed for the Civil Service and whatever is proposed for the Judiciary must be taken into account in the financial arrangement. That is the sort of debate which I thought this historic Chamber would have been proud to adopt. It does not matter whether any other Legislature has debated these Reports; it is to our credit that we have chosen to debate them. I believe that it was in this Chamber that the first suggestion was made in these Islands that we should have these three Reports before the Delegation given plenipotentiary powers goes to London; and I am convinced that that was a good view because in every one of these reports on Federation an entirely different view is taken.

I am sorry that the Hon. Premier should have confined his speech to only saying what merely has taken place in here. I do not think that is good enough. The motion on the Order Paper is not to recapitulate on the debates on Federation; it is to move the adjournment of the House to consider the three reports of the Pre-Federal Commissioners. I therefore felt that this House should have had some expressions of opinion on the contents of those Reports and I regret very much that the Hon. Premier did not see fit to approach this matter in that way. 9.45 p.m.

I should like to refer to his remarks made when I was not in the House last Thursday: that he alone will vote for Barbados. It is important that this Legislature and the people should have

known that that was the method of voting at this Conference. It was my considered opinion that those members having the status of delegates would have votes, that they would vote for the Barbados point of view. If it is a fact that each Unit is going to have a vote and that vote is going to be cast by the person leading the delegation, then we should have had one delegate and as many advisers as we were able to pay for; and so long as we were willing to pay the money we should have a larger delegation. That would have been an easy method of allowing the Opposition Parties of this House to have chosen a representative as an adviser, because if only one vote is going to be cast for Barbados and it is not a matter of carrying too many votes, it puts a different light on the choosing of the delegation. What I would like the delegates to understand is this: that if they are really delegates they have not the status of representatives. Delegates mean that you are taking the views of the people you represent, putting it and voting for it; and it is for that reason that I attach the greatest importance to a debate of this kind. We should be telling them what we want them to vote for. A delegate has no right with plenipotentiary powers or otherwise to go and put a point of view that he is not given. A representative can do as he likes. A delegate is delegated to go and carry certain views, but in a matter as big as this I have no doubt that you must allow some latitude; and I hope that our delegates and our advisers will do their very best, not only to see that they get whatever they can get for Barbados; that they approach a Conference of this kind not only to get the Capital, or the advantages. This is something that will last forever, and there is to be a certain amount of co-operation and give and take, and I hope that will be the spirit with which the Barbados delegation will equip itself for this Conference. If I may say a word on this question about the Capital, the Barbados delegates must leave here like all the other delegates that have any opportunity or chance of getting the Capital, to put that over as best they can. But let them leave also with an alternative place to vote for and do not be caught as you were on the last occasion when you came in here and said it was a farcical method of choosing the Capital. If you have not got your minds made up now, you are going to be in chaos and difficulty; make up your minds to do all you can to get it in Barbados, but be quick to say if it is not in Barbados, I think the alternative is Antigua or wherever it is you want to choose. Do not come back and talk about a farcical method. That is one particular thing I would like you to make up your minds on. It may be right or wrong or good for Barbados, but have an alternative place in your minds to vote for. But do not go up there and be confused and say it was a stupid and farcical method in choosing the Capital.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as regards this Civil Service Report, it seems to me as if these Commissioners have come to the conclusion that we must make provision, whether we like it or not in this Federal setup, to incorporate C.D. & W. and R.E.C. Let us be careful on that score. Let us try and discover the reason for C.D. & W. and see whether there is any place for it in this Federal setup. It is not one of those things that you can lift up bodily and put in the Federal structure. It came here for the reason of examining schemes for assistance on the spot. As far as technical advice is concerned that is open to question. I know of no technical advice that has been given to this area from the people connected to C.D. & W. When the Mealv Bug scare came up, there was nobody in C.D. & W. to help;

when we wanted houses built they could not help; when we wanted to put a building on the Central Foundry site they said you had to pay an architect. The only person who came here and was financed by C.D. & W. was an architect and he did not even build a single building, except for private persons. Mr. DeSyllas came here, drew a plan of Bridgetown, and they do not know where he is or the plan either! What technical advice have those people even given? I know nothing about it at all. What they did is to set up a Social Welfare Department and then gave you a Social Welfare Officer who left the Social Welfare work to be done by a Commissioner of Police! [laughter.] So do not let us make preparations for taking over that nonsense. We know the things that are necessary in the government of a people. Let us set it up in a skeleton way as a super-structure and try not to make it too heavy. If we have to get experts, let us have some practical experts, and let us try in the Federal setup to do things on a reasonable basis. There is absolutely no necessity for Barbados to have a Department of Science and Agriculture and every other place to have one too. Let us see if we can do anything like that, but there is nobody in C.D. & W. to help in these things. Those people are going to look for jobs out here when they find there is no room for them, or that their services are being superseded with our Federal structure. The Judiciary, sir, is something that I do not know about, but I do not think that the Premier of Barbados can boast that he is going to have any special knowledge about the judiciary of the Federal set-up because the lawyers of Barbados have been trying to re-organise the judiciary of Barbados for years and years, and have made no progress with it; so that they cannot do anything even for a particular Unit; they cannot claim any special knowledge in re-organising a Judiciary, nor therefore, in creating one. I am sorry to have to say that, but it is true and we must be careful. I see that somebody proposed that the Federal Courts may need seven judges. I do not think that you have seven judges in all the Units and we must be very careful about this too. Another thing is—and I hope some attention will be paid to it—on page 8 of the Judicial Report, there is something in effect about: “(b) between Units or between a Unit and a resident of another Unit.”

I have had it put to me that if a Trinidadian came to Barbados and was knocked down by a Government-owned bus he would have to bring the case in the Federal Court. I am not saying it is as absurd as that, but if that happened you will find that you made litigation too expensive for people to get justice. Therefore I am asking the Premier to look at page 8, and have some discussion about little things like that. In paragraph 50, towards the end, the last three lines, they have “and that in the future no appeals will be permitted direct from any of the Unit Courts to the Privy Council.”

I think, sir, that these are things that should have very careful study applied to them. If they have cut down the years of experience that is necessary for the appointment to a Federal Judgeship from fifteen years to something less, perhaps no years at all, that is a serious matter. The people in these islands have been accustomed to feel that they can go right through the Courts searching for justice until they get to the Privy Council, and while it may be a good suggestion, to me you should be careful, and it appears that this is based on the assumption that there will be seven judges.

9.55 p.m.

I am asking that we do not outrage the people of this place with the Federal structure which we build. Seven Judges do seem to be an abnormal number to have in this Federal set-up. We have a Chief Justice in Jamaica, one in the Windward Islands, one in Barbados, one in Trinidad, and one in British Guiana; and if British Honduras comes in, that will be six. Do you mean to say that you will maintain these six and then superimpose seven judges on the people? This Conference has too many things for plenipotentiary powers to deal with; to have plenipotentiary powers to set up this whole structure seems to be a super-human task. I hope the Hon. Premier is correct that as far as these Reports are concerned, some Caribbean Committee has to be set up to consider them. I hope that these things will be discussed further in this area. I must say that these Reports put an entirely different light on the Federation as conceived by people in this area previous to their publication. We had no idea that in the setting up of this Federation we would need £2 million in capital expenditure. That is four times and more what the original figure was. That is a serious thing to contemplate.

The next thing is the financing of the Federation. I can quite see that to levy a percentage of your Customs will not give the Federal Legislature the sort of control and independence that it will ultimately need. I think it strange that the absurdity of it was not apparent. I think so for this reason: to me, if you can collect the revenue for the Federation from the entire population, whether it be indirect or direct or both, it gives every person in the Federal area an interest in the Federation, and that is how it should be. To tell me that you will come by direct taxation and tell 8,000 people out of 220,000 that the tax is attached to their names only to pay for the Federation, does that give the common man an interest in this Federal structure? If he pays but a penny a year in taxation, that is better than to have it thrown at him that the cost of Federation does not come out of his pocket. I can quite see that the time will come when the Federal Government will control the collection of Excise or Customs and both; I do not mind the confusion that Sir Sydney Caine has found. It will not be a matter of the Unit Governments collecting revenue and handing over a percentage of it: it will be a case of the Federal Government collecting and handing back a percentage to the Units.

I would like to mention the question of the Federal employees paying Income Tax. I think the hon. junior member for Christ Church mentioned it and the Hon. Premier wanted him to enlarge on it. As you know, the people of these places are paid salaries and pensions from the British Treasury and pay no Income Tax in these Units. Anybody who is drawing a salary from the British Treasury does not pay any tax out here and likewise if anybody from Barbados is drawing his pension in the U.K., he does not pay any tax there. I do not know how this matter is going to work out; I do not think Sir Sydney Caine has taken that up. If you make people pay where they earn their money, you will find some of them paying at one rate and some paying at another rate, until of course you have a unified method of collecting Income Tax.

I want the Premier to listen to what I am going to say now because he will come across it in a proposal from Jamaica. Sir Sydney Caine has something about profits from the currency. I am asking the Premier very specially not to agree to that; this is something which will have to receive

the attention of a Federal Bank. You should have a West Indian National Bank operating in the area and I am glad to hear that the people in Jamaica are planning for it. I am sure that they will press it.

10.05 p.m.

You have Currency Boards down here for this area. You also have Jamaica with their sterling and you should have, like the Bank of England, a Federal Bank to do the issuing of notes and to be a sort of clearing house for the Bank business in the Islands. Do not let them interfere with the money which comes from the Currency profits until you have that vested in your Bank. If you do not have a Federal Bank, you are going to lack information which is vital to your very existence. Your Bank should have the Currency profit coming to it so that it can be strong and so that it can help you in your financial matters.

Let me point out that the profits which have accrued to your Currency Board and your various Island Governments are based on your experience of taking up paper and printing a sum of money on it—regarding it as one dollar, five dollars, or one hundred dollars—and the printing of each does not cost more than five or six cents. You have now gone in for the dangerous and expensive part of having your own coins. I will give you one little illustration because I think this is one of the most uninteresting subjects to most people. If you take a \$100 note and destroy it by fire, the Currency people will make \$100 less six or eight cents. That means almost \$100 profit to them. But if you take one of your 50c. coins and put it in a place beyond recall, the Currency people will have lost more than that, and very much more if it were made of silver because what we have issued is just debased currency. In some instances our 25c. coin costs half as much more to make it. Now, if you have only just gone in for the more expensive part of running your own Currency you cannot tell your future profits from our own currency until you see what is the result from your buying your own bullion, or may I say the nonsense which you are buying, because not a half-ounce of silver is put in the entire issue of what you are now issuing. As a matter of fact, the British Government has debased its currency since 1947. As I was saying, you can lose more on your 50c. coin by its being lost than you can lose in the destruction of a \$100 note.

This is a matter which you will have to clear up. I think there is probably a little trick by those gentlemen to prevent you from ever having your own bank. I do not like those suggestions. If we had been issuing all types of currency before and we knew from experience what it was, probably we could then do what has been suggested.

Now, Sir, I am sorry to see that Federation has really caught up with us. Whoever said so, spoke correctly. We have been talking about it so long that it has caught up with us. I do not know if we are prepared for entering into it in the proper way. To-day, we have less communications, Island with Island, than we had many years ago. We have a little ship running up and down these Islands now and I do not suppose anybody here knows when it comes in or goes out. Previously we had three ships making fortnightly calls and giving us a cheap means of transport so that we got to know each other better then. If you want to travel to the various Islands frequently nowadays you have to travel by the expensive way of flying, so it is a fact that we do not know each other as well as we did before.

I was sorry that I was not present at last Thursday night's meeting of this House. I under-

stand that the Government was proud of the fact that it got a lot of Items off the Order Paper. If I had been here, I had a suggestion to make to the Hon. Minister of Communications when the House was dealing with the Bill to ratify the Agreement entered into between the Governments of certain Caribbean Territories and the West Indies Navigation Company Limited. What I wanted to remind him about was that when we were paying a little more subsidy for the operation of the three ships between these colonies, we were getting our mails carried free of charge between the islands. Now that we are subsidising one ship for nearly all the money that you were subsidising the other three ships, we are paying for nearly every bag of mail which we are sending to these colonies. [Hon. M. E. COX: Time changes.] Yes, time changes and it has changed for the worst now because you are too short-sighted in your looking after these matters.

Sir, it is well that under the circumstances surrounding Federation that we should not for the sake of a compromise give up too much. Do not let us give plenipotentiary powers to our delegates (although we understand that we only have one voting candidate) for them to go and write and draft a constitution, and then to discover that it is the hardest job on earth to amend the Constitution in order to get rid of the bad features of it. I said in here sometime ago, when I was asking the House to insist on getting these three Pre-federal Reports, that I was suspicious. Now that the British Government has got us to agree to Federation and has got us so far as the drafting of the constitution and how to finance it, it was only then they thought it necessary to appoint three Commissioners to draft these three Reports.

10.15 p.m.

It is a good thing to rely upon the facts before us. Not only that, sir; it grieved me on the last occasion to hear the Premier of Barbados get up after the part that he has played in Federation debates, Conferences and things of that sort, to say that he knew nothing about the arrangements for this Conference on February 7th. He said he knew nothing about the fixing of the date February 7th and that he was not previously consulted. The Minister for Communications said in an aside that this matter was decided by Mr. Gomes and Mr. Manley. They wanted this Conference on February 7th. It seems to me, sir, entirely out of keeping with the importance and responsibility of this island in this Federation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not remember speaking on that point at all. If I did, I must have been misunderstood. I had a talk with somebody at the Colonial Office and he said, as far as he saw, he could not have the Conference before April. It suited me. The Colonial Office then sent around to all of us, and as far as I am concerned, asked me to name the most suitable month possible for Barbados. Then that time (February) was sent to all the Governors. That is the position. It is conceivable that Gomes and Manley had a talk at the Colonial Office and they felt February was better. I did not want the Conference until later in the year, and I made it clear that I had to go there and then hurry back to get through the Estimates.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, you see that the thing is even worse than I thought it was. For the Premier of Barbados said that at least after March and Mr. Manley said about the middle of the year would suit him, and now the Colonial Office tells them to come there on February 7th. It is a serious matter. Up to that time there was no thought or expression of opinion as to whether these important

documents would be in our hands. I do not see how Mr. Gomes or Mr. Manley could go to London and have a Conference on Federation without asking for these Reports beforehand. They seem to have forgotten them. I do not know whether they felt they could go up there and read them and decide for the people in these colonies that they would accept these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to express any opinion about these large sums of money. Sir Sydney Caine said you might have to buy land at £5,000 an acre. He did not say what place he based that on. It is difficult to understand, but when I hear members of this House saying only 10,000 people of our population of 200,000 can feed themselves properly, and that they are spending \$720,000 for the Governor General's House, I wonder if people realise that Government is paying \$1,640.00 to send each of our delegation to England. You are lending emigrants \$240 and for yourself you are taking \$800 to go. That is what we voted. Divide the amount by six and you will see it is more than \$1,640. Everything is out of proportion and I hope, sir, that we are not going to put a millstone around our necks, and there is going to be a Federation based on a modest beginning and built on the sure foundation of a sound economy. I am all for asking that the British Government give you as much as possible. I am all for seeing to it that they give you an assured market for our products. That is what we want. There is no man tonight that can tell you what are the resources of this area. There are some people who may have bauxite in their backyards, just as it was found in Jamaica. There were people who knew it, and people know where oil is down here and have it bottled up in case of emergency. We have not built up our own technical staff as yet, and nobody knows what the area has in it. If it is developed, you may find you have an extremely rich area. Recently there was a nancy story about somebody finding bauxite. That is the kind of story you tell to children. Nobody knows the resources of the area, sir, but I do not think that that would justify us in finding a super-imposed structure that would definitely be too heavy for us. Let us try and be modest in our design but adequate in what we get. The Federation idea that has been thought of all along is one based on "unity is strength." I do not think anybody formulated what shape it was to take, but it was a coming together of the people in this area, first of all to have a beginning. Others have been purchasing our raw materials and making themselves wealthy. I heard one hon. member say that the Dominions should come to our aid as well. I was sitting in your seat and I did not want to interrupt, but I wonder what contribution he would accept from South Africa, or whether he would expect one at all.

I did not wish to embarrass him by asking. A certain parish church would not allow South African wine to be used because it would desecrate the service. Would we expect anything from South Africa? I think there are people nearer here who have a greater responsibility to us and it is to them we should look. We should cut our coat to suit the cloth and the style that we have. First of all we have to know what cloth we have and then decide on the style; and I am asking our delegation to do the very best that they can, not for Barbados alone,—you will find yourself wanting—but go out to do the best for this area and let the people see that is what you have come out to do. I was sorry to hear tonight that if we did not get the Capital here it would not be because of, but in spite of, the attitude the Premier

has adopted. If there is any truth in that, I hope he will recapture some of the affection and the regard it is said he once had among the smaller islands. We have not taken sufficient interest in them, or in their representatives, and we are now in such a position that we will need their assistance.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the whole range and tempo of this debate here today is, I think, an indication of the attitude not only of this Government, but of a lot of us in Barbados and in the West Indies, and in fairness to all of us, both here and outside of this House and in the West Indies, I think it ought to be said that this lukewarm attitude is not entirely our fault, but we are in this strange and novel position in that as West Indians we find ourselves going forward into a change which, if the truth is told, is none of our seeking.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

If, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the larger issues of the Federation of the West Indies had come to the top as a result of some popular agitation, and if nationalist feeling had reached such a height that the necessary impetus was given to Federation, we might find ourselves experiencing the same enthusiasm, the same sense of urgency and drive which animated the citizens of the thirteen American Colonies.

10.25 p.m.

I bet you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when our Constitution is before us and we read it, we will discover in it none of the ideas and ideals which motivated men like Jefferson and Washington. For one thing, when the Americans wanted to Federate (because they are among the most important people in the world today, and their experience is valuable to us) — when they wanted to Federate and they had embedded their ideas into a constitution, they started by saying: "We, the people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect union, do hereby devise this Constitution as follows:" and the words "in order to form a more perfect union" might be taken to be the clothing, so to speak, of the ideals which animated them. Here in the West Indies we have no such driving urge. The truth about the whole Federal idea and its implications are known: and it will be conceded by all who follow us that the British Government was the foremost contender for these Federal stripes. The whole agitation has come from the United Kingdom; the drive and energy have come from the United Kingdom. It is not surprising therefore that even the very Constitution which we are to have, unless it is radically changed in scope and range will be no more than Colonial tutelage.

I am sorry that I was not here earlier today when, I understand, the Hon. Premier had given the House some idea of Mr. Manley's seven points. I do not know them in detail, but I understand that they are in substance, at any rate, matters which have been mentioned in this House before, and among such matters first and foremost is the demand for self-government and possibly for Dominion Status. I wish to make it clear that if the Barbados Delegation does not contend with Mr. Manley and lend its voice as strongly as possible to have this demand for a self-government, then it is wasting its time and the time of the whole of the West Indies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have always believed that there is nothing wrong or unfortunate about a people asking to be allowed to govern themselves; and contrary to most popular opinion on the subject, I have always held the view that the only real test of people's ability to govern themselves is their willingness to do so. That is the only test you can have. Therefore the Delegates assembled in London next month ought to be clear and resolute in their own minds that in order to carry out the responsibilities which the ideal

of Federation involves, the future Federal Structure must be as nearly self-governing as is practicable in the circumstances. There has not been any popular upsurge demanding a more perfect uniformity; there has not been any shouting or tumult in any part of the West Indies on the part of men and women for any of these matters. We are principally responsible for that part of the West Indies known as Barbados, and this Government cannot escape the censure which is due to it for not having treated this matter as one of such importance as to enlighten the people about it. That is the most shameful part of their record—to discover even now, two or three weeks before this Conference, that the Barbados Labour Party, which has the responsibility in this matter, has not thought this matter of sufficient importance even to tell its own supporters of the rights and wrongs of Federation. It may well be that they feel that discussions like these in the House of Assembly every year preceding a Conference is the contribution which they should make to public enlightenment. If that is their view, it only shows that the idea of Federation is in a very unfortunate position in Barbados. But there are certain things which the people of the West Indies must have: there are certain things which it is their due to have. It ought to be clearly understood that although the three million of us are not shouting and clamouring at the gates of Downing Street to satisfy a particular nationalist aspiration, yet inasmuch as the English Government and English public opinion are willing to push Federation, there is no reason why we should not have the best of what is going and not the worst because we are not clamouring for it.

I do not know what is the mind and temper of the Delegates, but some of them will be representing countries which have long enjoyed a tradition of representative government. However, it ought not to be a difficult thing for a Barbadian Delegation to go strongly on the issue of self-government and even ask for Dominion Status or as nearly that as possible, because the Head of our Delegation is a person who has been shouting loud and long that our particular Constitution is among the best, if not the best, in the Colonial Empire.

10.35 p.m.

He should certainly not want to see a new constitution for these countries (and I mean the West Indies) inferior or less in its applicability or usefulness than under the constitution in which he is now working; so as I have said, it is an important matter. There are certain matters of details to which this principle can be applied. I feel for instance that it is wrong (and I want to say it with all the emphasis I have at my command) that if the Governor-General of the West Indies is absent or incapacitated that the Federal-Chief-Secretary should act for him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Federal Government is not a colony; it is an association of free and in most cases nearly all self-governing territories. It is an association formed to create a more perfect and higher type of Government. How then can you pass over as being not important the possibility that the Federal Chief Secretary is a more important personage than any other West Indian of equal eminence. My own view is that the Governor-General's Deputy, if not specially appointed, should either be the President of the Senate or some person like that, possibly a Governor of the Unit of the Federation. He should be the person who should be asked to deputise whenever the Governor-General is unable to do so. The idea of having the Federal Chief Secretary to act as Governor-General is an

idea which belongs to the Colonial era and it is an insult to the West Indian nationhood that that will be so. I am not submitting that the President of the Senate will not have much work to preside over in the Senate but from his experience and eminence, he certainly would be the fit and proper person to act as Governor-General in the absence of the holder of the post. If I were a Federal Minister, I would feel very odd, knowing the wide authority which I would wield in the affairs of West Indian people, to see a Federal Chief Secretary, who could not by any stretch of the imagination mean as much as I do, acting as Governor-General.

Secondly, for the kind of prominence which is placed on the Federal Government, it is obvious that the big question of where the money is going to come from and how it is going to be spent must be the biggest question of the Federal Government. Yet, so far as I see, it has not yet been sufficiently stressed. No matter what you may say about the Governor-General's reserved powers or the particular site of the Federation, in its early stages it is the money of the people of the West Indies which is going to be spent or misspent on the people of the West Indies. I therefore cannot see any reason why you should appoint a Financial Secretary giving him a seat in the Federal Capital and treat as a matter of preference whether you should have a Federal Minister of Finance or not. If you claim to rule yourself — and you are even saying that you are pressing for Dominion Status and the opportunity to play your part in the Commonwealth as you think the genius of our people deserve and all those matters which stress your claims to independence — I want to know what Federal Prime Minister he would be who would seriously constitute his Cabinet by ignoring the pressing question of finance and be contented to receive the official advice from a Federal Civil Servant who has no responsibility, no matter how distinguished he might be. I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Federal Government in its earlier stages could probably do without a Federal Minister of Agriculture, but it cannot certainly afford, to do without a Federal Minister of Finance.

This matter just leads into a problem which has been worrying me for sometime and which opens a line of thought which seems to lie behind this whole question of Federation. If you read between the lines and if you listen to all the British pronouncements both spoken and written on Federation of the West Indies, you will see that you have ample comment in the Civil Service Commissioner's Report that the Federal Structure as seen by them is entirely a resting house and haven of peace and quietude for certain retired English Officials and certainly for many of the top staff officials of Development and Welfare as would probably manage to fit into the Federation. Therefore I say, much as they tell me that they want the Federation to be modest and unpretentious, all that they have recommended makes it immodest and pretentious.

10.45 p.m.

They carefully with a wealth of argument tell you how conveniently it would be to work C.D. & W. and its agencies into the Federal structure. They carefully tell you that in their view it would make for greater efficiency if this and that line of activity were dove-tailed into the Federal Civil Service. What of course they would not tell you is that they are asking for jobs for the whole structure which we see around us in C.D. & W. I do not take that view of things at all; and that is why I feel that the West

Indian leaders are losing the initiative in this matter, because they are not prepared to be loud and vulgar enough to insist on our being masters in our own house, and it is a silly idea to believe that, because the British Government may have to advance money to the Federation it does not necessarily mean that they are to tell us how we should order our business, because it needs a very little research to be able to show world public opinion that the only thing the British Government does to the West Indies, is to borrow money; so that no West Indian leader need worry himself or have any qualms of speaking for West Indian interests when he is to, and he should not feel that he cannot at the same time make a demand for as much financial help that is necessary, and in the same breath speak out his mind on certain problems. If you go on, Sir, to see the setup, you will notice — and we have seen it in this House — that our Government and its chief spokesmen have put down what I think is a not-so-clever but well-calculated obstruction to this island having the Federal Capital. Everything the Premier has said seems to me to indicate that he is not keen on our having it. I do not blame him, because it might not be recognised by many Barbadians, but it is true. Wherever the Federal Capital goes, there goes at the same time a burst of limelight and floodlight playing upon the activities of the Government.

And Mr. Deputy Speaker, can you imagine the Capital of the Federation being here, set some 2, 3 or 4 miles away and the astonishment which would greet some Federal Legislators if they saw some of the things that go on even in this very House and the pronouncements which are made by him in the name of the Barbadian people? What is wrong with him is that he knows that he will not have that freedom to manoeuvre if the Federal Capital comes here as he might have if it is somewhere else, because a pronouncement made in the Barbados House of Assembly with Federal officials sitting in the gallery would be challenged immediately he went into the Federal Chamber; and he would have to justify his words and actions before a Federal Assembly; and he would feel that having a Federal Government here would not give him that freedom of manoeuvring. He may have very good reasons and the reasons he puts forward may suit him, but I know that all of us who know him as well as I do would hate to have it here because he would find himself being continually contradicted on matters which he would prefer not to be contradicted on; and he knows that the standard that he has set for the working of the party system in this island would meet with the utmost ridicule and scorn when seen at close hand by a lot of the people who do not yet know the rot that goes on. And therefore anything he does and says in respect of the Federal Capital coming here is not the action of a madman or of an unpatriotic person or of a person who talks for the sake of talking. It is a scheme to make certain that the people in the smaller islands would be so fed up that they will think twice before coming here and he would have more time to pursue his particular career. I therefore have no feeling whatever that the Federal Capital will come here. I think enough damage has been done already, and done in a calculated manner; and nothing anybody can say now can bring it here. All the shafts and shots have gone home where he aimed and they have stuck. However, on broader grounds, I do not think that the Barbados delegation can make an issue even if it wanted to of having the Federal Capital here. It would be nice to have it; there would be certain advantages; but we cannot wreck West Indian unity on these grounds. Therefore, since the reasons for

our coming into the Federation are completely unconnected with our getting the Capital, I prefer for this reason that no issue which may mar the unity of the West Indies should be created over the Capital, but that if we can get it, we should be thankful. When you come to these technical matters which have been the subject of these Reports, I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker that one thing has been made clear and it is this: that the British Government knew better than we what it was pushing us into, but some hidden sense of decency made them, as it were, lift the curtain before the last step was taken. They have lifted it late enough to make it not worth while for us to turn back. These Reports, especially the Fiscal one, would have been excellent and very informative document had they come immediately after the Report of the S.C.A.C. That was the logical and historical time to have the Pre-Federal Commissioners' Reports and the Consultative Committee which was to meet in the West Indies after the London Conference should have been doing as a permanent body all the work which was hurriedly and so inadequately done in the London 1953 conference. But some innate and decent sense of decency has made the Colonial Office allow us to see what was actually involved.

At this stage Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, that with every year, everything becomes more expensive: and I personally am not surprised to find that the capital cost of establishing a Federation has leapt four times in seven or eight years. It is a wonder that it is not more; but with the kind of Federation which the British Government has in mind, and which we have expected, unless there is a complete reversal of attitude in London, this kind of structure is the best they can envisage. They will line the Federal Civil Service with as many of their own kind as they find room for, and naturally they will insist that they be paid the salaries and given the conveniences that their own people deserve. Have you noticed that with all the importance attached to the Federal Parliament, no mention is made of providing Mr. Speaker of the Federal Parliament with a residence?

10.55 p.m.

A person who is holding an office of such dignity, especially since he is likely to be a member of the Federal Parliament elected by the members themselves, should have a residence provided for him. But they have not thought of that, because, in their view, the Speaker of the Federal Parliament is bound to be a West Indian. If I may be personal for a moment, Mr. Speaker, if you were fortunate enough to be elected to the Federal Parliament and have the opportunity of presiding over that august Institution, I do not think that any of us would like the idea of your not being provided with a residence suitable to the work which you have in hand owing to your dignity as Speaker of the Federal Parliament. This is something on which any Parliamentarian would feel strongly: yet with all that is recommended for the Federal Prime Minister, there is a silent, eloquent omission of suitable dignified quarters for the Speaker of the Federal Parliament. It is these little things that you do that go to show the whole tenor and inclination of thinking in England with respect to West Indian problems and of this Federation.

As to the technical matter of how the Federation is to be financed, I think there is something we have all overlooked. It is this: valuable as this Fiscal Report is, it cannot help the Leaders of the

West Indies until it is first decided what the range and scope of that Federal activity will be; because the Federal Government will need more money if it has to do more things, and it will need less money if it has to do fewer things. If, as I think it right and proper, it should be the duty of the Federal Government to take into its control all the trade, commerce and industry—at least the planning of an industrial part of it—for the whole area, then it must control the revenue, or the resources of the area, or at least share in that. Whether it is income tax or customs duty, it is not an important matter in the first place. It is a matter only for you to decide just how much the Federal Government can do. It is clear and obvious that if the Federal Government has a lot to do, then the more it has to do, the less the Unit Governments will be doing. Therefore, no breach of power is involved if the Unit Governments find themselves with less to do and at the same time having less responsibilities; but that is a matter which is really for the technicians and I strongly advise that if they are not financial advisers, it would pay dividends for the whole purpose involved to have Professor Arthur Lewis seconded from his Chair to be here for six months after this Conference to go into all these matters and see that the best is done.

The people realise that it will be necessary for us to pay two sorts of income tax and two sorts of excise duties: and how many realise that if all of these recommendations are implemented, a man might find, through no fault of his own, that his cost of living has been raised, without his being able to control his financial destiny? If you are going to have these taxes, one of the guarantees which should be given to the Unit Government is that a sort of sliding scale should be worked out through the Federal Government, and taxes will not be taken by the Unit Governments. If a man is required to pay seven cents a gallon on his gasoline, it does not mean that gasoline can go from 63c. to 70 cents a gallon.

I take into consideration that £2 million is too much for the capital expenditure. It all depends on who is going to work the thing and to whose benefit it will be. If a top-heavy structure paying little respect to the needs of the people is going to be established, then anything you put up like that is bound to be oppressive. I fear that, because Federation is being pushed on us and because there is no apparent upsurge from below, there will be many years of groaning and suffering under the Federal structure until it becomes familiar to us and we to it. If the British Government wants to put us on the world stage and if our Leaders are prepared to accept that responsibility, we can do no less than to take the plunge and venture.

11.05 p.m.

I would like it to be fully realised that we are moving into a wider field of world history and to a wider sense of our own development; and from this step which we are about to take there is no going backward or any turning. After the Federation has been established it would not be possible to untangle the things that have been done. My hope is that the people of the West Indies will catch on rapidly to their responsibilities and that the people of Barbados, for instance, will get a good credit in Federal affairs as they sometimes think they have in running their local affairs.

If I may go back to a constitutional matter, there is another aspect of the constitutional problems facing us which I should like to mention and which has been puzzling me. I am not without

some little knowledge of the history of Federal Government. I have read a fair amount of them: and I have always noticed that in some Federal Constitutions, notably that of the United States, perhaps for peculiar reasons, a Bill of Rights was attached to the constitution. I think it was a good thing. What I mean by a Bill of Rights is that a series of provisions ought to be drafted to form part of the Federal Constitution (although in a separate place) outlining in simple language what the rights of citizens are and guaranteeing all those freedoms which belong to the democratic way of life. I think it ought to be laid down in our constitution clearly that we should have freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of association and all of that, and it should be put down in a separate part of the constitution as a Bill of Rights, and having the force of law without slipping those provisions into various Clauses of the Constitution. It is something which I feel is very important. When it is remembered that we are a multi-racial community, and that we are a community with what you may call inadequate land surface and lack of historical background, you cannot expect us therefore to have that automatic unity and identity of outlook. The constitution is the thing which should unify us, and under that constitution the principles which embody our unity ought to be made clear. It is known that some people do not support a Bill of Rights; they say that it is nonsense and they only pay lip service to it. Perhaps, you will realise how necessary it is with the democratic set up we have, and that free expression should be given to supporting it. It is my opinion that it is in the interest of West Indian people that these rights should be constitutionally guaranteed and that the Federal Supreme Court should be the interpreter of them. As usual, the Federal Supreme Court should not only be the guardian of the Constitution but the defender of these Rights as written in that Federal Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, when all is said and contended, I do not suppose that any member of this House seriously believes that anything said here to-day will cause the Barbados Delegation to take heed in any way. I thank God that I have no such delusion. I am certain that the Hon. Premier has an idea of his plan of action and his own outlook on the Conference which is about to take place and has already settled all that he should think of, so that he will be able to twist or turn any part of his mind. His mind is like the moving finger which writes and having writ moves on. The only difference is that he will not move on. As I know, what we say will be published in the *Official Gazette*. I hope that the criticisms which we have made and the points which we have raised will be useful if only for future reference. However, I will plead with our delegation to throw itself behind whatever pleas the Jamaica Delegation might make for self-government of the British Caribbean and to do what it can, if it can, to salve the wounded feelings of the representatives of the smaller islands, which have been irritated by a calculated attempt to upset them. They must also try to use as broad a vision as they can command in looking at matters from an area point of view and not from the point of view of the convenience of themselves or other politicians. I will also particularly plead with them at the Conference not to suffer or to fall into the trap of pitting one's strength or influence against the other, —either that of Jamaica or Trinidad—just for the sake of impressing the impressionable; but to take

a firm and clear stand on all those issues which are undoubtedly West Indian and by so doing, give the lead even to those delegates—if they can—from big countries whose ideas may not be clarified.

11.15 p.m.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, despite all the controversy which has gone on in this Chamber, I would like to place on record best wishes to the Barbados Delegation. They do of course act as if they recognise this: but they are stepping on to a new age and entering into a limelight which is important; and if the people of Barbados are to play their part in the Federal structure and in the future destiny of the West Indies, the part they play will largely be dictated by what is said and done by those persons who will speak in their name for Barbados. I therefore wish them well and assure them of this House's support in all matters calculated to raise the prestige of this island and satisfying the needs of the people, because I am convinced that when things are looked at in a proper perspective, the records must bear the facts, while we strongly condemn their attitude, and their unpatriotic attitude towards what a delegation should be, yet, at the same time, since the delegation is going, it will have to speak for all of us: and I should like to warn them that if they do not speak as they should, they are likely to receive a different end of the stick from that which is now held out towards them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I deprecate it and squirm every time the honourable member says he knows me; and he gives a very false impression. If I live to be as old as Methuselah, I do not want to know the honourable member. This suggestion that he knows me so well that he can afford to say even on the eve of our going to London to speak with a united voice; that he knows me so well that he can afford to say that I am a hypocrite and am doing my best to put the Capital somewhere else I do not want to know him mentally at all. The honourable member glories over the way he speaks. He makes these accusations because he can afford to say that he knows me so well. I do not know him and I do not wish to; and I hope he does not try to know me. I have upheld in this House even its viperous critic, the honourable junior member for St. Peter. He still says these things even at a time when Barbados will look at us; he cannot allow an opportunity to pass without chucking filth at me, saying that I have lost the confidence of people I work with in the other islands. He reports a vicious libel made against me. In fact, I have an action for libel against the *Guardian* Newspaper; so far I have desisted for the sake of Federation. The lie is that at the R.E.C. Conference I had gone back on a decision which all of us had taken, that the Chairmanship should rotate, and I, being the Colonial Office boy, wanted to put Professor Beasley in the Chair! I could not have failed in that action because the newspaper could not discover one single line in the minutes of any R.E.C. meeting in which that happened; but the honourable member chooses to get there and repeat it as being the reason for the deterioration of the prestige of Barbados and for the fact that the regard which the people of the Windward Islands had for me has gone down.

Mr. Speaker, those who really know me unlike the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, would know that I would be the last man on this delegation who would go there, and, who would do anything to bring personal kudos to myself as the Premier of Barbados. Whether my prestige goes up or down is truly immaterial to me. I am not going to seek to gain anybody's favour. I am going to speak and act, as in the

past with the object and intention to do my best on behalf of the cause for which I speak. At the R.E.C. meeting, I may have annoyed some people—I am sure not the Leeward and Windward Islands—by reminding them that R.E.C. will hardly be the Federal Executive of the West Indies, but I will not take any notice of what the honourable junior member for St. Peter or St. Lucy have said on these two points. One of the reasons (whether the members guffaw at it or not) why I brushed aside the suggestions that a member of the Opposition Party should go, is that there is no essential difference between the 24 members of this House on the question of Federation, and there is no question of the views of the Opposition being distinct from those of the Government. I had before me this morning the last minutes — and I said this morning as I did not finish before the morning of the 1953 Conference, I have to refresh my memory with the views from the Montego Bay Conference, and will say that even with Sir Archibald Cuke, a Conservative, when it came to the cause of Barbados, I have found that he would say, "I agree with the other Barbados delegate, that is what Barbados feels." He has fought on issues as I have fought — for restraining the powers of the Governor-General, for getting Freedom of Movement up to the last. He spoke as a Barbadian; and if Sir Archibald Cuke who is a spokesman even of the Chamber of Commerce and the big planters, fought like that for Barbados, is there any human being who knows me, as distinct from the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, who feels that I would not do my utmost for Barbados? From the last point of view would it not be a feather in my cap, to say: "This great blessing I have got for you—the Federal Capital, bringing more money into the Island?" Surely, if I were considering only personal glory I would fight for the Capital to come here: but in his adolescent way—the honourable member has been accustomed to making speeches which are more clever than accurate, or regardless of the truth—the honourable member has seen fit to suggest that I am deliberately trying not to get the Capital here, and the usual sneering suggestion that we will do well if we follow Jamaica. Whether he was in here or not, I repeat, it is not a case of following. I say that because Mr. Manley is following us in point of time. It is inevitable that he should; it is obvious that sooner or later we, having Socialist views, would say the same things. I have already told the House what we fought for: that there should be no officials in the Cabinet. I am not going to call names, but I am going to say this as an instance. The Chairman put up the suggestion which was the original S.C.A.C. suggestion (or the draft Report before S.C.A.C. was finished) that there should be officials like the Attorney General, the Treasurer and the Financial Secretary as members of the Cabinet. There was a suggestion by the English Chairman that the Governor General might on the advice of the Prime Minister make this nomination: and one neighbouring West Indian delegate went further and suggested that it should be made upon consultation with the Prime Minister and not on his advice. That sort of thing makes a Barbadian's stomach turn over to find a West Indian trying to give the Governor General such powers.

11.25 p.m.

That is an instance of the sort of thing that we are up against. Mr. Manley has now come along and seen it and is making the same points that the Barbados Delegation fought against. On that particular point my recollection is that even Hon. Mr. Cuke, knowing our circumstances (although be-

ing a Conservative) spoke against that. Mr. Manley's second point is that the Federal Prime Minister should use his discretion in appointing Senators to the Executive without limitation as to the number. The Minutes of the 21st April, 1953 will show that I used the same expression and fought for the same thing without, I regret to say, succeeding. I still feel, I am sure, that honourable members who are accustomed to our Constitution will also wish me to fight for that again. We did have the compromise that the Governor-General in appointing Senators, should first have consultation of some sort. Sir George Seel suggested that if you left it to the Prime Minister he could not know as well from each Unit whom to choose. Somebody has suggested that you write in the Constitution that he should seek the advice of the Governors of each Unit. It was pointed out that you cannot very well write into the Constitution either one or the other without causing confusion, and therefore a discretion was left in; but I repeat that the point was made strongly by the Barbados Delegation that the Prime Minister should have the right to advise on who should go to the Senate and he could put as many as he likes. Therefore, that point has already been thought of and has been fought for.

We fought for reduced powers of the Governor-General. It is regrettable that considerably few honourable members have spoken and that those who, as representing the Opposition Parties might have been thought big enough to live up to the situation, have merely gone down into the gutter and chucked mud. The speeches of the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the honourable junior member for St. Lucy will be remembered with regret on this occasion rather than on any other occasion.

Mr. Manley's fourth point is that the Federal Government should be given power of original planning and initiative in maintaining the consultative and advisory services. We have agreed on advisory and consultative services. However, it is not too late, if any hon. member wish to convey any views on this particular point which is of great importance to Barbados and the smaller islands, for them to pass on such views as they may have on this matter. While it is true that the overall development of the West Indies is the necessary aim of Federation, even at the risk of being called insular, you must remember that—I am being very blunt—Mr. Gomes did not hesitate to say that Trinidad is establishing factories to sell stuff to other islands. Trinidad has not abolished all restrictions. We, in the smaller Islands, have got to agree to overall advisory planning, so to speak; but with the seats distributed as they are distributed, if two larger colonies come together and say "I have a cement factory, you must grow sugar, and St. Vincent must grow arrowroot", that is a matter which we have to consider very carefully.

Mr. Manley's fifth point is the reconsideration of U.K. Financial assistance in the new Federation. Who is going to be so foolish as not to say: "We thought the Federal Capital would cost \$500,000; now it is going to cost us more, you must give us more money!" Mr. Manley's sixth point is a new method to be worked out for amendment to the Constitution. Hon. members may remember that the hon. senior member for St. George, like his distinguished colleague, the non-Parliamentary Leader of the Democratic, I believe, Labour Party [*Laughter*] in that vein has just attacked us and said that Mr. Hannays was the only person who had any sense. I will say that up to today the Canadian Government has not put in anything

about an amendment to the Constitution, and it is still done, and it may be better done than the Australian way.

With regard to Mr. Manley's seventh point, I do not agree: and I repeat, it is contrary to the view which Jamaica and ourselves put up in 1953; that is on the question of dual membership. Jamaica and ourselves put up the compromise of being a member of both Houses but not a Minister in both. An hon. member was telling me that I was, so to speak, like a little dog running behind Mr. Manley. I want to say this: letters have been written to me saying "I have seen Barbados going down." I will say that largely what has happened has first happened on the floor of this House.

11.35 p.m.

In attempting to put me in the gutter, they have put Barbados instead. Day after day, lie after lie, libel after libel, abuse after abuse, they have put in the Saturday newspapers against me, and they do not realise that it has fallen off my back like water off a duck's back and instead has put a rope around the neck of Barbados. I am sure that any respect I may have is still there; but the almost reverence that people from outside had for this House of Assembly has fastly dissipated. You hear small islanders say: "The people of Barbados can say anything about their Governor; they can do anything in the Legislature; they can pass anything whether the Governor likes it or not," but they are also seeing the black side of the Barbados social life; some are saying that it is because of racial discrimination, although it is in those islands just as bad as it is here. These accusations which they are making are like the constant dripping of water on a stone, wearing away the stone of Barbados prestige. I am not a pessimist, but certainly the chances of Barbados getting the Federal Capital are not as great as they were.

Now, some of the points which have been seemingly made against the Government have been answered, but I would like to say in answer to what the hon. junior member for Christ Church said in respect to what the Fiscal Commissioner recommended about tax collection; that, after all, really does not matter. Every Unit has to give up some of its money to the Federal Parliament to run it, so it really does not matter if the money is taken from Customs, or part of it from Excise, Income Tax or what-not. In the actual working of it, it may be better to have something certain; because to rely on a levy on revenue is uncertain. That is much too uncertain; therefore it is better to collect some money from Customs and some from Income Tax and Excise—some from beer, some from gasoline and some from other things like those. Therefore, if I take the view, speaking on behalf of the Barbados Delegation, that this modification is preferable to the other suggestion made in S.C.A.C., I hope hon. members would feel that far from letting down Barbados I am helping Barbados.

I do not think I need mind what I am going to say now, because some of the others must have seen it; therefore, I am not pulling any cards from up my sleeves. The provision of 15% or any per cent of Customs Revenue in relation to your other sources of income may hit one country more than the other. For instance, if Trinidad did not have oil, her customs duty would have to be higher. She might be paying the same customs revenue that Barbados is paying but it is bound to be a smaller percentage of her total revenue because she gets revenue from oil; therefore, even from a selfish point of view this modification by Sir Sydney Caine might be better for Barbados. I would not have said that if it were

a secret, but I cannot be so stupid to see Trinidad not seeing that also. Obviously, it is not only more profitable to Barbados but certainly more equitable to Barbados and to all the other islands.

There was some suggestion about Socialist Governments and income tax. I said in my opening remarks that in all Federations, sooner or later, income tax will come about and I hope that none of us will see income tax come about in our lifetimes. Although I am a Socialist, I hope the duty will always be collected on Customs. If you have to pay 10 shillings in the pound as income tax to the Barbados Government and then something else to the Federal Government, God help you! What are you going to live on? If you find yourself having to pay two sets of income tax, you might rue the day that you ever came into Federation.

Of course, the Federal Government does not put on extra taxation. When you take on more services you can put on more taxes but the additional tax might not be put to this or that Unit. For instance Barbados only has sugar, but the additional service may be for running a cocoa or citrus crop. Therefore it is not necessarily true to say that if you have to pay more as a unit there is additional service, as a particular unit will get the benefit.

On the other hand, the appeal has been made (I think by the hon. junior member for St. John; it may be somebody else) to look on this matter as our going forward as West Indians. That is perfectly true, but we are writing this Constitution for all time barring a Revolution. Therefore we have to see that all amendments we have to make must be made now. We have before us, staring us in the face, that the one people who profit out of Federations are lawyers. You can always hear of a State fighting the Federal Government. It is the constitutional history of the United States; more so of Canada; and even more so of Australia. You always have State interest conflicting Federal interest. Therefore, it behoves us, especially in matters of supreme importance to Barbados, to be extremely careful to what we agree. I have to wonder what posterity 25 or 50 years hence will say of the persons who brought Barbados in to the Federation. If we find that through a hurricane or some other calamity (let us not say through bad government) that the Federal Parliament has to appeal to the Secretary of State to enable it to be financially stable and the Secretary of State gets between in Council to make an order taxing Barbados, posterity might say "I wonder whether these legislators of 1955 and 1956 realised what they were doing when they ended a three-hundred-year-old principle and agreed to the Queen-in-Council or the Governor-General making positive laws to take money out of the pockets of Barbadians."

11.45 p.m.

If you go into Federation, and Mr. Manley and myself could not persuade them to change that, we are sealing our doom financially in that respect—at any rate, certainly for the next five years. [A VOICE: What about the Reserve Powers?] We have one advantage which is not in any constitution, I remember reading about, and that is of necessity everything comes under review in five years. That is, in the fourth year from coming into operation of the Federation, Units will get together again and say what they do not want written back in and what they want written in for the first time. But I must warn Barbados that is a risk we are running by allowing an outside body to make laws for us, not for ordinary legislation but to make taxing laws: and we have to accept them whether we like it or not.

I cannot say I agree with the hon. junior member for the City. I more than agree with him as regards a Federal Bank, but I cannot say I agree with him that it is wrong to make the currency profit. If you do this it would mean that no individual member of the Unit is going to feel it as much as if part of the Revenue is taken and he has to pay more for salt fish. Why not the Currency profit rather than keeping it and sharing it among the individual Units and then the Units have to find the same amount of money to pay to the Federal Government again. Suppose Barbados is to pay to the Federal Government \$500,000 and it is getting now \$200,000 from the currency, it has only to look for the difference. What difference does it make, but I agree with the hon. member that a Caribbean Federal Bank is essential. I do not know if the hon. member wants to say anything else. I wish before I sit, to thank hon. members (and I am not going to be a hypocrite about it, like those who used this debate to put a clear, concise, non-abusive case to the delegation) very much for their good wishes and I do assure them that anything that has been said is going to have no effect on me. If all these years of abuse in the weekly Press has left me still alive, a little more abuse cannot hurt. I am going there—I am going to be bold enough to say—with full confidence that the views which I feel sure are the views of the real true Barbadian. We must enter Federation. Circumstances compel us to enter. The evolution of West Indian Governments and the West Indian people have carried us to the brink of Federation and it is not only necessary for us, but a pleasant duty to enter into Federation. You cannot get Federation without sacrifices, and if we look upon it as a matter to press, giving ourselves a good start in Federation at the expense of what Barbados is going to lose, then I think I can put our hands and hearts and say, we have done our duty to Barbados.

I promise the House that I shall see that we work in harmony. We will use our judgment, and discretion in our approach to fellow delegates. We are not going to be so oily-mouthed to make pretence that we agree to please the majority. If we have to disagree, we will disagree firmly; and in everything we are doing we shall endeavour to persuade our fellow delegates inside and outside that the logical place for the temporary Capital is Barbados. I emphasise temporary, because I think we should stick to that part of the constitution which says that the first Federation Government must at all times say where the site of the Capital shall be; therefore, any Capital that we choose now shall be temporary, but who does not feel fairly sure that where that temporary Capital is, the permanent Capital will be. If however, the majority of the delegates feel to choose that too, we will have no cause to wonder in the next five years whether we shall lose the Capital.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you sit, do not forget to ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Again, I thank the House and I give it the assurance that we are not going to let down Barbados, but we will do our utmost, and I feel we shall successfully get the Capital in Barbados.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw my motion for the adjournment of this House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I should like to ask on my behalf for one month's leave of absence beginning on the 24th January 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked leave for a month's absence, from 24th January, 1956, and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

11.55 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 24th January, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I have already mentioned on the floor of this House with regard to a set of Minutes. The hon. member who has been objecting to those Minutes being confirmed has stated what his objections are and I think we should take steps to have those Minutes confirmed. I do not like the idea of having Minutes and not confirming them.

"EVERDENE"

I also want to take this opportunity of saying something to the Government Bench. It is this: Barbados has had three disasters of a similar nature. Many years ago, about 1920 or thereabouts, there was the burning and sinking of a ship in the har-

bour. Now you have the "Everdene" under the water in the inner basin and I think the Government should make some statement about it. I am going to ask questions about it. It is not good enough for a member of the Government Party to be the person who has tendered and who is responsible for raising the "Everdene" [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A firm is doing it] Well, a member of the Government Party is a prominent member of the firm! [Laughter] I would not like to be put in the position of having to discuss this matter; it should be far removed from there. I am asking the Government not to put me in the position of having to debate the matter in this House. Let the Government make some statement about it. We have had to pay money to blow up the "Guyrany" and I do not think they have finished doing that yet. Then there was the "Potick" and now we have the "Everdene."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I would like to say this. On Tuesday next we hope to bring down an amendment to the Shops' Act which is in connection with racial discrimination. I want to give notice at this early hour that we will bring down that Amendment next Tuesday and I will ask leave of the House to deal with it in all its stages on that day. There is also a measure in connection with emigration and I think we should notify the House about it.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 24th day of January, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th January, 1956

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS C.B.E., M.D. C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. O. T. ALLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*) and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 3rd January, 1956 having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended the 31st December, 1955.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following Papers:—

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1956.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1956.

REPLIES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to lay the following:—

Reply to Question No. 6 asked by the hon. senior member for St. George regarding the removal of sand from the beach at Shot Hall, St. Michael.

PETITION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the Vestry of the parish of St. Thomas. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I think we should hear what the Petition is all about.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Petition prays the House to pass a Bill authorising the Vestry to borrow an amount of money over and above the £500 which they are at present authorised to borrow.

Mr. SMITH, and Hon. G. H. ADAMS entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1956."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1956."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$32,200 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56 No. 64 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$291,010 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 65 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$20,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 66 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Shops Act, 1945. As we intimated to the House at the last sitting I intend to ask for leave to proceed with this Bill throughout all its stages to-day.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with the Resolution for \$291,010, I should like to say that that is in connection with Housing. I think I can afford to say today that this is the final figure. I intend to ask for leave to move for the suspension of

Rules 88 & 89 in order to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

In connection with the Bill to amend the Shops Act, 1945, I intend to ask for leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order that this Bill can be dealt with today in all its stages.

With respect to the other two Resolutions of which notice was given to-day I am giving notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with them.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Shops Act 1945, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911, was read a first time.

3.25 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 60, 88 & 89 be now suspended.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

There being no objection, leave was granted to the hon. member.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Runway At Seawell

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for the sum of \$15,000 is for the purpose of continuing the work of reconstruction of the runway at Seawell. As hon. members know, in the Estimates of 1955-56, provision was made for the sum of \$63,000 to continue the central strip, which we agreed to construct of concrete slabs. As the Addendum points out, the work has been progressing at a pace which is far better than it was in the case of last year; for example, last year, we were only able to complete 24,000 square feet. That was largely due to the frequency of plane flights as well as the weather, plus the fact that the workmen were not as keen as they have been this year by virtue of the experience they have gained this year over last year's progress.

As honourable members will see in the Addendum, the total area reconstructed from the 1st April, 1955 until now amounts to 27,250 square feet with the \$63,000 vote. It has been represented by the Director of Highways and Transport and also the Director of Civil Aviation that there are some cracks which have shown up recently and which would be wise and advantageous at this time to repair with concrete slabs; hence it is felt that you can use up at least another \$15,000 between today and the end of the financial year, and as a result this Resolution is before the Committee.

I think, sir, that explains the position as it stands, and I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to hear that this great progress is made with the work at Seawell. We did not hear the honourable member say whether he had increased the amount of night work, but I take it that they must have been doing work at night; and it is good to know that this Department which has had its Head now occupied in an entirely different class of work is still able to make this progress that we see reported here.

Of course we did not hear how much more work they have to do; for instance, it is good to know that the suitable area reconstructed from April is 27,250 square feet, but we did not hear whether that was the length contemplated for the \$63,000. There is nothing here to show how much this \$15,000 will do, and I am asking the hon. member to instruct those Clerks or Heads of Departments that make up these Addenda for the Resolutions to tell us what it is you intend to do with this. Is it just a proportionate amount? Can you do a quarter more of the work in the next two months? Is that possible? You said it is possible for you to say that you have this done? You set out to do 30,000 or 40,000 square feet and you have only done 27,000 for the money voted, and it is good for the members of the House to have not only the amount of money but to have the amount of work done, so that they can keep a check and follow more intelligently.

I ask the honourable member that, just because I do not have the programme of work, and I do not think it is stated in the Estimates that you can say you really intended to do 27,250 square feet. Your money has gone already. That might be the sole reason for coming back for more money. Have you done the amount of work you intended to do with it or have you discovered there is more work to do and more costly? These cracks that have developed, have they developed in a new area or in the area which you have repaired already? That is the type of information I should like to get. You have not yet budgeted for the cracks which now appear. The work that has been done has proved satisfactory and you have not had to go over it.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that the progress of the work is getting on satisfactorily and ahead of schedule. It is most important that this runway be kept in the best condition, and what I wish to ask the Minister today is this: what has happened about the transportation of the workers to and from Seawell Airport? Some money was voted in the Estimates, and some preparation was made to get these men to and from work, and complaints have been coming to me that they have not got that.

A couple of months ago tickets were issued when the Government took over transport business. Tickets were actually issued to four men to get to work and back, and two days after, the tickets were taken away. That is the complaint that has reached me. I would like the same Minister to let the Committee know why that was done and why these men have not yet got their travelling allowance. I may be wrong, but in these circumstances, are they going to run a Government bus or give the men additional pay to get to work, because they must be there on time. If they are ten minutes late, they are not allowed to work. They have to be there because it is most important work. We wish to know today. This is now January and money was voted

in the Estimates for that purpose, and they have not yet received it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as regards the question asked by the honourable junior member for the City, I said in my opening remarks that last year similar provision was made in the Estimates for that amount. That amount did not carry us over 24,500 square feet, and I stated reasons for it. This year I pointed out we have been able to get 27,000 square feet for the same money due to improved conditions, and this additional money, the amount voted today will give us another 6,800 feet. Now, as regards cracks, these developed in the old building construction which was done by Messrs. J. N. Harriman and Co. and not really in the construction carried out by the Department of Highways and Transport. As far as I am aware, the actual construction is standing up very well indeed. As a matter of fact we are substituting concrete where necessary for the original material. So the concrete is standing up very well indeed. Now, on the question asked by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, it is true that we agreed and did pass in the Estimates an amount for the purchase for a bus to transport the workers to and from the Airport, but with the taking over of the buses by the Government an agreement was reached between the Director of Highways and Transport and the Director of Civil Aviation for the transportation of these workers by a bus. As far as I am aware, that arrangement was agreed on two months or so ago, and I must admit that I am aware that is not working satisfactorily. However, I promise the honourable member to get on to it tomorrow and see what the position is. But it is the intention of the Government to transport these workers to and from their work, not as you know, actually taking them to their homes but to vantage points where other transport can be got.

Mr. GODDARD: Thank you very much, but the Minister seems very hazy of what is happening. I understand that two tickets each were issued to the men to get them to and from work. They were not able to use the tickets before they were withdrawn, and they are some firemen who live in the parish of St. James who have to get to work; some live in Christ Church; and it is some two months ago that this scheme whereby a Government bus would be used. It was not a pass, they were two tickets issued—a ticket to get them from a certain district to the Airport and back, but they were never used, and I wonder if you can tell us why they were withdrawn 3.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not know that the tickets were issued. I was under the impression that transportation facilities were provided for these people.

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

Statistical Service

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$21,683; it is a supplementary provision covering four Heads. The first Item is under Head II—Secretariat—and as hon. members will see it is in connection with furniture and office equipment for the new Statistical Service. As hon. members will also see, the sum of \$210 is asked for to pay for four special security boxes and keys which were ordered in 1954.

The Crown Agents only submitted the account last year and this sum is a revote.

The Second Item is in connection with the new Statistical Service. The Statistical Adviser has examined the mechanical requirements of the statistical Office and has estimated that \$7,000 would be required to provide the necessary equipment. This equipment will most likely not be received before the close of the financial year, but it is necessary that funds be provided in order that an indent be sent forward.

I think all members will know, as they certainly should, that this Officer has taken up temporary occupation in the new offices in Bay Street. I was not present in the House when the original Resolution dealing with appointment of Mr. Seers was brought before the House. I was rather surprised to find that the distinguished honourable junior member for St. Lucy—I am sorry he is not in his place, although, claiming to be a shining light of the ancient University of Oxford—did not know that Mr. Seers was the senior lecturer in Statistics at that University. I thought he would have been able to enlighten the House as to what Mr. Seers has done and that we could consider ourselves lucky that the United Nations had been able to spare him to us. He has gone into the matter and he advises that we should use this system. It is in order to provide this office equipment that this money is asked for.

Mr. Seers has already taken up his duties. I promise the House that I shall keep them informed from time to time as to the progress of the work in this new Office. It is an Office which is long overdue, and the Service has started in the best possible office. I beg to move that Head II stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, when you read these two explanations together you will see that the Government is very scrupulous about making an Order without a vote from this House. I am asking them to see that this \$7,000 is put in the next set of Estimates; because on their own admission, they say that the goods would not arrive in the financial year. You have the explanation No. 1 that you ordered these special security boxes in 1954; you did not receive them, you made no provision in the Estimates for them and you got the Bill for them late last year. I am continually saying that when you present these things in the House in this way, you do not give a correct idea of the financial position of the Colony. You should show at least that that is the amount of money you budgeted for and for that you have not received the bills.

To come here and say that at the end of the financial year you had budgeted for so much, you spent so much and the balance is so much, is not good enough. You are not taking your own admitted liabilities into consideration. You know you had an order out for four special security boxes; you must have had some sort of order down for them, because you admit that you wanted to place an order, and therefore you wanted the House to authorise it by voting the money, even although you know that in 1955-56 you are not going to spend it. It is time that these matters be attended to. In this case it is only \$210, but on another occasion it might be \$210,000 when it comes to budgeting for the Public Works Department or some other Department.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If honourable members go through the Estimates and would take note of those sums which are said to be revoted, they would know

exactly how much money has been voted in the Estimates and not yet paid out because it has not been possible to make an order or because you have the goods but you have not yet got the bill; and therefore, you have not been able to pay it. It is possible that you might be over scrupulous and have a separate portion of the Estimates in which you set out items like this where there has been a vote, and for one reason or another, the account has not been closed for the reasons I have just given. I might tell honourable members that when the Financial Secretary and myself were considering several portions of this vote, we each turned to the other and said that the honourable junior member for the City is sure to raise this point.

I would like to add something more because it might save me from answering other questions, as to what has happened to the Statistical Office.
3.55 p.m.

The sum of \$4,900 was voted in Supplementary Estimates 1955-56 No. 43 around the middle of November last year for the setting up of this Statistical Service. The note to that Resolution reads as follows:—

"In His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 30 of 1954, the Legislature was informed that consultations had taken place with the Chief Statistician at the Colonial Office and Mr. Dudley Seers of the United Nations Secretariat in connection with the establishment of a Statistical Service for the Island, and that as a result the Government had made application to the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration for the services of an expert to advise and train suitable local personnel to carry on the services.

Mr. Seers is due to arrive in the Colony about 12th November and funds are required to meet the preliminary costs of the project to the end of the financial year. This includes an estimate of the cost of clerical assistance and furniture which will be necessary for the establishment of the office. It will not be possible to prepare precise details until Mr. Seers comes, but it is desirable that funds should be available, when Mr. Seers arrives, so that there may be no delay in getting the work started."

The idea at present is not to collect new information; it is to get together all the information we have with regard to this matter and to make available that lot of statistics. Mr. Seers is also providing Evening classes in statistics twice a week under the training scheme. So far, 50 people are enrolled.

As I have said, Mr. Seers has recommended the machinery. These numbering machines are not sold, they are loaned out at a rental value by the manufacturers who keep a resident engineer to look after these machines (one is in Jamaica and one in Trinidad) and they will send one of them here. As I have said, they do not sell these machines. The rental of these machines and the wages of the mechanical staff would approximately be equal to the savings of the salaries of the Clerks who would have had to do this job manually.

Of course you can use these machines in other ways, just as for tabulating a census. As honourable members will remember, when we took the last census we had to send it to Jamaica to be tabulated. When we have our own machines we will be able to do the job.

Now, we do not know when these machines will arrive. There is a large and small one. We do not know whether they will get here by the end of the financial year. The delivery generally is three

months for the small machines and six months for the large ones, so that we know for certain that we will not get the large one, but maybe, we will get the small one before the end of the financial year. However, it is necessary to have this Resolution passed now so that the Crown Agents can order these machines.

I will bear in mind what the honourable junior member for the City said, but I would like to say that it is too late to put it in this year's Estimates. I do assure the honourable member that we do appreciate his saying that the Estimates are not drafted as they should be. It is not that we ignore the honourable member but as I hope honourable members will understand, when we are preparing the Estimates, time is also against us. It is not always possible for Departments to send them in before the end of the year and then, sometimes there is a delay in the printing of them; I will not say wilfully. However, this year, owing to the prevailing circumstances—the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and myself going away shortly—we have had to bring forward the date of presentation of the Estimates. They are actually ready now—they are now in the hands of the printers—and when we leave at the end of the week, the Estimates will be more or less ready for presentation to honourable members.

I would like just to say that the Technical Assistance Administration of United Nations is providing us with some of this equipment and information to help Mr. Seers establish this Statistical Office by way of statistics and subscriptions to the leading academic periodicals. The total value of this gift is \$1,000 (U.S.). I should like to take this opportunity to thank the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration for this great gift.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the Hon. Premier to know, as he has said on a previous occasion, that I am glad that I have afforded the Government a laugh. I hope it is a serious laugh. I quite realise the difficulty of printing the Annual Estimates in time and waiting until the last month to fill in something. However, the honourable member will remember that this is something ordered in one financial year and has come in the next financial year; but there are things like this that skip two financial years. Of course I quite agree that if one year's vote catches up, it equals out.

I would like to ask the Hon. Premier if this gentleman in accepting pupils for his class is confined to those people who work in the Civil Service or if he would accept the members of this House of Assembly and the general public? I would also like to know if there are any fees attached to it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have forgotten how many members there are of the Opposition, but I think it an excellent idea for all of them to go along and learn something. Speaking without the book, I should be inclined to think that Mr. Seers cannot possibly take classes for other than Civil Servants. He is here to set up a Statistical Office for the Government of Barbados. He is still an Official of United Nations but he is here to help the Government set up this Statistical Office and obviously he cannot have classes for the general public.

Mr. LEWIS: I am glad that the Opposition can go along and learn something. If the honourable member had said that all members of the House can go, I was going to suggest a couple of members of the Government and I would like the Hon. Premier to be assured that I had him in mind.

4.05 p.m.

Head XXIII (2)—General Hospital

Head XXIII—General Hospital—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next Head is for the sum of \$2,375. The Note to the Resolution reads as follows:—

"The sum of \$2,550 has been found inadequate to meet commitments up to the end of this financial year. The increased number of burials, mainly of children whose parents claim inability to pay for burials, is the principal cause of the anticipated increase under this Item. It is also necessary to meet the insurance on a new station wagon for the Hospital. It is estimated that an additional sum of \$2,375 will be adequate. Supplementary provision of this amount will, therefore, be necessary."

Therefore this sum is estimated. If honourable members want more information as to this vote, I am sure that information coming from a Medical man is infinitely more and infinitely better than coming from me, and so I ask the Minister of Social Services to explain.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in seconding this I would like to explain that a Medical man does not like to have anything to do with burials. But sir, honourable members will remember that not so long ago there was an epidemic of children's diseases, such as whooping cough, and things of that sort, and as the Hospital buries the children (and adults too) of people who are unable to pay funeral expenses, as the result of this increase of deaths of children, this vote to supplement the amount has become necessary. I may add this, sir, that my Ministry is taking this opportunity to investigate the cause or reason why many of these burials should not be done at the expense of the parishes from which the children of the poor people arrive. In St. Michael this is done, but I am told by the Hospital authorities, sir, that very often they have difficulty in finding relatives of the dead, and are forced to meet this demand for the interest of public health. But as I said Sir, we are investigating it, and probably might have to come to this House for legislation in the near future.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, arising out of this I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Health the absolute necessity of introducing some legislation for a penalty to be placed on mothers who neglect their children. I am reliably informed by more than one Medical Officer that the high infantile death rate in this country may be cut down if a penalty was made for Barbadian mothers. The majority are humane people and love their children: but they are some who are absolutely neglectful of their children. One doctor told me that he performed a *post mortem* on a child eight months old covered with sores, who had died from starvation and had never seen a doctor. Barbados is full of Medical Institutions; for instance, in the eleven parishes, I think, there are thirteen or fourteen public Medical Officers, eleven Poor Law Inspectors, where mothers may apply for a certificate for her child to be examined; and consequently there is no reason for the continuing high death rate. And, Sir, arising out of this I would like to bring the seriousness of it to the Minister. He knows I have always talked on this subject and I do believe that a lot of neglect is only due to ignorance. One Acting Medical Officer here in St. John said it would take 100 years before the average mother of those children became aware that early deaths are not absolutely necessary. Well, I told him I certainly did not envisage that it would take 100

years before they are aware of such a necessary social service. I was not so pessimistic as the doctor appeared to be. He was a new man, I admit, but he impressed upon me that too many cases of infant mortality was due to absolute neglect. They bring their children when they are dead, and unless some penalty is introduced and an example is made of a few either seriously ignorant or seriously indifferent mothers, that state of affairs will continue to the absolute disgrace of this country.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You know, sir, I am surprised that the honourable member said that the Acting Medical Officer had only been here for a short time, because a lot of them come here for a short time and make statements which they know nothing at all about. I do not think that Barbadian women are any more unmindful of the duties to their children than anywhere else in the world. My own experience, is, sir, that they are more mindful. Let me remind the honourable member who has just spoken that this is due to the economic position of the people in the country. It is true that from the statistics of the General Hospital you will find that a number of children die from malnutrition and starvation, but is that purely due to the mother's neglect? I would take on any public officer in this country who would get up and make such a sweeping statement not knowing the background of the women.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of correction. I particularly said, that the majority of mothers in this country were humane people, but that some of the infant mortality was due to the neglect of some mothers. I am not afraid of the electorate, I am not afraid to say that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I wonder why he thinks I should be afraid. I am not afraid of any member. I only said that some of them were talking about something they knew nothing about. What they know is, when a child come before them and then dies, it died of malnutrition. Mothers are mindful of the condition of their children, but what I am about to say is this: if the well-to-do and better-off women in the colony would come out and associate themselves with the various clinics and talk, speak to, and lecture, and let the ordinary woman in the street feel that she is still a woman, things would be different. But the average woman in this country as soon as she finds herself in a position well removed from the economic position of her sister, stands aloof; she forgets that she is just the same woman. Now, when you get up and tell me that it is partly due to carelessness and neglect, I ask you, neglect in what respect? A child is brought into this world and it is partly the duty of the country to provide the necessary assistance to keep the child alive. I do not think anyone would say that with my experience—the Minister for Health and the Premier would support me on this—they do not know more about this than I do, because I see more of this than any individual member of the House, but many of us who are in a better position would look and say they are unwanted and we should introduce birth control. Of course, you cannot let them die. But those of us who hold a public responsibility should see that whenever they go they should get some help, because the father might be, in many cases, and those are the cases the Medical Officer gentleman spoke about, receiving the proper income and refusing to support the child. In many cases, the father is unknown; but for God's sake the child is there and so long as it is there it is wanted. That is the spirit we have got to adopt, and therefore, sir, I cannot allow the honourable member to make such remarks and to let them go unchallenged.

4.15 p.m.

Therefore, although I do not think that the honourable member meant any harm, I could not allow those remarks to go unchallenged, without giving my own experience. I have never found, except due to ignorance, any mother in this country wilfully neglecting the care of her child. In any of the cases which the Medical Officer spoke to the honourable member about,—children having diseases other than malnutrition—I am sure that it was purely a question of ignorance on the part of a mother in not taking the child in the early stages of the disease for proper treatment. However, as time goes on, and there is a greater appreciation of public help, and when you get in our midst humane doctors like the doctor which you have at the Speightstown Health Centre—because all doctors are not humane, some are only mercenary—but when you get doctors such as you have at the Speightstown Health Centre, then there will not be that attempt at sneering at some unwashed or apparently unwanted person who may turn up in an office and not be given the necessary care and advice.

I say that what is needed more than a doctor's care and attention would be the dissemination of knowledge by the more well-to-do and well-informed women who could do more social work. Just the other day, a social worker from another colony said that it was a pity that you did not have more of our local ladies banding themselves together to do more social work. That is not a thing which the Government should do; the Government might put up the money for various things, but this is something which, to my mind, more women should band themselves together and do.

Mr. Chairman, weekly I deal with an average of over one hundred children. I will say this: nothing in my political life or in Party politics will prevent me from taking the best from any side of this country to give assistance in my public duty. Nearly a year ago in an interview with the Press I invited women who would be interested to sit in with me and see the dozens of children and give their advice and help. I am referring to women who are living well, with their husbands and enjoying good salaries; but unless it is a question of attracting the Government and getting an M.B.E. or something like that, there is no interest at all. No one wants to think that you should ask women of one particular race to come down and assist; there are our own women who have had education and who find themselves successful in life, who should give more of their time and assistance to their fallen brother. Some of us will jump through the windows of the House of Assembly if we see some women assist the poor black people. With the greatest respect for their skill and ability, when medical officers come here and cast any aspersions on our women because they find themselves faced with poverty and children in many cases, well, the doctors are so far removed from the people that when they turn up with their children, they would rather throw a bucket of water on them and chase them out of their premises. When a doctor says that this child has pneumonia or bronchitis—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should address the Chair. It appears as if he is addressing the gallery.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Whom am I addressing? I really do not follow you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Order!

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You would be glad if you had a cow's skin! [Laughter]. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, when doctors come here and they diagnose that children are suffering from whooping cough or some other disease, they come from countries where

public health standards are superior, and they will make a statement that it is criminal neglect in women in not taking their children to a doctor. A doctor will make that statement in good faith, but in many cases, it is a question of ignorance.

You have a lot of Barbados Scholars having been educated at the expense of the people of this colony; I ask you one straight question; with all these women with starving children, you cannot show me one Barbados Scholar who is a doctor, who came back here and said: "Let me go to Queen's Park, let me go to the Parochial Buildings and have these children together and attend to them because it is the pennies of all these people which have educated me, therefore let me attend to these children—

4.25 p.m.

Then one walks back here and tells you straight and plain that that is criminal neglect. That is the whole trouble. I am going to support this Resolution but I do not agree with the statements of the honourable member.

With regard to the last point raised by the Hon. Minister of Social Services I am glad to hear him say that in the parish of St. Michael that they have carried out their obligations.

Now this is something which I have seen myself. I do not see how the Hon. Minister of Social Services will be able to remedy this matter. As you know, children or even adult persons are sent from Alms-houses to the Hospital (I am talking of the very poor people) and they might die soon after they have been admitted from some operation or some complaint. How can you get in touch with the mothers of those children or the nearest relatives of those adults easily soon after the death when you know that there are no easy means of communication to get to them? It is not for one moment that those people, however poor they may be, are shirking their responsibility. If I may give you an example: suppose the mother of such a child is working at Bawdens in the field for her living. You know as well as I do Mr. Chairman, our Barbados. She is in the field working; her child is in the hospital dead and there is no telephone in her house. Sometimes the only means to notify her would be by a telephone message to the nearest doctor and you know as well as I do that he is not going to take up any body and send them out to tell her in the field. What the Hon. Minister said is absolutely correct.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services has had some experience abroad and he knows that you cannot take the stand which an honourable member took in a parish. What I wish to say is that we in these days should make an effort to allow for a more decent burial of paupers. I was surprised myself when this Resolution came to this House to learn that it was only eight or nine dollars for the burial of an adult and four or five dollars for that of a child. I can tell you that there are cases where many persons turn up at the Hospital and ask to be given the box in which the burial of their relative is to be made so that they could ask an undertaker to put a little paint on it to make it look a little tidier; what I will call closer to civilisation. I hope the Hon. Minister will in some way in the not distant future try to remedy this horrible situation. I do not mean to say persons who are buried under those circumstances do not get the same burial rites as any other person, but you know how badly it looks when a person is buried in just a plain box. I am sure when Government raises this contract to \$10 or \$12 more for burials they are going to make the relative of the deceased feel they belong more to civilisation. Do you know what it means if you can put a little paint and

a little handle on to that plain box in which you now bury those persons? Let me say that sometimes after the relatives are notified they turn up at the Cemetery and they see the horrible situation. I want the honourable senior member for St. John to realise that while I am in sympathy with his sentiments, I do not believe he intended to convey the idea that our women in Barbados are unmindful of their duties and more so than women in other parts of the world. I therefore have to rise to let the public know the real facts of this case. It is a fact that when people are placed in the economic position of these poor people that they can do very little more than what they are doing under the circumstances.

Let me take this opportunity to say that some time ago the Minister of Social Services discussed with me the question of giving milk to children between the ages of their birth and the time they get into school; and with reference to that question of malnutrition I will say that what we decided on will help tremendously those children because indeed what I have observed is that a number of them never have been given any milk at all during that stage of their life. Their mothers cannot possibly get it for them and they do not get any until they are able to go to school.

Secondly, I am going to make a suggestion which I hope will be taken very seriously. I hope that more women who find themselves in a better position than these poor unfortunate mothers will come out and discuss and take an interest in helping these poor unfortunate people, in one way or the other not only with the hope of attracting Her Majesty the Queen for an honour but purely for the love of womanhood and for raising it to a better standard. You know Mr. Chairman, as Miss Audrey Jeffers has said, it is striking that only Mr. John Beckles could be the pioneer in this respect, but I realise that it takes a lot to do this work. I will never forget this incident. I remember many years ago that Mr. John Beckles sent out his first calendar which he had to advertise his business, the Barbados Dye Works, he had two small black children pictured on it and a lot of well-to-do people turned up their noses at that calendar. You just must have a love for this sort of work. If you go to the Nightengale Home you will find that there are about 48 children; if you go to the St. Michael's Almshouse you will find that there are 68. It may be surprising to you to know that people will go into the St. Michael's Almshouse to look at those children and of the number that are there you get about seven who are fair-skinned. When those people especially when they are black women go there to visit them, you will never see any of them take up a black child; they will take up any of the fair ones. They just do not like the black children, or so it seems to me. Is not that surprising? My criticism might sound a bit funny but it is true. I want to say again that it is not true to say that these mothers have neglected their children. This doctor who has reported in that direction, whether he comes from Honolulu or not, let him understand that he must learn more of this country before he makes those remarks.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, were I on my guard I would not have given the honourable member that golden opportunity that he so readily grasped to raise one of his usual rants about certain topics. I never for a moment suggested that it was the neglect of the general woman of Barbados that caused the high rate of mortality, but in order to say that he does not agree with me, he had to imply that I made state-

ments that I never made. Of course, the most serious statement he made is about the ignorance which obtains among many poor mothers regarding the health of their children, but I rise on my feet to draw to the attention of the Minister of Health that a penalty for those women whose neglect of their infants could be substantially established should be on the Statute Book. Sir, I was told of a *post mortem* by a doctor on a child eight months old covered with sores suffering from starvation, and it had never seen a doctor. Now that kind of ignorance would not prevail, I am sure, if she knew that there was a possibility of her suffering some penalty at the hands of the law.

I have not missed an opportunity to deplore the high mortality rate, and I know a lot is caused through poverty. I have criticised bad housing as being a contributory cause to the high infantile mortality rate, but if neglect is also a contributory cause, I am saying there should be a penalty for that neglect. I am not saying more, but as regards the statement of how neglectful doctors are, I was a dispenser at one of the Almshouses and this sweeping statement of how neglectful doctors are where children are concerned, is not fair to the medical profession. I have seen and witnessed the diligent attention paid by medical officers to children brought to them almost too late, therefore the sweeping statement about neglect is not fair to the general run of parochial medical officers.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not say that any parochial medical officer was neglectful.

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN: The hon. member said "medical officers," and parochial medical officers are included. Anyway that was the general impression I got. This medical officer said you cannot take people and treat them like a donkey. The S.P.C.A. prosecuted a man for ill-treating a donkey, and yet infants can die without seeing a doctor and nothing is done to the mother. So I am only drawing to the Minister of Health's attention the necessity that such a penalty should exist. I am not afraid to say that some of these neglectful cases are contributory. Some of these people should never have children.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The majority of women where children are concerned are excellent people; the only thing wrong is that there is poverty, but they would go to the gates of hell to help their children, so I cannot let that remark go unchallenged.

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN: I am not afraid to say there are some who are neglectful of their children, and totally indifferent to them, and I feel this penalty should exist. That cruelty, that slaughter of the innocents caused by neglect should be punished. I am repeating this; I know there is poverty, I know all that, I know they need more attention, but neglect through ignorance should be remedied.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, less anyone may repeat anything the honourable member has said, fifty-one years ago—on December 10th, 1904,—an Act was passed, the same as that used in the United Kingdom, for the Prevention of Cruelty to children and that does not apply only to mothers, but anyone over the age of 16 years who has the custody of a child, may be arrested if there is any reason to suspect there is cruelty. Thirty years at the Bar has made me realise that if you look at an American or United Kingdom Newspaper, you will read of more instances in those places of neglect and cruelty than you can possibly find in Barbados. The Law is there. A magistrate can see that a child can be taken from a mother or grandmother and given to another relative if there is enough proof that the child is neglected, so there is no question of law being made. I go further and say this: it would be remarkable for a doctor to say a child died from malnutrition and did not acquaint

the Attorney General. [A VOICE: That is nonsense.] If a doctor knows that a parent has neglected its child and does nothing about it, it makes it possible for the honourable member to say what he said, that there should be a penalty attached. Anyway, this debate is lasting infinitely too long, and I got up to draw attention to the fact that a Law does exist.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All that is well and good; and for the Medical Officer to find that so many children die of malnutrition, ask the Minister of health what the Report on the Hospital was. What percentage died from malnutrition? Malnutrition does not mean neglect so when the hon. member says that they should be prosecuted, you cannot do that. Malnutrition might be too much of one thing and not enough of the other. He knows a law is there, but as to the question of cruelty, treating a child cruelly is a different thing from when a child is suffering from a disease and is carried to the doctor.

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN: Despite the lengthy debate, I want to say that there should be some form for the Medical Officer to fill out and send to the authorities as for the cause of death, and on that form there should be some room to say whether the child had seen a doctor; otherwise that type of neglect would go on forever.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: There was a time when I had my part to play in here and I said that somebody of influence should start an organisation for the prevention of cruelty to children. I am glad that the honourable member came very near to it by referring to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and I think it would be a lot of good in preventing cruelty; but penalising people is a very serious thing. If a mother has neglected her children, what is the penalty? Do you make her pay a fine or put her in jail and let her neglect the rest of her family? I think we should get a society to deal with this matter. This is a serious matter, but I do not think the method of dealing with it is to have punishment in your mind.

The question that Head XXIII (2) General Hospital stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the acting allowances, I know it is difficult to estimate, but all along what we seem to get is a high percentage of what is estimated. There must be something wrong. There are instances in which you know of people who are going on leave because their leave is due; but 20% is a big increase. I do not know whether these contingencies which cannot be foreseen justify it; I have on several occasions tried to get information in this connection and I think that 20% is quite a lot and every year it happens.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This matter has not gone unnoticed by the Executive Committee, but it is rather difficult to estimate what is going to happen, as the honourable member has said. When people go on training it is really difficult to estimate, but I do not think there is any carelessness in asking for the original estimates.

The question that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation

Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter of Civil Aviation, I would like to take this opportunity of drawing to the notice of the Committee and the Honourable Minister of Communications that I have been informed that at Seawell Airport which is regarded as an International Airport on the basis that it runs for twenty-four hours a day, something is wrong there. It has been drawn to my attention that the number of hours during which the staff is required to work are excessive and the Air Traffic Control Officers are required to perform duties which these officers should not be asked to perform. I feel that is in the interest of the Public that I should draw this matter to the attention of the Committee and of the Hon. Minister; because if any untoward incident takes place, one of the criticisms which would be made is that these Air Traffic Control Officers have been working beyond the hours which have been laid by international standards.

All international airports see that their Air Traffic Control Officers do not sleep and if you have these officers in the Tower not being fit to give proper directions to aircraft arriving here, that would be too bad for this Island. I do not believe that any cheap, parsimonious attitude should be adopted; you have spent quite a lot of money at this Airport and then you do not provide the staff with the hours which are laid down by international standards. That is an injustice to the people who have to travel.

The question that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that a Resolution for the sum of \$21,683 do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

GRATUITY TO THE WIDOW OF THE LATE CLERK

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$5,760 as a gratuity to Mrs. Sarah Sarjeant, widow of the late Mr. D. Lee Sarjeant, former Clerk of this House. Hon. members will remember that sometime ago this House passed an Address to the Governor-in-Executive Committee asking them to send down this Resolution. I do not think that I need say anything more about it; we all know that we had a Clerk who died in harness and left a widow. In accordance with the law, one year's emoluments are granted as a gratuity to his widow. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that earlier in the afternoon I had asked for leave to move for the suspension of the Rules in order to deal with a Money Resolution and a Bill. We did not have twelve members present in the House and therefore I had to postpone the matter. I now beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended in order to deal with the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: So far as the Resolution is concerned, that is a different matter, but I am not supporting the question of dealing with the Bill today. This Bill is not a matter of emergency and I think that the Public should be given an opportunity of reading this Bill and of seeing what it implies. I would like these two motions to be put separately; otherwise I will vote against both of them.

Mr. LEWIS: There is one little point which I would like to draw to your attention; it is this: it would be well if a vote was taken and that you, Mr. Speaker, cast your original vote.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If you so desire, Mr. Speaker, I will put the motions separately. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is at present constituted of 12 hon. members and the hon. junior member for St. Peter has voted against the motion, therefore under the Rules of the House the motion cannot be allowed at all. The Hon. Minister can deal with the Resolutions by his moving the suspensions of Rules 88 and 89 but as he has also moved the suspension of the Rule 60 I cannot allow the motion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw from my motion the suspension of Rule 60.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

5.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House when it goes in Committee to deal with the Resolution of which notice was given to-day.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

General Post Office

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$10,890. As honourable members will see from the Addendum, the request has been made under various Items and the notes to them explain quite fully the purpose for which the amounts

are sought. Except any honourable member needs any further explanation, I am going to move that this Resolution do now pass. I leave it to honourable members to raise any question which they so desire and as far as the information I have available I will in reply inform them accordingly. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, in the first explanation we have here, I take it that the Government is responsible for these notes and for the actual drafting of them, and we have here — the first time I have ever seen it — “there has been a great increase in the volume of mail handled, and it has been found necessary to work overtime frequently and for long periods owing to inadequate clerical staff.”

Mr. Chairman, that is a serious thing. This is a most essential service, and if the Government itself can come here with an explanation which says they have inadequate staff, it is their duty to let us know that some notice is being taken and that it will be remedied. When it comes to explanation (2) that you have issued more licences to stamp vendors, and when you say that this has resulted in an increase in the sales of stamps, that cannot possibly be true. Do you mean to tell me that because you have more stamp vendors you sell more stamps? Are more people writing more letters as a result of this? It is true that more people left the place in the last year and more correspondence has taken place as a result. You sell more stamps to put on the money orders the people are sending out here. How can you say it is the volume of stamp vendors that has caused an increase of sales? That is not so. It is a result of emigration that you have more correspondence, and let us say so; and the Post Office now, in spite of having other people selling stamps, has to handle the letters and it should be adequately staffed. It is one of those services that the Government should understand. If the Post Office lost money, you had no right looking at it that way. Every cent you get in income tax money comes through the Post Office. All the businesses in the island are run through the Customs, and the Post Office. Cut you off in a place where you cannot write a letter at all and see how much business you can do. You could not do any business at all. Cut off these communications and see what would happen. Nobody would get any documents to pass things through the Customs and they would have to shut down. This is a service which you cannot look at like a business. What right have you to regard the Post Office as a business. It is a necessary service you are rendering to the public and you get back every cent you lose on it. You budget for \$3,000 in the Estimates and end up with \$30,000. It is the most expensive inland postage in the world; 3c. and 4c. for a letter; and you can send an airmail letter to any of the other islands, and for me to get a sealed envelope just in Bay Street, you have to pay 4c. for it, and you can send an air letter form to any of the other West Indian islands for the same four cents, and the labourites in the island did not know that as soon as they were gathering strength they changed from one cent postage for an open letter to two cents and then to three cents. We should understand that it wants more staff, and I am asking the Minister to see to it. It is a most necessary service and it should not be understaffed, we want a proper building for the Post Office; and another thing is that the Post Office collects about \$1½ million a year for the Customs, and the Post Office has to pay the Clerks. The Parcel Post Department is paid from the Post Office,

and handed over from the Customs. It is only some international convention that makes goods coming through the Parcel Post Department a Post Office matter and not the Customs, but the Revenue is credited to the Customs. However, I am telling the Minister, this is not a statement that was made outside, this is a statement of fact; and when the Government can come in with a vital service like this, and tell us "owing to inadequate staff . . ." this is a serious matter. I have no doubt that we will put this right. It is good to see we have a healthy Post Office and that you are having a lot of letters.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I entirely support the criticisms of the Deputy Speaker in regard to the inadequate staff, because as we know with this large number of boys leaving Harrison College, and Combermere with their G.C.E. Ordinary level certificates and the bright boys from the Leewards, so many of whom are seeking employment, there is no justification for the most temporary inadequate staff in any Government office, because the material is there and surely Government realises this is a paying Department and they have the material to hand. There is no justification at all to say it is necessary to work overtime owing to inadequate clerical staff. I wonder why the voice of the Union has not been heard as regards this matter of working overtime and for long periods. We have more than enough people to fill the Post Office, yet we have our staff working overtime frequently and for long periods. That is a lamentable position, and as quickly as it can be remedied I suggest we had better remedy it and see that it does not happen again. This has been happening for a long time. Does the Labour Department know how Government offices are staffed and how they are employed for long periods? Perhaps the Labour Department is inadequately staffed; but there must be something wrong, and the Government can give us no account of what is going on there. Now sir, Item (2); there is reference to the additional licenced stamp vendors. I would suggest that as many as possible be appointed. You will find in many cases suitable people are willing to become licensed stamp vendors, but the commission paid by Government is not enough. 5% is not sufficient. For people dealing with a £10,000 property, 5% commission is something substantial, but 5% commission for fulfilling a social service in a country district by selling stamps certainly deserves a reasonable commission, and 5% is far below what is reasonable. And then, sir, in considering item (5) with reference to the rate of compensation payable in cases of damage to or loss of parcels, I am rather mystified to know what happens to parcels. I know of a case in which a friend of mine was sent by a relative in the U.S. a parcel containing a ham, and the people at the Post Office would not allow him to get the parcel and quoted the reason as stated in a circular that the parcel contained an imported product which is not permitted by the senior Veterinary Officer. Fancy, Mr. Chairman, a ham bought in the States and sent out here to a poor relative, and then to hear this from the Postmaster General! As a matter of fact, the person was invited to pay the postage to send it back to the United States. I wonder what kind of ham the senior Veterinary Officer took this Christmas? And Sir,—I am told this—when the person to whom it was addressed went to the Post Office, there was this little tag outside marked "ham." I know cases in which people from the United States have sent hams to people in Barbados, but they had other things in the parcel and the parcel was marked "groceries".

5.45 p.m.

Unfortunately, in this particular case, the little tag "ham" appeared there and the Senior Veterinary Officer, (according to the Postmaster General) says that this is an inadequately cooked pork product; and reference was made to the number, F.-4341. The importation of which is subject to the Animals (Importation) Control Regulations 1951. The only thing about it is that, as you know, people boil hams; but that did not suggest that this ham was inadequately cooked. It is hard on our people to receive a ham from the United States of America and for it to suffer that fate. This is a matter which requires attention before the next Holiday.

I think that those are the major points which I would like to bring to the attention of the Government. I suggest that they reconsider this amount of the commission which is paid, because it is entirely inadequate and it affords no encouragement to people who do the service, which would be of great convenience to the people in the rural areas. But 5% up to a sixpence is too small to make this thing worth while. People cannot hope for M.B.E.'s for doing this service.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When one reads this note, one will see that there has been a great increase in the volume of mail which is handled, and it has been found necessary to work overtime frequently and for long periods owing to inadequate clerical staff, and they need an additional amount of \$6,000. I am not here to advise the Government on Labour matters, but this is an elementary thing. Here it is that you are spending \$20,000 per annum in overtime pay, and in the note to this Resolution you say that one of the reasons for that is that there is not an adequate clerical staff. Do you realise that you are paying clerks at the rate of \$600 a year? You can clearly see that an amount of \$6,000 is equivalent to one year's salary for 10 additional clerks. There is a Resolution for increasing the staff of the Post Office by this amount, but that is the temporary staff which they will use as permanent staff. When you read the Resolution in respect of the Civil Establishment Order, you will see that that increases the number of the permanent establishment which they now have, but it would not really increase the staff. They are putting on the permanent establishment those whom they now have on a temporary basis. They will be putting on an Assistant Postmaster General, Supervisor, Long Grade Clerk and Postman; I take it that this note means that these eleven people are the number which they now need, and these will be put on the permanent establishment.

If it is so that your overtime work is of such a character that you must increase the staff to cope with it; if your mails are coming in late, no matter how big your staff is, you will still have to do overtime work. Therefore, you have to make provision for this overtime work. But it is stated in this note that one of the reasons for this frequent overtime work is on account of inadequate clerical staff. In Barbados no Government Department has any right to say, in a community like this, where you are putting up a big Emigration Department, and you have a Liaison Officer in the United States looking after the employment of Barbadians [the Liaison Officer is getting as much as the Premier] as in this Resolution that you are telling people you have inadequate staff in your Post Office and you are not allowing your people to get a job. Who is responsible for this type of thing? It is nonsensical. You are telling people that you have an inadequate clerical staff and you have to pay for overtime work; at a time when there is a shortage of work, you have to make people do overtime work! In this colony when you have people who can do this work, what is the use of sav-

ing that there is a shortage of work? When there is this note stated in the Addendum, it makes the Government look stupid. You could not employ five Clerks to do the work in this House, but in the Post Office where the work is such that it will require more people to do it from time to time, why is it that you are making these people do overtime work because of the shortage of clerical staff? There should be a means of allowing employment to spread among those who are willing to get employment.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable junior member for St. Peter has answered the question raised by the honourable junior member for the City. It is known that every five or six years we have been using temporary clerks in this Department. Only a few weeks ago the Government decided to have additional staff in the Post Office; we are going to appoint an Assistant Postmaster General, a Supervisor, five Long Grade Clerks and six Postmen to that Department. We hope that they will take care of quite a lot of the temporary staff which is being used, but that will not prevent the Postmaster General from using additional staff if and when that is required. I believe that in all Post Offices you will find that there are times when it is absolutely necessary to employ additional staff, and therefore we cannot get away from having overtime work.

5.55 p.m.

However when these permanent offices are created it is hoped that overtime will be reduced considerably.

I should like to assure the honourable senior member for St. Lucy that it was not the Postmaster General's wish that those people to whom he referred did not get hams for Christmas. As a matter of fact, I know of a Minister who was also involved in the matter; a ham came to him and he could not get it out of the Post Office. These hams came here in parcels through the Post Office and under an Act, provision is made putting the power in the hand of the Government Veterinary Officer to prohibit the importation of ham, pork and meat from certain countries which are affected with foot and mouth disease and swine fever. There is also a similar Act in Trinidad, Jamaica and other colonies in the West Indies. I would like to assure the honourable member that we did go into the matter although we had the advice of the Veterinary Officer and the Director of Agriculture that it was inadvisable to allow these hams to be landed. They argued that the island is small and should it occur that foot and mouth disease or swine fever, or both, get into the island, our animals would be affected and depieted as a result. Hon. members will also remember that was also the advice of the Advisory Council of the British Caribbean in Animal Health and Husbandry.

We could not go against that advice, because it is law. As I have said, the matter is put into the hands of the Veterinary Officer. We tried our best but we could not go against the advice of the expert. I am sure that if that advice was given to the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and other honourable members, they would have accepted that advice in the interest of the country as a whole and not of an individual or two or maybe more who might be deprived of a ham which might only be used at Christmas time. If the Veterinary Officer says that they are not to come into the Island, they cannot come in; and that is the position.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must apologise to the honourable member for speaking after him. I rise merely to make one or two observations on the last part of his speech. Let me say at once that all things which are lawful are not expedient. It

was a most pathetic thing to see those persons for whom hams were sent going to the Post Office to get them and then being deprived of them. It leaves one to wonder if the West Indies will ever grow up from the point of view of the various islands having their Government Officers who are not trained in the United States to respect the Public Health standards of the United States. Without any prejudice to the Hon. Minister, I want to say that there is hardly any stricter country in the world than the United States as regards its standard of public health. The Hon. Minister said that there is Foot and Mouth Disease in the United States. That will be so in any large country where you have a tremendous lot of stock, but does the Hon. Minister appreciate that with the standard of Public Health in the United States, not one of those hams or any piece of pork or whatnot that has been affected by that disease could find itself in any of the shops of the United States? It was most pathetic to find that the best hams which were put up by expert packers were not allowed to be taken out of the warehouse. One wonders whether these hams came from the United Kingdom and you had a similar occurrence what would be the position.

However, I am in sympathy with the Government, but I cannot see why power should be put in the hands of one man. Whenever you get an English graduate with the 18th century idea that American Universities and Schools and its Public Health standards are still behind hand, that graduate is only fooling himself. I can very well appreciate the Government's case. They say that they were not responsible but let me say this: all those people who are higher up and better off can bring in any amount of hams and you will not hear any Veterinary Officer saying anything. It was most pathetic to see the people to whom these hams were sent at the Post Office. My only argument is this: I wonder if Barbados can ever reach the standard of Public Health as that of the United States of America.

6.05 p.m.

Do you know that all the Medical Officers in these parts prefer to take their degree from Harvard or other Canadian and American Universities than in England, because the standard is so much higher? In America there is such a penalty for labelling something wrong that one has to be very well qualified. Do you imagine, therefore, that the United States Veterinary Department could let out any type of meat for human consumption that would be injurious to people's health? There is no possibility that such meat could get into the stores; the standard is too high and they themselves are too well qualified. You cannot even put a false advertisement in the papers, or an advertisement that would be misunderstood in the United States. Even with wearing apparel, you cannot put it in a store window and claim it is something else. Such a regulation still, Sir, should be so amended as to allow Government to exercise their authority. What I mean is this: if goods come into this country—pickled stuff or any other stuff for that matter—and any regulation which applies says it must be inspected, the Government has the authority to say whether it can be used for manure, animal feed or something of the sort. There is that power and I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture realises that. They must have been afraid that if anything happened they would be responsible. There should be Emergency Regulations that if an article is not fit for human consumption, it could be used for other purposes as long as it did not get into the hands of the wrong people. I regret that this has happened and a lot of people asked whether they could be sent to Grenada. I advised them to do so because if any thing can be got in Grenada and

the people in Grenada are more wide awake and at free will to let them in, I see no reason why we should not let them in here. But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that no one will fool the majority of people in this country. Fifty years ago if you came here and said Mr. X was a graduate of an American School or a Veterinary School, everybody thought he knew nothing of medicine, and that he was not much of a veterinarian; but today the position is somewhat reversed. It is amusing to find 21½% of people here who took their degree in England, would look down on a man from an American School with contempt, not realising fully that America and Canada have been spending large sums to get the best of everything. If this were realised, I envisage that the attitude would not be that unless a person was qualified in the United Kingdom there was nothing doing. We only have faith in that our public health standing is far removed from that in England. This is not the view of Mottley, but of other people in other parts of the world.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a rejoinder to the hon. senior member for the City. The least that the Postal Department could have done would have been a few months before, around September or so last year, to notify, by advertisement in the public press, people that the importation into Barbados from the United States of such items as hams would not be allowed, and people in Barbados whose friends had intimated that a ham was included in their Christmas hamper, would have been able to write to the people in the States and save them the expense and trouble in mailing it here. But the hon. senior member for the City makes the point larger than I have seen it. Hundreds of people sent hams to their relatives in Barbados because they realised that we were in a more stricken position than normally because of the hurricane, and were more in need of sympathy. By notifying them in the Press, they would have been able to advise against sending out these hams and nothing like that would have happened, because they would not be permitted to land here, and no action would have to be taken by the Veterinary Officer. These are the same hams that we would eat if we were spending our Christmas in the United States. As a matter of fact, Sir, some have come in parcels marked groceries, but the tags had dropped off. People should have been told in advance that they would not be allowed to land. You can imagine if somebody in the States promised you one, how you would feel when you go to the Post Office and were told you could not have it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform members in defence of the Postmaster that the hams were sealed among other things, and no one knew there were hams until the packages were opened and they were found.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of my Department, I am very happy to be here when this point is raised in connection with the restriction in so far as the importation of hams and uncooked beef and things of that sort are concerned. Well, I would first like to assure the honourable members who spoke on this point that this Government is as humanitarian as any other so far as matters pertaining to hams and that sort are concerned, and the welfare of the poor classes receiving such gifts at Christmas time as members have spoken, and every effort was made at a time in order to secure the receipt of these hams from the people from abroad who sent them, in order to see that their loved ones here spent a happy and good Christmas. But in the face of these points, I hardly think any Government could have turned a deaf ear to expert advice which came not only from the senior Veterinary Officer or the Director of Agriculture, but also from the

Advisory Committee on Animal Health and Husbandry, Forestry and Fisheries in the British Caribbean area and the advice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. And there is this point, Sir, that Barbados is free of Foot and Mouth Disease and Swine Fever, and in trying to develop the economy of the island, if Barbados is free from these diseases and we slacked up on these restrictions to satisfy the needs of a few, we would destroy the prospects for the thousands not for Christmas but for all Christmases; and when I think that the U.S.A. is already infected with Foot and Mouth Diseases and the people use hams from there, things may not be too good for Barbados.

6.15 p.m.

The point which has been laid by the honourable senior member for the City can be overcome, provided that Certificates are issued by the Ministry of Agriculture in the United States of America whereby hams which are sealed and properly stamped provide evidence and certification that they are free from such disease and they are cooked. It is then that those hams will be accepted. We know that many of these gifts, despite the Regulations, have been detected in parcels, and hundreds of these same hams were distributed during this very year. However, in the face of expert advice, this Government will not be found guilty of any act as result of which the population will suffer. The difficulty with these hams lies in the bone content. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: They can be boiled in soup.] And the disease remains in the bone content. We do not want any outbreak of swine fever and foot and mouth disease.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I quite appreciate what the honourable member has said. I think he should see that a notice is inserted in the Press to that effect and everybody will be able to keep their relatives informed as to the matter. That will make it very easy for people who want to send hams to their relatives here.

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

Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$230 to supplement the provision in respect of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute. The students at this Institute have been increased in number from 40 to 60. Barbados has four places and we will be granted six as from this year. As a result of the increase in the rates of salaries and wages paid by the Trinidad Government which would necessarily apply to the employees of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute the same salary scale and wages have been adopted. On account of that, the increase in cost is greater. We are asking for the sum of \$230 to supplement the money which was voted last year; a part of this money will be spent between January and March of this year. There is a little balance for contingencies.

In so far as the additional twenty places at the Institute are concerned, British Guiana will be taking ten. Barbados two and Trinidad will also be taking some. All of that will be the subject matter of another Resolution which will come before the House very shortly. We are asking honourable members not to embarrass this Institute by not voting this money. This money is needed, I repeat, as a result of the increased cost of the Institute. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

Harbour and Shipping

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$300 to supplement item 24 relative to the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department. As the Addendum explains, this application has become necessary since there has been an increase in the number of British and Foreign Warships that visited Barbados in 1955. The Addendum goes on to point out that the amount voted originally was \$600 and there is only an amount of \$43 remaining. It is expected that during the remainder of this financial year, there will be two ships visiting the island and the Harbour and Shipping Master has asked for a supplementary vote of \$300 for the entertainment of these Officers. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, time and again I have drawn the attention of the Government in respect of the expenditure of these funds to the discrimination which is exercised in the entertainment of these Officers. I have heard complaints — and they are fully justified, — time and again, that when these functions are being arranged — picnics, excursions, dances and so on — that only the minimum of our local coloured personnel receive invitations, and they are mainly those who would pass as white. Apart from this latter class, you do not have that proportion of undeniably coloured people whom you would expect to see at these functions. I should like to say that coloured girls would be just as pleased as the 'blondes' who are held for the entertainment of Petty Officers and other Ratings visiting Barbados.

I suggest that the hon. member call up the Government Officer who is responsible for these entertainments, and let that Officer show him the list of the local invitees to all of these functions. It is not enough just to say that the Y.M.C.A. or the Y.W.C.A. has undertaken it: It is a matter of showing the people who are invited to these functions. You would not think that the population of this Island is predominantly coloured when you look at the people who are invited to these functions. Our coloured girls like to take part in these sprees; every girl likes a sailor and when it comes to the expenditure of Government funds they like to take a full part in the entertainment.

6.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will promise the honourable member to report his remarks to the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

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

Hurricane Housing

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$291,010 according to the Schedule. Honourable members will remember that on the 3rd of this month a Resolution was passed to continue repairs to houses damaged by the recent hurricane "Janet". At that time I told honourable members that despite the check made by the Housing Board, the Government was prepared to make test checks in order to verify or otherwise, the report submitted by the Housing Board. I also said then that the Government would be coming back for more

money to repair those houses and I hope, as I have said at that time, that this will be the final instalment.

We have gone into the matter as carefully as we can and it has been decided in order to complete the programme that \$291,010 is needed. On the last check which was made, we find that there were 242 houses which were listed among those for repairs under our repairs programme but which have not qualified for repairs. Those houses apparently were in a bad state of disrepair, not from the hurricane, but from old age; and as a result those houses have been eliminated from the list.

Now, Sir, there is a breakdown of this \$291,010 in the Addendum to the Resolution. With the removal of the 242 houses which I have just mentioned from the list, we have now the figure of \$4,061 for repairs. I should mention that quite a number of these houses have been repaired because the figure of 4,303 was given on the 20th December last to be repaired. It is from that figure that the 242 is subtracted. With the removal of the 242 from that number, the figure on the 20th December would be 4,061. As is set out in the Addendum, it is felt that the sum of \$250,000 will cover the repairs for this number.

Now, you will also see in the Addendum to the Resolution that an addition of \$20,010 is required to reimburse plantations as part of the cost up to a maximum of \$200 for any one house for repairs carried out by them up to a total of 234 chattel houses. You will also find that the amount of \$15,000 is set down to assist in meeting the cost of repairs to houses which were done by the people themselves. As you know, at the time of the hurricane, we encouraged people to undertake their own repairs and we asked them to keep their bills so that Government will assist them. We have had quite a number of claims and, as you will see, there were 141 claims from small owners and the amount of \$15,000 has been agreed upon to reimburse to a maximum of \$200 for any one house for repairs carried out by those people. Let me say that the average cost of a house which was extensively damaged by the hurricane and repaired by the Housing Board is around \$150, so we felt that if in special cases we went to a maximum of \$200 to be given for repairs to any one house that will be as much as could be expected of the Government under the circumstances.

With respect to the \$291,010 which is to meet the claims from plantation owners who have repaired chattel houses, I should like to say that this amount is part of the claims put in by those people. Unfortunately, some plantation owners went ahead and spent on the repair of some houses more than what the Government could supply on a pre-fabricated house. One plantation owner spent as high as \$932 on the repair of a house. Well, that is not repairing a house: that is rebuilding a house and the Government would have supplied a pre-fabricated house, rather than spend that much sum in repairing, say, a 16 x 9 house.

6.35 p.m.

Consequently the Government has decided to pay a maximum of \$200 to that plantation and others who might have spent much more than that in repairing a house. The Government intends to reimburse to the tune of \$200 per house. These are the facts as stated. Now, Sir, the last one is the rehabilitation of Government Headquarters. We have actually spent \$6,000 in cleaning the premises after the hurricane victims left. As honourable members know that we have had to provide money — I think the Resolution was passed here on Thursday last — for the cleaning of schools and elsewhere,

in which victims of the hurricane were housed, and this was also necessary for cleaning up the Government Headquarters after the victims have left. It is felt that this is an appropriate charge against the Hurricane Fund; that is why it is included in this Resolution. That is as much as I would like to say at this stage on that part.

Now, sir, I just want to make a statement while I am on my feet. As the Committee will remember, when we had the Resolution before the House for \$200,000 to continue this work, the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, the honourable junior member for the City, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, and I think the honourable junior member for St. Peter took part to a lesser degree. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew accused me at that time, sir, of writing a letter to the Reverend Woodroffe whom he said was Chairman of the Hurricane Relief Organisation in that parish, dismissing him and putting in charge the honourable senior member for St. Andrew. I denied it flatly and I again want to publicly deny ever writing any letter, I would almost say, to any Reverend or any Chairman of any Hurricane Relief Organisation. I know that in my Ministry it would not have been done without my consent or my seeing it; therefore I did not ask whether a letter was sent. I got in touch with the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board and asked him if he sent a letter to the Reverend, or anybody connected to the Reverend, or the Chairman of that Organisation; and he assured me that he never wrote any letter to him transferring any authority. But what he did say was that originally the arrangements were made from the outset, and here I should like to say that the order which was given to this Hurricane Relief Organisation in the various parishes was given by the Acting Chief Secretary in the first instance. There is correspondence to the effect that these orders were given by him, because as you know, in the early stage, or at least in the Ministerial setup, Hurricane Organisation was placed rightly or wrongly under the Chief Secretary. He told me that originally the arrangements were made for the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, being a member of the Committee and apparently with the Reverend and other members of the Committee for convenience and otherwise, to store the material at that place; but it so happened that at a later stage—two or three weeks after—when the honourable junior member for St. Andrew wanted some lorry owner to participate in this business of running around repairing houses, he was told that he could not employ this man at that time because they had already employed two or three lorries, and they had a full complement. When told that, I understand that they attempted, without the Manager-Secretary's advice or instructions, to remove stuff from the home of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and take it to the Reverend's place and pay a watchman and so on; but he said that in as much as there was nothing wrong and everything was working satisfactorily and smoothly, the stuff should remain at the honourable senior member. I want to assure this House that there was no letter written by me to the Reverend or anybody. As a matter of fact, the reverse is the truth: that is to say, originally as I said, it started off with the material being stored at the residence of the honourable member, being a member of the Hurricane Relief Organisation and it was only long after they wanted to transfer it from there for the convenience of the honourable junior member of St. Andrew. These were the facts put to me and I want to deny

writing any letter to the Reverend transferring any authority. I am saying that if I had to do it for the interest and working and economy of any Department, I would not do it. But I want to assure this House, the Reverend cannot show that letter, and I do not believe he told anybody he had any letter; and all I want to say is I do not mind people cursing me, slandering and talking, but I still think in the interest of the dignity of the House, that members who claim to be responsible should not come to the House and out of spite, malice, viciousness and enmity, attack a member for something which they cannot justify to be the truth or which has not got an atom of truth in it. I want to say that quite frankly, Sir, and I appeal to members to get the facts and whenever you can, attack. I am willing to and can stand up to any attack, but you should have the facts and it does not speak well for these attacks to be made on members just because they may have some dislike.

I beg to move, sir, that this Resolution for \$291,000 do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion when we had a Resolution for this Hurricane Relief, I told the Minister who just sat down that they were not repairing sheds and I repeat that again to-day. When he got up and told me I did not know what was going on in Christ Church and that repairs to sheds were being effected, I was taken aback and I thought I must have made a mistake. I went out next day and took my pocket-book with me.

6.45 p.m.

I went into Fair View and I went to the houses one after the other and there was not a single person who said that the Government had repaired a shedroof in that district. Since then I have been around the Parish; there have been a few done where there has been a little siding applied; but there are still many which have not been touched. I went to one house on Sunday afternoon at St. Lawrence near the Graeme Hall swamp. I was called to see the condition of that house which was left unrepaired and the man was sheltering in one corner of it. The Housing Board had left it in that condition for the man to live in it. If the Government is repairing houses like that, then they had better stop now. The people are dissatisfied with the repairs. That is only one of many instances. The instructions to the foremen have not been that they should repair shedroofs. I do not know if that is done now, but when I spoke on the last occasion, it had not been done. Let the Hon. Minister get up here and tell me that it was a statement of policy on the part of the Government to repair shedroofs as well as frontroofs.

There are many cases in Christ Church in which only the front houses have been repaired and even then they have not been repaired properly. Up to this morning complaints were made to me that they have not completed the repairs to the ridging gutters and things like that. I know many people would want all the money spent on their houses but I am speaking of a general policy. Let the Hon. Minister tell the Committee that they have instructed the repair gangs to repair frontroofs, second roofs and also shedroofs. I claim that the size of a family should have been investigated and taken into account when a house is being repaired. It is unfair for seven and nine people to be living in a house and then they repair the house in such a way that where they were two roofs they only put back one. If you are doing that, then you should have said that from the beginning. There are many people who feel that the money will run out and they will be left in the cold.

There are many houses which were repaired, or rather an attempt was made to repair them, by the Public Works Department, and they were left over when Mr. Lashley took over the job. Now the owners of these houses are wondering whether they will have these houses completed. When these people go to Mr. Lashley, they are told: "Your house is not on the list", or "That house was started by the Public Works Department and we are nothing to do with it". Let the Government rectify that. I can take the Hon. Minister to the spot where houses have been started by the Public Works Department and the people cannot live in them. The Housing Board has not gone back to these houses and people are told: "The Public Works Department has done them and you must be satisfied". It is the duty of the Hon. Minister to investigate that matter and put it right. Nobody is going to be satisfied with that; we want fair treatment for everybody.

In the Addendum to this Resolution, there is Item (d) rehabilitation of Government Headquarters, \$6,000. That amount, I understand, is for the rehabilitation of the Ministerial Buildings which had been occupied by the refugees. You have \$6,000 for rehabilitating these buildings and they offer \$150 to the Vicar of St. Patrick's whose house was in a deplorable condition when it was left! How much have they given to Mr. John Beckles for his house? The people went in there and left it in a mess. Are the claims of these people to be looked after? This amount of \$150 will not rehabilitate this Vicarage. This matter has been the concern of the Vestry of Christ Church. There are many people in private houses who are in the same position because they did a service—and a wonderful service too,—which many of us did not do. I would like these people to be given some consideration.

Then we have the Item (c) assistance to chattel house owners who undertook their own repairs, \$15,000. I understand that only 141 claims have been sent in. Do not let the Hon. Minister fool himself that these 141 claims are all; there are many more people than that, but the people did not know where to make their claims. Do not let us think that this is the last Resolution which will be brought down; they will have to come down to this House for more money. When the Public knows that you have voted this money for those people who have effected their own repairs, then it will be discovered that this \$15,000 will not satisfy the bill.

It strikes me that something has either gone wrong in the past or it is going wrong now. You come here for more money and you are reducing the staff which is doing the repairs. Is it due to the inefficiency of the people to effect the repairs? You have come for more money, and a large sum of money too, and still you are reducing the staff! Is it a matter of economy or is it that the Housing Board cannot employ as large gangs as they used to employ? We all want these houses repaired as quickly as possible and therefore why should the staff be reduced?

I have heard it said that this Resolution will fix the whole lot of houses. It may be so if you continue to do what you have been doing all along, but I think a better job could, and should have been done. If the Hon. Premier wants to take the expenses of the hurricane relief rehabilitation up to London, then this is not enough. When he goes to London let him tell them that we have done the repairs and we are asking them for 50% of the amount. They have really done a bit of patch work and if you have a high wind, not a "Janet," many of these repaired houses will be blown down. If the Hon. Premier wants to take all the expenses for the rehab-

ilitation up to London, he is still in time; but let him tell them that in the opinion of the people who have been going around in the Parishes and who have seen the repairs, what he has brought up to London is only 50% of that estimate.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I just want to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister of Communications what I would call a grievance. I am sure he is not aware of it although he is responsible for it; but these things happen. He would not be aware of this thing because it is not a policy of the Government, but the policy of certain underlings of the Housing Board, who took it upon themselves to decree certain things. It has been brought to me as a grievance by certain people of St. John that the houses repaired by plantation owners have not been repaired adequately for the people in them and that these houses now need repairs. I want to know if it is the policy of the Ministry not to completely repair a house damaged by the hurricane or if that policy is something which has come from the supervisors. Let me say that the Government is not responsible for the hurricane "Janet", and if those people take it upon themselves to say "this is too much to do to this or that house," that is a false view. I want it forcefully brought to the notice of the Ministry that the plantation-repaired houses have not been repaired properly and the Ministry should bring it to the notice of the Housing Board that it is their duty to finish repairing those houses which were partially repaired by the plantation owners.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the last point of the last honourable member who spoke and am going to couple it with the point made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who said that he heard more complaints in the two worse damaged parishes as regards the repairs carried out by the Public Works Department. To the contrary, all the reports I have received are that the houses repaired by the Public Works Department were among the best done in the island. Also I know of nothing said against those houses which have been repaired by the Plantation Owners.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. When I said that there were complaints against the houses repaired by the Public Works Department, the complaints were with respect to those houses which were left unfinished owing to the fact that the workmen of the Public Works Department were called away in a hurry so that they did not finish their job. The complaints were not that the workmen were not doing a proper job. They anticipated that the Housing Board would have come and finished the repairs to the houses which they had left unfinished.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What should have been done was that they should have handed out a list of the unfinished houses to the new repair authority. The complaint which I have heard about in respect of houses repaired in early stages of the hurricane, which were those houses done by the Parochial authority, was to the effect that the Parochial authorities knowing that they would have been soon replaced by another authority only just put those houses back up and left them there. There is only one plantation in St. Philip which repaired houses of which I have had complaints and that, not surprisingly, is the Government-owned plantation, Dodds. The people who live in Dodds Plantation houses have complained to me that their houses were inadequately repaired; and that when the Central Government Housing Authority took over, the plantation manager stopped repairing them and since then nothing

has been done to those houses. I will therefore suggest to the proper authority that they investigate the position of those houses repaired at Dodds Plantation.

Much of the defects in the general operational policy complained of by the hon. junior member for Christ Church apply to St. Philip. About two and one-half months ago, I had occasion to comment on the fact that large families who could not fit in a small bedroom of a house and who were separated by having a room in the shedroof were now without accommodation in the shedroof because Government was only repairing the front part of houses and not shedroofs. On the last occasion when we debated this matter, the Hon. Minister of Housing said that it was Government's policy to repair shedroofs of houses; and although he was told that this was not the case in St. Philip or Christ Church, we have heard no statement today as to whether or not the Government intends to see to it that the policy of repairing shedroofs applies equally in St. Philip and Christ Church as anywhere else. It is totally unfair to expect those people to put back their shedroofs and kitchens, because they have not the money to do it. I believe that with the money which we are spending on these houses, we can afford to more properly repair these damaged houses.

Now with regard to this famous episode of the letters to which the Hon. Minister of Housing made reference, it is very unfortunate that neither the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, nor the honourable junior member for St. Peter who originally raised this question are in their seats today to reply to the Minister, because they were well informed of the matter of which they complained. They had all the information; and now that the Minister is refuting the allegations, they are unfortunately absent. All I want to know is this: in the case of St. Andrew, the Rector (I understand his name is Reverend Woodroffe) made a complaint to which exception was taken by the Hon. Minister on the floor of this House on the last occasion when we were discussing the replacement of damaged houses. The Rector claimed he had been told by the Minister of Housing to relinquish his control over the building materials he had and that the control would be passed into the hands of one of the members of this House. Similarly, the Reverend of St. John the Baptist complains (I think his name is Reverend Clementson). I am told that the Rector of St. Andrew and Reverend of St. James made the complaint that they devoted their services freely and unselfishly to this cause and suddenly they had been supplanted by other authorities and in the case of the latter gentleman, he had been told that the honourable senior member for St. James would be in control.

7.05 p.m.

And, Mr. Chairman, you can bear me out if it is true that the Churchwarden of St. Joseph received similar treatment. I mentioned these things, because that is the information I had from the Vicar of St. John the Baptist, the Rector of St. Andrew and the Churchwarden of St. Joseph. Now, I do not want this Committee or the public to get the idea that because none of their original people who made the allegations are present today, that these accusations are as unfounded as the Minister wants to make it appear; because we will hardly get people with the responsibility of the Rector of a parish and the Churchwarden and Vicar of an important Church complaining against this summary and discourteous treatment if it were not true.

I am saying, sir, that it is all well and good for the Minister to get up here and say that these accusations are lies, because he probably does not know what a lie is; because the members who made those complaints did it because they were informed as to what they said and they regard it as their duty to bring it to the notice of this House.

Now, with regard to the money we are again voting to-day, another \$291,000, I want to say again that we are spending a lot of money and nobody will grudge the expenditure providing this money was being spent in the manner and for the purpose for which we vote it. I received a complaint from the parish of St. Philip, from people who are still living under the most unsatisfactory conditions. I can think of a family in the Almshouse pushed among the sick up there, and left to live as best they can for months and cannot get their house to live in; and people who never had a house before the storm have received pre-fab houses, new houses. Up to yesterday a man came to me and said, "Do you not think it is a shame we were living in a house before the storm; my wife never had a house. She and I are not together now, but she has got a pre-fab house—how did she get it?" I understand that pre-fabs are for people who had houses which were completely destroyed or were not capable of reconstruction after the hurricane, and I do not think that it is fair for any Parochial Authority to use his influence to get new houses for people who never owned a house before the storm and who are not entitled to one. So far as I know, most of the regulations governing the expenditure of this money are broken in St. Philip. People who are in rented houses, have had their houses repaired, and when they go back to them they have to pay more rent, although the owners have not spent a cent to reconstruct them. As regards others of the people who are in rented houses and were in Government shelters after the storm their houses have been repaired and they are not allowed to go back in them by the owners, and the housing authorities have done nothing about it. But I do wish that an investigation will be made as to the manner in which these new pre-fabs are being distributed, and a check made to find how many people have, who according to the Government policy are not entitled to pre-fabs. If that check is made, the Government will be surprised at what is happening.

Now, there is only one final point for today, and that is this: paragraph 4 of the Addendum of this Resolution states that:—

"As the Government Headquarters had been used as a Hurricane Shelter for two months, a certain amount of repainting and rehabilitation had to be undertaken. It is estimated that a sum of \$6,000 is needed for this work, including the cost of replacing scaffolding which had been lost during the hurricane."

Six thousand dollars, Mr. Chairman, to repair the damage for two months by a few hurricane sufferers and to replace scaffolding? Now, Mr. Chairman, do you really believe that the hard-headed experienced men in this island will believe that nonsense? To begin with they say scaffolding was lost during the hurricane. We know that the scaffolding for a building like that is either this 1½ inches steel or heavy pine joists 3" x 4" or 4" square. No storm can blow that away. We had a lot of things missing in this country from time to time and nobody knows where it goes. The framework of this 3" x 4" or 4" square pine joist could be blown down, but not blown away. If this scaffolding was blown down, it would remain on the ground. You are saying that the people in this country must be veritable pigs and animals to cause damage to the extent of this

amount in two months of living in Government Buildings. If they want money to do buildings, say so; but do not tell the public you have to repair and rehabilitate the place because people were in it because of the storm. It is a libel on the people who were in it. They are human beings like any of us, and although they may not have had the opportunity to acquire the correct behaviour on all occasions, yet still it would imply that they were living in filth and they had no respect for their decency to do all this damage in those two months. What has happened to all the other school buildings and churches in which large numbers were housed after the storm? In St. Philip you had nearly every single school, in some cases the churches, the Admiralty building, the Princess Margaret Secondary School in Six Cross Roads, all of them filled with many people and nobody spent \$60, on washing and rehabilitating these buildings, and you mean to tell me that the people in Beckles Road and Bay Street are such pigs that the Government must spend \$6,000 to rewash the rooms they occupied?

7.15 p.m.

The only thing lost are the true facts of this case. That is what is lost. The sea did not wash up by the Government Headquarters so as to wash these things out to sea. There are watchmen there; if they were not there during the storm, they resumed duty immediately after the storm. Any scaffolding or building material which was blown down should, and must have been salvaged. The only expenditure incurred would be to put them back up. You cannot possibly expect any rational human-being to believe the comparatively small number of people who had been housed in the Government Headquarters after the storm could have lived under such inhuman conditions as to warrant the expenditure of this large sum of money of \$6,000 to put again the place in a fit and proper condition suited to the demands of Their Highnesses the Ministers.

Mr. Chairman, it could not cost any \$6,000 to wash the entire buildings inside and outside. After all, everybody in this Island has some experience of what it costs to wash a building, and even if it was dirty inside, it could not be dirty outside too. You could have got sandpaper and scraped off the finger prints on the walls, or you could have got some metholated spirits and washed them off. You cannot fool this Committee that it will take \$6,000 to clean these buildings. I am therefore moving that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$5,000 whether the motion is seconded or not.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anybody in this House would begrudge anybody who happened to be in the unfortunate position of having been struck by "Janet" any amount of money for rehousing, or generally helping people who are unfortunate. Whether you are in the Opposition, in the Government or otherwise, it is your duty to see that something is done. Nevertheless, as the last speaker has said, we of the Opposition are bound to question things, ask for information, and draw to the Government's attention any information we might have had. We want to draw to irregularities which have taken place following the hurricane.

This Resolution is asking this House to vote a sum of money to carry on the rehousing programme. If you want money to carry on the rehousing of the people, well, you want money for that purpose. I think we should spend money in order to get people as nearly back as they were as possible.

The first question which I would like to ask the Government is whether it is their intention to ask the United Kingdom Government for a gift—I do not

speak of any loan—to replace the money which we have already spent. Nobody could think that with this hurricane, the sum of £50,000 which Great Britain has given this colony could go any where near their duty and responsibility, which is to assist in the rehousing of the people. From what I have read in connection with Grenada, I am wondering if the Barbados Government will follow in like manner and make a request. Whenever you are finished, you will require a large sum of money. Sir Winston Churchill himself has made it clear what these colonies mean to the United Kingdom: and from the point of view of economic stability, it is the duty of the United Kingdom Government to pull them through. I contend that £50,000 is just a token if the United Kingdom Government is mindful of what they owe to this colony, and therefore it is their duty to help us in this matter. I am not talking about any loan, I am speaking about a gift. You cannot be beggars and choosers; you have a country which was struck by a disaster and after four months of that disaster the British Government can only offer £50,000 to assist us! I cannot understand the treatment which is being meted out. I hope the Hon. Minister will enlighten this House as to whether he is going to ask for this assistance.

The next question I would like to ask the Government is in connection with the repairs of the houses. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has made a point about there being dissatisfaction with regard to these repairs. Everybody will appreciate the fact that in a matter of this sort, there will be dissatisfaction. What I object to is that when any honourable member brings some dissatisfaction to the Head of the Department, he is criticised. Well, that is a matter for them; if I find that there are any facts in what the people bring to me, I will draw it to the notice of the Government. Some complaints are founded on fact and others are just imaginary grievances; but when they are founded on fact, it is necessary to consider them.

As to the Public Works Department, everybody will agree that they did a very good job when they went on, but they left houses here and there not repaired. What the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said is that they should go back and deal with those houses as quickly as possible. I hope that the Hon. Minister will be able to say what has been done about the matter.

Paragraph 3 of the Addendum to this Resolution says this:—

"from owners of small chattel houses who repaired at their own expense the damage wrought by the hurricane, and the sum of \$15,000 is needed to assist these applicants in meeting the cost of the repairs."

7.25 p.m.

When the Government first came here for money for rehabilitation, we told them that that amount seemed very small. When he says now that this is for the purpose of asking the people in England for some assistance, then this is rather misleading.

You have \$15,000 set down as the amount to assist chattel house owners who undertook their own repairs. He says the number of persons to whom they are distributing this money is 141. I would like him to answer these questions: will he tell us from how many persons did he receive applications? Will he say what proportion of the claims this \$15,000 is and on what basis have they arrived at this amount? Is it a full claim or a proportionate part? The next question is: what is he doing in respect of owners of houses which were damaged that are not small chattel houses? When you say small chattel houses, I take

you to mean houses that are not doubled-roofed and do not have a shedroof or gallery attached. As you know, we made our position quite clear to you. We said that there are a number of people whose houses were damaged which would not come under the category of small chattel houses but were the type of houses which the owners did not comprehensively insure against hurricane: and it is that type of person who, I know, has also sent in application for assistance. We have to acquaint the Government of this fact if all of this is to arm the Hon. Premier with all the facts to lay a foundation for a gift which I am saying is something to which we are entitled. You must have all this information correctly. I ask again, tell us what proportion of the claims are you paying out—half, two-thirds or what? If, as the Hon. Minister has said, a number of applications has been received from owners of small houses, can he say if applications have been received from persons other than owners of small chattel houses. There are small chattel houses and other chattel houses and that is the point we made on the last occasion. I personally have filled in cards for a number of those people.

I come to another point and it is with respect to those persons who had small wall houses which were damaged in the recent hurricane. We have people in this island who are owners of wall houses of the size 20 ft. x 10 ft. Are those persons helped or does the Government propose to help them? I want that explained by the Minister and I hope he will be able to do that.

I take it that, so far as reimbursement of plantation owners are concerned, the Government has properly investigated the matter. For instance, I understand that as regards a place like Constant Plantation, the Hon. E. S. Robinson paid such a great interest in the work that was done to those damaged houses on that plantation that he would not hire a blacksmith or shoemaker to do carpenters' work. I understand that some of the best jobs done in the whole rehabilitation programme were done under the supervision of the plantation managers because they had the wherewithal and they knew what was to be done. That is what I understand from the people and the carpenters who worked for those people. It is well known that in the rush you took on people who called themselves carpenters who started to shingle from top and come down. [Laughter] That is no joke. When you have a hurricane and you want people to help, things like that would happen.

I come to the next point and it is with regard to the rehabilitation of Government Headquarters. I want to say that the Minister is far from being serious when he puts up \$6,000 for rehabilitation of Government Headquarters. All of us in here have a high regard for Captain Tomlin's recommendation. The note to the matter reads as follows:—

"As the Government Headquarters had been used as a Hurricane shelter for two months, a certain amount of repainting and rehabilitation had to be undertaken. It is estimated that a sum of \$6,000 is needed for this work, including the cost of replacing scaffolding which had been lost during the hurricane."

As Churchwarden for the parish of St. Michael, I have used Queen's Park House as a shelter from the 24th September, 1955 and at one time there were 200 people in it. The people cooked in there and did everything else. They even went as far as to put down galvanise sheets on the floor and cook with rotten cane. I am not saying that this figure of \$6,000 is wrong but I want you to define it for me. You say that a certain amount of repainting has to be undertaken. Can the honourable member tell me what

part of that sum is for repainting and what part is for rescaffolding. The repainting may be only for \$1,000. I do not know what is rescaffolding. The figure can be \$10,000; all that I am thinking of is repainting that portion of the buildings in which the people sheltered. The Note goes on to read as follows:—

"It is considered that this expenditure is a proper charge against hurricane rehabilitation instead of being a charge to the Capital Cost of the building."

If you really want more money to finish your Ministerial building with the grace and dignity which the Minister of Housing wants, come in here and say so; but the Hon. Minister cannot be really serious when he puts down \$6,000 for rehabilitation of Government Headquarters. I take it that he has visited there so he should know what has to be done. Again I ask: can you really tell me how much of this amount is for repainting and what is for rescaffolding?

7.35 p.m.

Let us take it this way. You had people in the rooms, they were cooking and what not and the walls got dirtied, but the Government are so financial that they did not want to go and do what I did at Queen's Park, that is, put on a coat of paint and wash down the walls. You want to repaint the whole thing and present it new to the Government. But even if you use plastic emulsion paint, how could you spend \$6,000? How can you do it? But I am not going to criticise it until you can tell me what is for scaffolding. If you use 1½" steel pipe scaffolding that could be an expensive thing, but the cost of replacing scaffolding which had been lost during the hurricane could not cost that much. I am entitled to know—and the Minister will agree—how it was lost. Did it stray? We know the wind would blow it down; I confess that I will grant you all of this. But I ask this: who could be the one to say it is appropriate to put this charge against rehabilitation? If you went to the British Government to ask for money to assist with Hurricane Relief, would you say that scaffolding got stolen? It is dishonest: you cannot spend all that money on scaffolding, that is going to be used for ever. Do you mean it is as a result of the people going into the building that it was carried away? The person who prepared this note was trying to mislead this House, but you haven't got a chance. In other words, we have to show a true and accurate picture of what the hurricane cost Barbados, and because in Barbados scaffolding was lost they tell us we must put in this money. I know it cannot take one cent more than \$1,000, even if you use two coats of the most expensive plastic emulsion paint. The Minister, I am sure, will realise that. If you are going, I repeat, to present a true picture of this country to this is what the hurricane cost Barbados we will grant you that. But you cannot put in this expenditure as an appropriate charge against Hurricane Relief. The people were housed in the Government Headquarters and they dirtied it; they had to cook in it and you did not move in Gas Stoves for them; they had to put nails on the walls; now, you must paint it and fix it back, but how did you lose the scaffolding? Even so, if you lose scaffolding, that is an expense connected to capital works, because that scaffolding will be used at the Courts, Police Departments, and as a matter of fact, all about. Is it fair to attach it to Hurricane Relief? It does not seem the decent thing to do. Surely the Minister should be able to tell us. Anyhow, as to the statement of the honourable member for St. Philip, about the claims of parsons and other people saying that they were badly treated, I will make this statement on the floor of this House. At half

past six one morning a parson rung me and asked, "is this the treatment I get for the service I am doing?" The Churchwarden for St. Joseph also told me that, and he went further and said that the Chief Secretary told him to take back over and he refused. I am saying this to show that whether the honourable member said that he heard it, it is correct. I am prepared to say that the Vicar of St. John the Baptist phoned me and told me so. I will tell you something; as a matter of fact the gentleman was not on very good terms with me, and I was surprised and the member for St. Joseph actually brought that to me, but as regards these criticisms I have not worried about them. You are the Government and you know full well whom you want to do it. But this evening what I ask the Government to tell me is question (1). If you ask the United Kingdom to help in this matter and if a number of applications have been received for small houses, does that include any small houses other than chattel houses, and embodied in that, is question (2) how do you arrive at the \$15,000? What proportion of the claim is being spent? Are you going to give other people who have claimed they lost, but who really did not lose anything? The Minister will tell us what proportion is for painting, and if he can tell me that, we will agree that, being able to subtract, the balance is for scaffolding. You cannot face the public and tell them that scaffolding, which has been lost, and has never been used one single day for Hurricane Relief, must be replaced with hurricane relief money. You do not have to use scaffolding for an 18 ft. x 10 ft. house. This has been put as an expense under Hurricane Relief, to bolster it up, to show a statement that this is part of your estimate. So, whoever has put it in your hands has tried to mislead the Government.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, there is one point in this matter of rehabilitation that I would like to draw to the attention of the Government, and it is the attitude that certain landlords are adopting towards their tenants. In my opinion it is unfortunate that the order for control of rents died a natural death when the emergency ceased. I have been informed that landlords are already serving notices to quit and notices for increase of rent for the houses occupied by their tenants and it is a very sore point with them. The houses have been put in good repair, in some cases in better condition than previously, with Government Funds. I am hoping, sir, that Government is keeping an eye on that situation.

Now, previous speakers have mentioned problems which they have encountered, and in St. Michael I have been approached by people too, who claim that their houses were partly repaired and left over in some cases perhaps for lack or shortage of lumber. Others have claimed that their houses have been inspected and placed on the list for repairs. It is possible that in the survey, the party who is doing it passes in a district and sees that repairs have been done to the roof, but from the outside he cannot see that there is a damaged floor which was left over because of the shortage of flooring.

7.45 p.m.

My idea is that there is a remedy. Right through this rehabilitation programme, from the days of the "flying squads," records have been kept by the Housing Board of the houses repaired, houses on which repairs have been started and houses which have been noted for repairs. I am wondering if any account has been taken of these records during this final survey. If that is done, surely in respect of the claims which are now being established by people in the categories I have mentioned, it can be proved whether the

repairs have been started or whether these people are just trying to take advantage of the situation.

I know the Government would not want anybody to suffer owing to an oversight. This amount of money is supposed to be the last amount for which the Government has come. However, Paragraph 3 of the Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:—

"A number of applications have been received from owners of small chattel houses who repaired at their own expense the damage wrought by the hurricane, and the sum of \$15,000 is needed to assist these applicants in meeting the cost of the repairs."

I am going to tell the Hon. Minister now that all the claims have not yet reached the office. Only today I was approached by a party in connection with the sending in of a claim. It is unfortunate that some of the people did not know where they could send these claims, and now that it is getting down to the last stage, you can look forward to what has been referred to as a stampede. I hope that those persons who sent in legitimate claims will have these claims dealt with similarly to those which have been sent in before.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable junior member for Christ Church has made a point about repairing shedroofs. I did not say that the Government was repairing all shedroofs; I made it quite clear that the case of persons who had houses with shedroofs, the shedroofs did not come under the heading of repairs. The honourable member referred to the question of restoring one house where there were two roofs. I pointed out that there were a number of houses which carried two roofs and both of them have been repaired. I say again that in the case of a shed-roof which is attached to a one roof house and which is used for sleeping purposes and so on, there is authority to repair that shedroof. I must point out that I have known from my experience of cases where shedroofs were just old dilapidated bits of structure which have fallen completely and which could be referred to as trash; I pointed out that there was no question of repairing such shedroofs because to repair them you would really have to rebuild them. However, in the case of a shedroof which was in a repairable condition at a reasonable cost, that shed-roof would be repaired. I repeat that instructions have been given from the outset and I know of quite a few shedroofs which have been repaired.

Soon after the last discussion, I got in touch with the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board and I pointed out to him that the honourable junior member for Christ Church had raised the point; he assured me that he was repairing shedroofs which were attached to one-roofed houses and used as extra bedrooms. He said that there have been one or two extraordinary cases in which shedroofs which were attached to houses were repaired; I want to assure the honourable member that where there is a shedroof attached to a one roofed house and it can be repaired at a reasonably low cost, that shedroof is eligible for repairs under the repair programme.

If I have missed any point which the honourable member has made, I will be glad if he will remind me of it. The honourable senior member for St. Philip said that people who never had any houses before the storm were given "pre-fab" houses. I made a statement when dealing with a Resolution in respect of housing on the 3rd of this month; the Hansard will show that it was the Government's policy in so far as people who rented houses were concerned to give them a prefabricated house. I said that we are repairing houses or giving "pre-fab" houses to those

whose houses were destroyed in the hurricane in the first place, and in the second place we were giving "prefab" houses to those persons who were renting houses and who were rendered homeless as a result of the hurricane. In other words, if a person is renting out a house and that house was totally destroyed we would not give him a "prefab house"; but if the person who occupied that house applies for a house, that person would be considered eligible for a "prefab" house. That is still the policy of the Government.

I think I have some knowledge of the case to which reference was made. That is a case in St. Philip where a husband and his wife are at loggerheads, and one of them has been given a house. I know something about that case, but the person who was in charge of the area recommended the case for consideration. It was not a case of the individual refusing to go back in a house; there was some misunderstanding. In the first place, the house was damaged by the storm. I understand that it was some old wall house the roof of which was blown off; I understand that this woman has six children and she had nowhere to go, but she was in a shelter. That woman would qualify for a house. There is something between the family in which I am not interested at all. That sort of thing does not get us anywhere.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order: I hope the Hon. Minister will appreciate what I said. I do not know anything about any domestic wrangling between the husband and his wife; all I said was that the husband came to me and said: "Neither myself nor my wife had any house before the storm and she has been given a "prefab" house, and I have not been given any one."

I really do not know anything of the man or woman; I do not know how many children they have had. All I am saying is that my idea was that you could get a prefabricated house if you owned a home which had been damaged by the storm. Now the Hon. Minister is saying that you can qualify for a pre-fabricated house whether you owned a house or not. I did not say that the Hon. Minister never said so before; I am only saying that I did not know that before.

Hon. M. E. COX: The case the honourable member referred to is a case concerning a parishioner of the parish of St. Philip. The officer in charge of that parish recommended that individual for a prefabricated house. As a matter of fact, I will go further and say that his colleague was interested in seeing that help should be forthcoming to that poor woman. I know the case. The person qualified. We do not give you a house just because you want a pre-fabricated house. We examine all the circumstances. This was a case of a woman in St. Philip with six children who had no where to go save in the shelter, and the individual was allowed a house. If the husband of that woman felt that it should be he who should get the house, I think he should be more than glad that his wife has got a house. It is clear that some people felt that he should have been the person to get the house instead of her. I am not interested in the quarrel. All I am saying is that the individual qualified for a house and she was given a house and that is to the satisfaction of the Ministry.

I do not want to go over what the honourable member said about the Reverend gentleman saying this and that, but I do want at the same time to thank the honourable member for the City for actually showing a green light on the Reverend gentleman who telephoned him and from whom he got some

explanation. I hope they will so give some explanation as to whom the authority came from. As a matter of fact, I knew nothing of Revd. Clementson before. I go further by saying that for some months now the Executive Committee agreed that the Housing Board should be the sole responsible agent for spending money on the repairs to these houses. If an officer of that Board goes to Reverend Clementson and says "I do not want you anymore, we have taken over;" he has that authority from the Housing Board. What really matters is the scandalous remark that it was taken from Revd. Clementson and given to the honourable senior member for St. James. I am definitely sure that the honourable senior member for St. James had nothing to do with the matter. I am saying that when these repairs were first started, the Hurricane-Relief Committees of the various parishes—and the honourable senior member for St. James is a member of one of those Committees—were all interested in helping and did help; but after some time the Government took complete control and put it into the hands of the Housing Board.

Reference was made to a case in St. Joseph. I want to say here and now that the instructions were given and the letter which was sent out to the various Committees is there to be seen signed by the Acting Chief Secretary, Mr. Burrows. There were differences of opinion and a misunderstanding between the members of the St. Joseph Hurricane Relief Committee and as a result, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Bishop who was employed by the Department of Highways and Transport was put in charge of the St. Joseph,—St. John area and he was succeeded by a man by the name of Mr. Springer. All that was done directly by the Housing Board. If, as the honourable member knows, lumber was stowed in the parish at some particular individual, it was stowed there then for convenience, because it would be more economical to leave it in the country than to pay a lorry so much for transporting so many feet backwards and forward per day, and it was to the satisfaction of the Transport Board that it would have been well taken care of at the place which it was stowed.

I am convinced that the British Government will put its hands deeply into its pockets to help us. The honourable senior member for the City asked what percentage of the claims is to be paid. I think in my opening remarks I said that Government has agreed to pay approximately 75% of each claim.

8.05 p.m.

As I pointed out, the Housing Board repaired extensively damaged houses at the average of \$159 per house, and we decided to give up to \$200 as a maximum for anyone claim. I should say that there are very few claims which exceed \$200 for small houses and hardly none more than \$212, and the Government has decided to reimburse up to the tune of \$200.

As regards the larger chattel houses and wall houses, to date there are 46 claims, 22 from people owning wallhouses and 24 from persons with large houses like chattel houses, and it has been decided that those claims be referred to the Hurricane Relief Committee to be dealt with by them. As you know sir, our whole trend was to repair houses belonging to people of slender means, people who would qualify for treatment or loans under the Housing Bill, which we passed some time last year. We have confined them to that and have referred the 46 claims to the Hurricane Relief Organisation. To the question raised by the honourable junior member for the City about the increased rentals by landlords of houses repaired by the Housing Board, I should

like to tell him that that is being actually considered I have had quite a few reports from people who rent the houses that the unscrupulous landlords whose houses have been repaired at Government expense and put in a better condition than many of them were before the hurricane, are now charging higher rents. I have discussed it with the Hon. Attorney General with a view to bringing down legislation to this House very soon, so that we can control those houses repaired by Government at Government expense.

Now I must say quite frankly here what I have had to tell quite a number of people, and I wish that members will assist in telling not only their constituents, but any people who come with grievances or supposed grievances about houses not repaired properly and all that sort of thing. I have myself visited some of these houses about which people make complaints and I have found that in the majority of cases, the remaining repairs were almost negligible. Some individuals would look up at a few holes in the galvanise or a window not properly replaced with just a crease between it, and a little hole here and there, and say well, it is not properly repaired. I have had to tell them in the case of a hole in the galvanise to get a pound of protex and go up on the roof and stop it, but I emphasise that, Mr. Chairman, because there are still a considerable amount of houses, as you will see from the report here today, still on the ground and our forces have got to be concentrated on these houses. I made it clear to people that they should be in sympathy with the other people, that at least they can occupy their houses to a larger extent with a great measure of convenience as against so many people whose houses are on the ground and who are suffering materially from every point of view. And if we can get members to impress this upon people who insist that every little hole must be plugged up and every little crease stopped—I must say up to Sunday morning I saw a few houses and I told the people what the position was. I told them we have to concentrate on houses on the ground and I must say they appeared to me quite satisfied. Their only complaint was that if we knew that we were not coming back, they should have been told so. We have to have some sort of responsibility and assist people when we find that they have not got much of a claim. Now as regards the last point which I want to make, Sir, in so far as scaffolding is concerned and the painting, this \$6,000 is equally divided: \$3,000 for painting and rehabilitation and \$3,000 for scaffolding, etc. The Colonial Engineer or rather the Director of Public Works—and I must say I do not think it is fair to an officer of that calibre, an officer who has saved us thousands of dollars by his method of construction, to accuse him of puffing up any estimate for reasons other than the one given or at least for giving a misleading estimate on the work. He states that the timber scaffolding at the Headquarters was blown down by "Janet" and it took them three days before they could get things going again. He said that sheds and scaffolding were totally wrecked and lost and they had to be replaced. That is the information and I am sure he is not the type of man to mislead. I said the \$6,000 is divided into two equal parts, \$3,000 for painting and rehabilitating, and \$3,000 for scaffolding, plus the labour in building the scaffold again and so on that comes up to that amount.

8.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Let us grant you that \$3,000 is for repainting. You will agree with me therefore that \$3,000 is for the sheds and scaffolding

damaged by the hurricane. It is improper therefore to put this \$3,000 to the Hurricane Relief Fund. If you had sheds up there where workmen undress and so on, that is nothing to do with Hurricane Relief. You can carry a temporary insurance.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. We are voting so much money for repairing Government buildings and so on. That is an Item which the Financial Secretary feels should be rightly placed under Hurricane Relief.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would not be surprised if he felt that the whole thing should come under that Head. Everybody except an idiot would not think so. You have got to show a true picture of what the hurricane did to Barbados; you will show a picture of what you had to spend on Public Buildings. You might come with a Resolution for repairing the Courts and what not; I think that it would be more appropriate for this matter to be placed under the Head "repairs and replacements of Government buildings damaged by 'Janet'" [Hon. M. E. COX: That is exactly what we are doing.] How can you seriously argue that? I do not agree with reducing this amount by \$5,000 at all; my argument is such as any reasonable man can see. You are coming for this money under this Head; it is either that or it is not that. If you say that as a result of the storm you had so much money for repairing Government buildings, and the material which you had for the building was not insured and therefore you want this money, it is not fit and proper to come for the money in this way. This is misleading. We want the Hon. Premier to be able to put up a case to London, and do not let them say that the Financial Secretary and the members of the House did not understand what they are doing. I am suggesting that you should more appropriately come for this money under the Head of the rebuilding these scaffolds. You are replacing scaffolding and so on which you are using on this Government buildings under capital works; this is really not as a result of people going into the Ministerial Buildings after the storm.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is an important matter involving a large expenditure and therefore I crave the indulgence of the Committee so as to express one or two observations. With regard to the policy governing the repairs of shedroofs, the Hon. Minister of Housing has stated that in some cases in which you have a double roofed house with a shedroof, it is true that they repair the two roofs and not the shedroof. If you have a one-roofed house and a shedroof which is repairable, they will repair that shedroof: well, that has been the policy in St. Philip. Whether there is a one roofed house with a shedroof or not, they repair the house and leave the shedroof alone. The Hon. Minister says that if the shedroof is trash you cannot repair it. How could that be correct? In the case of a chattel house, which is what the Minister would call trash, you cannot repair it, and the policy is to give the owner of that house a "prefab" house; but when you get an owner with a shedroof which cannot be repaired, you do not give him anything at all. That does not make any sense to me; if there is a woman with a one-roofed house who may have three or more children, they do not repair that shedroof. If one roof cannot be repaired, then they give a "prefab" house. I do not agree with that.

In the Minister's reply in connection with the snap dismissal of those Ministers who were formerly in charge of the housing programme in the country areas, you will notice how he was skating on thin ice. What I regard as remarkable is this; in every case

in which they dismiss a Minister, by some accident or other the persons who have assumed control over housing in the areas happen purely by accident to be members of the Labour Party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, that is not true. No member of the Labour Party is in control of running any relief organisation for housing anybody; we have a supervisor attached to the Housing Board with absolute control and responsibility to see that these houses are repaired. It may be a question of convenience in storing lumber at somebody's premises, but when the honourable member says that that individual has the control of running anything, that is not correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, what are the facts? In the case of Rev. Clementson of St. John the Baptist, the control was turned over to the honourable senior member for St. James, Mr. Holder.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not true, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member cannot bring anybody to prove that that is true. The Housing Board is responsible and the person in charge of that area is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Mapp.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the honourable member saying that the Rector of St. Andrew was not told that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew would be in charge?

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. I have already stated that the original arrangement was that the stuff would be stored in St. Andrew at the honourable member's house. The honourable member is a member of the Hurricane Relief Committee. Similarly in St. Joseph, but those honourable members are not in charge of anything.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In other words, the honourable member is only playing with words; that is all he is doing. The Rector of St. Andrew said that he was told that he was no longer in charge of the materials and that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew was put in charge. It was stored on his premises. [A VOICE: It was never.]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has that anything to do with the Resolution?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Why did it not happen by accident that the building materials were sent to the junior member for St. Andrew? The answer is that he was not a member of the Labour Party although he is a member of the Vestry and he is on the Hurricane Relief Committee. I am not saying that I know of any complaint against the Churchwarden of St. Joseph but is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that they removed him from control and that the control actually fell into your hands? [A VOICE: That is not true.] Is it not a fact that not by your seeking but purely by the merest coincidence that suddenly you found yourself in the position formerly occupied by the Churchwarden of St. Joseph? I am not suggesting for a moment —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is asking me a question, do you want an answer from me to that question?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Did I ask you a question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you want an answer from me?

You must not sit in your chair and listen to all lies.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I imagine, Mr. Chairman, that you still think you are on the St. Joseph Vestry where at every meeting there is almost scandalous behaviour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask again; did you ask a question? Do you want an answer from me?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is most remarkable in most cases where members outside of the Labour Party were placed in this position of seeing after the building materials and who were formerly in control that they were similarly dismissed, so to speak. Does anybody want this Committee or the public to believe that Rev. Clementson or Rev. Woodroffe or the Churchwarden of St. Joseph is going to get up and tell a lie on the Minister of Housing? He is completely beneath their notice. Revd. Woodroffe regards him with contempt. What has annoyed him is to know that he has been giving service to the community and at some sacrifice, and for his services to be rewarded in that manner!

Now with regard to the statement that the people who are living in rented houses which were repaired by the Government are now being charged increased rentals, my recollection is that under the Emergency Regulations promulgated immediately after the hurricane landlords were prohibited from doing so. Now that these regulations are no longer effective, obviously some legislation is needed to preserve the *status quo* so as to see that landlords do not benefit unduly from the improvement of houses for which they did not spend a single cent. This has not been the first time that this matter has been pointed out on the floor of the House. It was pointed out when this House was considering a similar Resolution. Therefore, there is no excuse for this unconscionably long delay in bringing down legislation for control of landlords owning houses which have been repaired by public money. That piece of legislation is needed and should have been attended to by the Legislature of this country before.

Now with regard to the Ministerial building and the expenditure for that, we are suddenly told that of the \$6,000 involved, \$3,000 is for repainting and \$3,000 is for rescaffolding and that is not all because sheds have been brought in too. The Resolution said nothing about sheds; it merely stated repainting and rescaffolding. Well, Sir, \$3,000 for redecoration is really high. I am really loth to believe how the sheltering of a few people in some part of this building could have caused such extensive damage. I still believe, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot spend as much as \$3,000 in merely repairing the damage to the decoration caused by the people who were sheltering in these rooms since the storm. Of course the explanation by the honourable member is unsatisfactory; it is not good enough to say that you suddenly lost scaffolding sheds and so on. You must have had watchmen there. With a building of that sort costing us all that money the material should be carefully protected. You should have had watchmen there during the storm.

8.35 p.m.

Nor could these things be removed during the storm. But certainly after the storm especially with the part of your scaffolding down, there must have been some supervision of the Government material there. They could not walk away. Then the Hon. Minister expects to come in here and vote money for things already provided and say they got lost, because then the Government would expect us to provide additional funds for rebuilding without regarding themselves accountable for the lost incurred. Finally, Sir, it may appeal to what the Minister may call his sense of humour to say that people are complaining about repairs of their houses. He had to tell somebody to get a pound of protex and ston holes in galvanise. I am sure they had similar complaints and laughed at them, but when we talk about unsatisfactory repairs, we mean the houses repaired

are uninhabitable, and in some parts of St. Philip—Four Roads, Penny Hole and so on—when the rain falls people have to leave the houses that have been repaired; they cannot sleep in them. I can show you where two sections of the roof are almost two inches apart. Nobody would encourage people to complain, but if we tell people that these complaints about unsatisfactory houses are insignificant, then the conditions would remain the same. But I am telling him that when he gets seriously down to the matter, he will discover that in many cases the sides have been put back up and roofs put on temporarily and that is all. As I said earlier these houses cannot stand the shock even of a high wind, and abnormal weather during the hurricane season would cause them to come down again and cause additional expense.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister tells us tonight, and what he said on the last occasion are two totally different things. What he said on the last occasion about shedroofs being repaired, was that it was the policy of the Government. We were made to understand that shedroofs generally were being considered throughout this island. Tonight he comes down and qualifies that. He qualifies it in many ways by saying, "provided it does not cost too much." But if it were a trash house and it was blown down and people were living in it, it was still a home and probably that person was more deserving of getting another than somebody who had a better one. When he made the appeal for members to assist Government in telling the people of these complaints and the true facts of what they were doing, that is exactly what I wanted him to tell me last time. When they came to me on the last occasion, I was simple and foolish enough to tell people that the Government was only repairing one-gabled houses, no shedroof and no second roof. Now, he comes back here and tells me it is the broad policy of Government to repair more than that and therefore I was telling the people wrong. I want the Government to state what they are doing. To-night it is qualified and I do not understand from that qualification whether it is the size of the family or condition of the house where it is allocated or to whom it belongs. I am saying and I will continue to say that a house should be repaired according to the size of the family; and if they come to me and there is only one front house I will continue to tell them if they had a shed and it was blown down it should be the Government's policy to put it back.

Now, I go further and will take him up on this point. He tells us tonight that they are 46 applications for these wall buildings and that they have been handed over to the Hurricane Relief Committee. There are 46 applications that the Housing Board have had, but there are many more that may have gone directly to the same Committee. I will state this. The fund at the disposal of the Central Hurricane Relief Committee, when other things are taken care of, is inadequate to properly give compensation to these stone buildings that were damaged, and it should be the policy of the Government to assist them just as they are doing with chattel houses. The Central Hurricane Relief Committee should have about \$80,000 to \$90,000, because the money that has been given to Barbados by the other Governments has been commandeered by the Government, and **naturally what was given by private persons, through the *Advocate*, the Merrills, Mr. Ronald Tree and other well-wishers like that, will come between \$80,000 to \$90,000.** We have been asked to rehabilitate and assist by way of compensation those persons that were hurt and the relatives of those killed in

the hurricane, and that is going to take up some considerable sum. We are also asked to try to assist with cooking utensils, furniture and bedding and other things that were damaged, and in most deserving cases people that could not afford to put back those things; and then on top of that, we are asked to assist in the repairs and rehabilitation of these small stone buildings. I have visited some of these stone buildings; they are newly built small bungalows, the property of people who are no better off than people living in chattel houses, but who have had a little more ambition—and often at great sacrifice to themselves—to put up these houses. In some cases it would take more than \$1,000 to repair these buildings. You cannot half repair them; and that Central Fund is supposed to take care of all these. I say again, Government should assist in the repair of small uninsured stone buildings in Barbados that were damaged by the hurricane, and the Central Committee should do more than rehabilitate, but provide furniture, cooking utensils and bedding for the people who live in the little chattel houses and the stone buildings.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When I spoke just now, I should have mentioned then that speaking for St. Michael there are still people in shelters in this parish, for example, Friendship Playing Field, Princess Alice and the St. Michael's Almshouse, and I wanted to ask the Minister what has been the policy of giving out pre-fab. houses, because there are still close on 100 families going in and out of them who have not received pre-fab houses. Actually, they were people who rented houses which were destroyed and could not be replaced. I wonder if the Minister could tell me what is the policy of allocating these houses, because there were people living in the houses that were not completely destroyed or were not destroyed at all, who got prefab houses and left those people without houses. I am asking this with a view that someone from the Department who is responsible for allocating the houses be sent to these three centres to ascertain these facts and give to these people preference with the pre-fab houses; because they are completely out of a home, and I do not think it is fair to give to persons whose houses were just partly damaged and leave out those persons who are out of homes and are placed in shelters and at the Almshouse. Will the Minister therefore tell me whether they will decide to give persons who are in the Almshouse pre-fab houses? 8.45 p.m.

There are a number of persons who the Education Board brought out of the schools, out of the Ministerial Buildings, out of Erdiston College and placed them in the Almshouse and every week they come and ask what is being done. I have sent them to the Housing Authority and they have reported to me that people who have been in shelters have gone back in their homes, and people who have been, renting have been given houses.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I said on the last occasion, the policy of the Government, is to get these people out of the shelters as fast as possible. In the case of those who do not agree to purchase these "prefab" houses, we have agreed to rent them "prefab" houses. I want to assure the hon. member that we are trying to get these people in houses as quickly as possible.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Inspector of Schools came to me to ask me to take the people out of the schools and put them in the Almshouse. I am asking the Hon. Minister what is being done to put these people back in houses? I am asking him to get somebody from the Department in charge and have an investigation into the matter. Persons who

are in houses already are getting "prefab" houses and others are still living in shelters. I am telling the hon. member that the Inspector of Schools, not once or twice or three times, has asked that these people be taken out of the schools and we have put them in the Almshouse. And they are not old people either; some of them are waterfront people. [Mr. CRAWFORD: We have such families in St. Philip]. I am asking the hon. member to investigate the charge that people who have houses are given "prefab" houses. Nobody wants people to be at Friendship or the Princess Alice Playing Field; it has been reported to me that the Inspector of Schools went in and said: "you have to remove out of here, we have nothing to offer." I have said that the people are not birds, they cannot live in a tree.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will investigate the matter.

Mr. ALLDER: I regret that every time the Hon. Minister introduces a Resolution here, he has to get up and agree to this, that, and the other. All of these things obtained from September 22 last year. I want to suggest to the Hon. Minister that he should be more active in respect of the rehabilitation of the people. It is of no use sitting behind a desk and hoping that things will work out properly in the respective districts. I am sure that if the Hon. Minister had made himself more active than suggesting that small nail holes in galvanize sheets should be stopped, more people would have been able to go back into their homes. That is all I would like to suggest. It is very difficult for us to be confronted by those who have not been able to go back in their homes, and be unable to say why they have been left out, what is happening, and so on. We have discussed this matter on many occasions and the same views have been expressed by the Hon. Minister and there is no use in agreeing to see after things now and when you bring down a Resolution again you have to make the same promise.

There is one other thing I would like to suggest. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister to be very careful with respect to the claims which the Plantations are going to make. When the matter was in the hands of the Plantations, many of the Managers were very embarrassing to those whose homes had been damaged and a lot of discourteous behaviour went on by such Managers. I am surprised now that they have been able to get a provision of \$20,000. What is more, although they knew that the Government would have reimbursed them for any repairs which were carried out for the people, they were causing the people to feel that they were doing such work at their own expense, and purely using that as cheap propaganda in the various districts.

There are houses which Plantations have had to repair and I have heard about the figures which have been submitted. I would ask the Hon. Minister to scrutinise these things as to the incomplete method of repairing these houses. It was on the last occasion when we dealt with a similar Resolution when the Hon. Minister suggested that windows and doors were to be left out. I hope that by now that decision has been changed and that the Hon. Minister will consider that windows and doors are as important to a house as the roof is.

8.55 p.m.

I have seen repairs carried out when the managers had this work in hand where a skylight of a gabled house was left undone and the occupant of the house was told that he could easily put a bit of cardboard there to keep out the rain. That is the sort of thing which really took place during that time and I repeat that the Hon. Minister of Housing should bestir himself more and do not depend on

supervisors who are sent out to see that those houses are properly repaired.

As regards those people who have undertaken to repair their houses themselves with the hope that the Government would assist them when the time comes, I think that the amount of \$15,000 is small. I have been able to see many such houses repaired by the owners and I am surprised that it is felt that \$15,000 can cover the whole expense.

However, Sir, I am still hoping that this is not the last Resolution of this nature and that it is the intention of the Hon. Minister to come for more money for rehabilitation of the people if the repairs are not completed. I feel that it is a pledge made by the Government and the least that the Government can do or should do is to stick to their obligations.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of seven Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

9 p.m.

IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT)

On re-assembling.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No 3. as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a short Bill tending, to put it bluntly, to strengthen the hands of the delegation to London. As the Immigration Act now reads, a person may be prohibited from coming to the Island on economic grounds. Well, that is what we are complaining about in the case of Trinidad. At the S.C.A.C. meeting I managed to get the others to press for the jurisdiction dealing with immigration not only to put it on the exclusive list but specifically to say that no person should be barred from travelling between Units on economic or any other grounds; so it would be pretty stupid of us to let it remain on the Statute Book in Barbados when we are going to this final Conference in which we are pressing that there should be more freedom than we have agreed on in the Freedom of Movement in Trinidad. It is quite simple and it is largely with that object that we

are asking the House to agree to the deletion of these two sub-sections of paragraph 2, in order that they would not be on the Statute Book.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, our Immigration Act, I think, was piloted through this House by the Minister for Social Services, and I remember distinctly then the member in charge of the Bill gave the assurance that it would not be used for political purposes. Well, Sir, so far as I know, the first occasion on which it was used was for poverty, some people arriving here by Schooner or small motor vessels from St. Lucia, and I believe that in other cases it was used politically.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have an extremely peculiar Immigration Act, because here is a gentleman coming from Canada owning property in this Island, leaving the island and coming back, Sir, and then being physically prohibited from even getting out of the plane.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with the character of visitors to this colony, because it must engage the attention of persons interested in the island. Well, it is said that the particular Canadian gentleman did own property here; he claims that himself; but what I am concerned about is, if he is an undesirable person to the extent that you have to be secret in your method of prohibiting him; I think it is something that strikes at that freedom of the individual. I have never been satisfied about that particular case. If he were guilty of an offence, if he were a smuggler, or if he were a Sodomist and you have laws against these things, track him down and imprison him or let him stand the penalty of the law; but to say that somebody can take a letter to a passenger arriving here and say "you are not supposed to land and I cannot tell the public why it is I have come to prohibit you," it does not seem right. Sir, it would appear as if the Governor-in-Executive Committee have the right to prohibit people landing here without giving sufficient reason. It is the first case I have known of just preventing somebody from landing without the public knowing why you have prohibited them. So far as I know, now, Sir, that is a secret, and while I hold no brief for anybody, and would be willing to see persons who are guilty put in jail, if you know that they are corrupt and you have evidence, it looks to me as though you are condoning a crime merely to say "I know something about it, but I would not let you land here." Is the person too respectable to go into our jail? If His Excellency and the Government take a dislike against you and you ever leave this island, you will be prohibited from coming back. If this is carried out under our Immigration Act there must be something more to amend in it than merely this. We can get a very bad name for merely being able to say "you are prohibited" and not say the reason why. We must be condoning an offence. There must be a method of bringing somebody to justice if we can just do that. If you have evidence, jail them or at least let them come up for justice; but to have the power to let a person leave wherever they are to come here and then humiliate them! Something similar to that was done to the Premier of this Island, and it is true that we took no notice of it, but that is regrettable, and there is no reason in the world why we should treat people so. If they are undesirable you can publish it before, not as you have done with people you don't want to come here. If there is something against an individual and it is proved positive, then the Immigration Authorities condoned that

offence when they refused to take him off and see that he was brought to justice. I deplore the fact that we should put anything on our Statute Book to be used against people politically; and do not forget, Sir, it is not the Governor, it is the political body known as the Governor-in-Executive Committee that can prohibit you from coming to this country, which is a wrong thing. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is a political body purely and solely.
10.00 p.m.

It is only human to expect that you will use it as a political weapon against a political opponent; that is where our Immigration Law breaks down. Let us put the blame on the Governor for prohibiting people and let us know where the blame is. That Act should never have the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" in it because all the Party in power has to do is to say "he has a different political view from me and therefore he cannot come here." If anybody disobeys the law of the country, we should be able to deal with the matter; if he is an undesirable person let us have the guts to publish it and put him out. You have the case of a Police Officer going to a plane prohibiting a person from landing and the Officer's lips are sealed. Postmen do not carry other postmen with them when they are delivering letters; and if you refuse to bring a man to justice, then you are condoning a crime. In the case of some other person you would give him the opportunity to land here and bring a charge against him. I think that in the same way that the prohibited immigrant could give publicity to the matter, we should be able to say why we did not want him here, so that all of his ilk will be kept out.

I am stressing the point of the liberty of the subject and the freedom of the individual. It was not long after that incident took place that we had an extradition Order; well, I do not know what happened to it. It does not take any 24 hours to send any citizen back to the United States of America, and yet some doctor was wanted for some charge and he had to go to Glendairy Prison. I think that things are going from bad to worse.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member is out of order. He is entirely wrong to question the exercise of authority by the Governor. When you give power to a person you have to assume that he will act honestly. This matter is nothing whatever to do with the Government of this country; there is no country on earth which has not got laws which put power in a particular person's hands. You could not have given wider discretion than is given under this Act to the Governor. My whole point is that under the Act, as it stands, or under the Expulsion of Undesirables Act, complete discretion is given to the Governor of this colony. If any real, public scandal takes place, a motion can be made against the Governor; we do not want to break the rules relating to the Governor, otherwise we might have an unholy, long debate.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know what law it was that stopped the man. The hon. member knows. If it is nothing to do with the Immigration Act, the people of this colony should know under what Act this thing has been done.

We have just abolished the Grand Jury because we felt that if somebody is going to justice, they could prevent them from doing so. In the case of Dr. Jagan did they not publish beforehand that they did not want him to come here? They could have published that they did not want Mr. Fontaine or anybody else to come here. When these things happen, you do not know whom next they will be used against. I say that a man who is supposed to be wanted for justice has been brought before the Police Magistrate and put in jail and nobody knows

what has happened to that case. We have got to be very careful; if as a result of our going into Federation we are going to be made decent by our association with other people, I deplore the fact that that is the way in which it is going to be. I feel that the laws of this country should be clean and that they should be administered in the right way.

I am willing to bring forward a substantive motion, but everybody will say that you are sheltering a Sodomist. As you pick up your newspaper you read that somebody has been given twelve months for stealing a sheep; but nobody knows what case has been or should have been brought against a man, and he has got away with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has mentioned something about interpretation. I want to remind hon. members that, as far as the hon. junior member for the City is concerned, he made reference to the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee." In one particular section of the Act reference is made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but in the Section following, the word 'Governor' appears. As far as the hon. junior member for the City is concerned, he is quite in order to refer to the Governor-in-Executive Committee as a Body.

10.10 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, lest it be thought that my colleague is singing a solo, I am going to join him. These amendments to this Bill seem to me to be quite alright and I have nothing to say against them. As a matter of fact, I had no intention of speaking on the Bill until the Hon. Premier rose and said that when you have these laws you must assume that the people are honest. What I feel about the matter is when you pass laws and give the Executive Committee powers to stop anybody from landing that it is still the right of honourable members of this Chamber to know why Mr. so-and-so was prevented from landing. If it is not made clear to the public why such a person has been stopped, hon. members of this Chamber should be able to find out why such a person has been stopped.

The point which my colleague is making is really important. Take the case of that man of whom reference was made. He is a Canadian. Now, nobody wants it to be said that you are just stopping somebody from landing here because you have power to do so. I believe myself that there must be some justification in stopping him from landing. I agree that if you have somebody coming here to corrupt the youth of this country that they should be stopped from coming here. As a matter of fact, half of them who are carrying on these practices here should be shipped out. That is making it quite clear what are my feelings about the matter. But all we have heard, as my colleague has said, is something about sodomy.

In these days when we are trying to get some of our girls up to Canada, we do not want to let it appear that we are just stopping somebody because we have the power. On the other hand, what my colleague said is quite correct. Here it is, the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Governor in the exercise of that authority vested in him or them stopped that gentleman. May be, they were doing something so dishonest that they could not tell the public. May be, if it were an ordinary person who had done what that gentleman had done, they would have waited until that person had brought in the stuff and then prosecuted him so that that person would also have a fine to pay. Do you know that the Governor-in-Executive Committee was accused of dishonesty as regards that matter and it

was said that if that gentleman was a West Indian, they would have locked him up. It was only because that gentleman belonged to the Platinum Coast that he was dealt with in that lenient manner. I think in matters of that sort, a responsible Government should be able to couch an interview with the Press. You should be able to let the public know what is the matter. We would like to know the reason why this poor unfortunate gentleman whose colleagues are not few on the Platinum Coast was selected and the others left alone.

On the other hand, this amendment is necessary. We must show Trinidad and the other places what is our position. I take it that the hon. Premier must have known something about it; they would have had to summon him.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I say again that this Government had nothing to do with it. The Ministers of the Government had nothing to do with it. That was not done under the Immigration Act; this is not an Act which gives the Governor alone the power to act.

Mr. SPEAKER: This debate which I have been hearing does not come under the purview of the Immigration Act and I am objecting to hon. members making any reference to that matter; we are now amending the Immigration Act. I think we should have no further discussion on a matter of that sort. You can speak on anything that comes under the Immigration Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you have said that this debate does not come under the purview of the Immigration Act but I do not accept the explanation. I do not accept it as so. However, if you rule I will agree. You have no responsibility for stopping anybody speaking on this matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am objecting to hon. members speaking on it. I say they should be stopped.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. senior member for the City is going to speak again on undesirable persons, we are not dealing with that and I am not going to allow him to speak on that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I may think all Sodomists are undesirable persons but hon. members of this Chamber may not think so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that as out of order because it has nothing to do with the Immigration Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I support Your Honour strongly now but I am just saying that Government should have given the public some information on the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: If you will permit me to explain, Your Honour, I never knew under what Act this matter was dealt with; I took it that the person to whom reference was made was an undesirable immigrant and that the offence was something provided for under the Immigration Act.

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

10.20 p.m.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving Clause (2), it sets out a number of reasons why persons could be prevented from coming into this island. I would just like to remind hon. members that these sections are strongly drawn, but it is not fair to Barbados to say that there are parts of the world, even in the British world, to which these

sections are drawn even stronger. Canadian immigration laws are terrifically stronger even against other members of the British Commonwealth.

I think hon. members may remember that the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Labour, before he had become mature and had a greater sense of responsibility, as soon as Trinidad put on their extra restriction, he had attempted to move an Address asking that legislation should be enacted to stop Trinidadians from coming here, and it was really as a result of the enthusiasm which the hon. member then showed, if I may be personal for a moment, for some two years I have had it in mind that Barbados must get it. I resisted any suggestion of changing immigration laws, but after this happened the hon. member was prepared to continue with his Address. We eventually tightened on the Trinidad Act, and like the Trinidad Act widened the list of Prohibited Immigration, but this went. I know that the hon. member for St. John is always opposed to persons coming here of Indian birth. Well, I am one of those Barbadians who do not fear Indian competition; nor this weapon which is put in here about barring people on economic grounds. I know I have heard that it has been used against some East Indians, who wished to settle here. It has been used against Europeans, Poles and others and that was seized purely from the desire of some Commercial interests in Bridgetown, not to have competition at that time. The standard of life was different. The sort of things, the self sacrifice that an Indian would undergo would not be dreamt of by a Barbadian, commercial men and so on. But we have, before we can press our point of view of Immigration, to remove some of these rough edges. You will remember that the *Times* Newspaper pointed out that when the flow of Barbadians began to show itself, we could stop an Englishman from coming here, but England could not stop a Barbadian going there. Well, if we are going to claim that there will be absolute freedom in Federation, we have to eliminate these things that may be thrown at us such as that we are keeping out persons merely because it is fashionable to do it as in some parts of the world. Obviously some reasons are inevitable. On page 578, in the Immigration Act 1952—26, paragraph 4 (1) (a) it is found:

"Any person who is without visible means of support or is likely to become a pauper or public charge."

It is that we are not eliminating and (f) which reads as follows:

"any person deemed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on economic grounds to be an undesirable immigrant and so declared by order published in the Official Gazette."

I repeat, sir, it is obvious that if we insist on getting economic grounds as a cause cut out from the Federal Constitution, you must cut it out from our own Statute Book.

I beg to move that Clause (2) now stand part.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if we are the only one in the field who are making this kind of amendment. We may be. I think this sort of Immigration Act should remain if others have not taken it out.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: So far as I know, Trinidad has reduced her number of 137, by 52, and that happened during the Freedom of Movement Conference last year, and the Council agreed to it; but as the hon. member said, I have not heard of any other colony doing it yet; and as we are most likely to

make the most noise, it is well that we make the first move.

Mr. LEWIS: On economic grounds it is a bit dangerous, because we do feel that we should not allow people to come here penniless, and in a place where it is difficult to get work without some means of repatriation; and I think that a deposit to the extent of a return passage or something like that should be made. It is not fair to the individual himself to allow him to land here in an overcrowded place looking for work and then to ask the people of the colony to repatriate him or wait until you can catch him to get rid of him. It is not a bad idea, sir, to have some deposit or some means of sending people back where they can see their own people, and have a better chance of getting some sort of support without going on the rails.

Mr. Chairman, it has never been clear to me what is this reciprocal repatriation thing that we had. I think if we had a time by which a standard Barbadian would be repatriated it would be unnecessary to collect a deposit, but I am told that that is not true.

The question that Clause 2 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this section can also be thrown at us, that if you are not a Barbadian the Governor-in-Executive Committee can say you cannot come in whether you be English, Dutch, or any other person. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Have the other islands cut out this?]

I do not know that they have. Mr. Chairman, a number of persons in that category can still be prohibited, as for example in Section (e) or (f), so if we do not cut that out, and there is prohibition of anybody who is not a Barbadian it can be thrown at us, that we are so strict that we have to raise our voices on people keeping us out.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like to ask the Premier if we are not going too fast in changing these laws. I presume that we are doing this thing so as to influence activity at the conference. I wonder when we have gone ahead and changed our law, whether the other islands will follow suit, or whether we will find ourselves breaking down our barriers while the other colonies are keeping theirs.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What does it matter? Let them all come. The Jews came here and ran and did not come back for all these years. What Coolie is going to leave Trinidad and get a job against a porter? Or what Agricultural Labourer is going to come here and hope to get a job on a sugar plantation? I do not think that any of us is afraid of immigration; when we have an overflowing population, one can easily say that people will say "Why do you want to come to our country and every now and then you are stopping us?"

Mr. LEWIS: I was hoping that the question which has been asked by the hon. senior member for St. John would have been answered. We must have some law in this country to deal with anybody who becomes undesirable.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not say this by way of criticism. The hon. member has already reminded us that you can keep out a political enemy. Of course, the Governor will have to take the views of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. You can say we know that you are keeping out a political enemy; the position is wider than that; It prohibits anybody but a Barbadian from coming here freely and that is much too strict.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

OLD AGE PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to revert to Order No. 2.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act 1937.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with an Amendment to the Old Age Pension Act, 1937. As hon. members are quite aware, Professor Richardson made certain recommendations as to Old Age Pensions and it is those recommendations that this Bill seeks to implement.

Clause 2 of this Bill provides for the payment of Pensions to deaf mutes of the age of twenty-five years and upwards, the reduction of the qualifying years for blind persons from forty to twenty-five years, and the raising of the limit of the qualifying means test from one dollar and seventy-five cents to three dollars per week.

As the law stands now, blind persons qualify at the age of forty years and under this Bill they will qualify at the age of twenty-five. Deaf mutes will qualify at the same age and also there is the raising of the means test from one dollar and seventy-cents to three dollars per week.

Clause 3 extends the category of persons who may qualify for pension by excluding from the calculation of means any property (other than cash) not exceeding five hundred dollars in value and any cash not exceeding one hundred dollars.

As the position stands now, a house and land and any money in the Bank was taken into consideration in calculating the amount of pension which should be paid. As we know, some people make provision for their burial and they leave a few dollars in the Bank for that purpose. Any amount over \$100 will be taken into consideration and similarly any property not exceeding \$500 will be taken into consideration and will not be computed in the rate of pension to be paid.

Clause 4 raises the maximum pension from one dollar and twenty cents to one dollar and eighty cents per week, and provision is made for this increase to apply retrospectively from 1st April, 1955, to any persons in receipt of pension when the Bill becomes law.

This Bill will apply retrospectively as from 1st April last year as was mentioned in this House during the consideration of the Estimates on the last occasion.

There are other recommendations of Professor Richardson which do not affect this Pension Act. They are by way of a Contributory Scheme which is now being examined by the Government and I hope that we will come down soon with something to that effect. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

10.40 p.m.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which was supposed to be a miniature Beveridge Plan has been hatching for nearly two years and has now produced not a miniature Beveridge Plan but an infinitesimal increase to the present Old Age Pension Act. It shows that the mills of God grind slowly but exceedingly fine: because in this instance you have been waiting very long for something which Professor Richardson said you could have done at the time he made his Report. It has taken all this time to produce what Professor Richardson said could have done when he made his Report. I will say that some of those people for whom you are making provision are already dead so you cannot make anything retrospective to the dead.

Now, I do not intend to go into the whole of Professor Richardson's Report at this late hour because it is a comprehensive Report but I want to say that you would have thought that as this was the first opportunity we have been given to discuss Professor Richardson's Report that the Government would have dealt with this matter at a time when honourable members were fresh. The Government is now dealing with this matter at 10.45 p.m. In the closing remarks of the Hon. Minister, he said Government was thinking over matters as regards a Contributory Scheme to bring to the Legislature later. Let me say that there are people who have a greater interest in these things than the Government; all the Government has done is to delay other people from thinking out other Schemes to be put into operation. I wish to say that schemes which could provide greater comfort for workers could have been put into operation before if we were not waiting on the Government.

As regards the amendment to this Old Age Pension Act let me ask this question: if you have someone who is blind what difference does it make if that person is blind at the age of 25 or 40 years? If you are going to give aid to the blind, there is no reason why you cannot give aid to them from the age of 21 years. That is one of the afflictions which befall mankind which can befall him at any time. If you are satisfied that a blind adult person or a deaf mute cannot support himself, there is no reason why you should not make provision for him from the age of 21 years, because you know that those people will never be able to make a mark on the community owing to the affliction with which they are suffering.

I do see, Mr. Speaker, from the amendment that you are lowering the age limit for blind persons and deaf mutes from 40 years to 25 years and at first glance it will appear that you are reducing it by as much as 15 years; but in an instance like this, let us bear in mind that if a person is blind we should give him assistance from the time he is blind. There is no point in your saying you will begin to give assistance from the age 25 years, as you are now saying, because there is nothing about 25 years at all. As a matter of fact, a man reaches the age of responsibility before that age. What you are doing today is not even closely related to a miniature Beveridge Plan and what has happened is that the Ministers are too busy, and therefore, they cannot get down to these social matters and look into them as they should. You are only tinkering with this matter and delaying people who are willing to get on with other things in respect to this matter.

If Government had not delayed this matter with respect to production bonus, the sugar workers

would have been discussing today a Provident Fund not based on any nonsense, but based on the economic value of the industry on the basis of a levy on the Sugar Industry—not on the basis of your taking a levy in order to build a Hospital, but on the basis of securing a Social Security Scheme for workers of this Island who have not known it for 300 years. The International Labour Organisation has passed legislation which stipulates that workers should have sick benefits and things like that; and with all that, you still have in this Island this delay which is preventing these workers from receiving that benefit. It is over two years ago that this matter was under consideration between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association. What caused the delay is that Government stated that Professor Richardson was coming down here to look into the matter; and after that statement was made, the people in the sugar industry felt that they should not enter into an agreement to provide this benefit because they would not know what the Government would do afterwards. They felt that if Government passed a law to tax the people in the industry and to make all of the workers pay, say, 50c. out of their weekly pay packets, perhaps after that was agreed on, Government might decide on something to make them pay an additional rate. I only draw that to the attention of this House to show what these delays can do. These delays have prevented a substantial portion of money which can be used for security benefits for the people in the sugar industry from being used for that purpose at present 10.50 p.m.

The wages of the Sugar Industry did not afford people to give them these Social Security benefits, because it was always regarded that the Sugar Industry could not pay more. But we know no sugar factory has gone into bankruptcy or in Chancery for the last ten or fifteen years, and there cannot be any question that it should not be done; and I do feel that this assistance that is given to the Old Age Pensioners, by raising it from \$1.20 to \$1.80 was so long delayed that we could hear something of a positive nature on the whole scheme that Professor Richardson came here to deal with, because it was that part of the scheme that he dealt with. Unfortunately, this is the first time that any account is taken of Professor Richardson's Report. The employers cannot see today how they can proceed with some of this scheme for the poor. The employers accepted a principle of discussing with the Union the question of a poor scheme, in order that even before you build the Deep Water Harbour you will hatch up some scheme and provide for workers, and now at this very moment people are willing to discuss these things. People are afraid to proceed to come to an agreement with the Union on the question of a scheme for workers, because they do not know what legislation the Government is going to pass so as to nullify all they have done. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that such actions make our social progress very difficult along what you would regard as voluntary lines, because people do not like to take voluntary action which involve financial expense, or if such action is likely to cut across anything Government provides. It prevents you from proceeding on lines that could expedite certain things on behalf of workers, and I feel sure that such an action would only be a deliberate attempt to stultify social progress along certain lines, because—I am sure I do not have Professor Richardson's Report, that report was made in September 1954—if you are going to tell me that the Old Age Pension which was a burning question with

members prior to that, and this is now January 1956 and we are now dealing with this matter, and even now the Government cannot say what is the policy of Professor Richardson's Report. He asked that we amend the Workmen's Compensation Act but today if a man dies he still gets \$1,800. Today his beneficiaries are getting that in spite of Professor Richardson's recommendations eighteen months ago, but the Government has taken no action to look at the Act as they look at this. That is the sort of thing we are getting. If a man is suffering from influenza a good employer would pay him more and he is much better off. If he is injured and he has to go home, he gets half his salary or wages as long as the injury lasts and that is the sort of thing that we are still dealing with; and up to today the public of Barbados and workers have to continue under what you would call 1925 Workmen's Compensation Act passed in Great Britain. Why is that? Because it is evident that those who have to deal with this matter do not realise the urgency. But I know this, that the impact of public opinion of all sections of this community is going to make that Workmen's Compensation Act become law, because this is the year in which you want to hear the worker's voice. You would then realise the plight it would be if all these matters are not dealt with in the way in which some of us feel it should be. I must say, fortunately for certain sections of organised workers, that we do not wait on the Government to initiate policy for us, and those of us whose duty it is to initiate social policy for workers have shown our own initiative. Our Providence Scheme for instance provides for a section of workers superior benefits to what this provides.

If a man is stricken with blindness the qualifying age was 40, but today are you going to perpetuate the same policy? Are you going to keep the same policy that it is going to cost you more money like Federation and the delegates to London? You increased the Resolution from \$17,000 to \$20,000, and we did not query when we were going to give more money; but can any man in this House tell me that you can spend so much more money if you provide for blindness at the age of 21 than blindness at the age of 25? You should even provide for children, why stop at 25? If an adult becomes 21 and is blind, you are not doing the country injustice by providing him with assistance, because it is going to be small. And I say this, with the type of education, Mr. Speaker, that we have in that people are not brought up even to take care of their bodies as well as they can, with this question of overpopulation and with the concomitants of these social diseases, we know that in the majority of cases blindness stems from one of these social vices; and I do feel it would do no harm to this country if the same age at which you regard a man as eligible to vote—a man or woman is eligible to vote at 21—a blind person also qualifies for assistance. What is wrong with giving a man or woman the right to be able to call on these bodies for assistance after stricken with blindness? When it comes to the deaf mutes, they should be placed in such a special category that there should be assistance given to people on the basis of a means test. If you are satisfied that the parents of the deaf mutes cannot afford to provide it with the good things of life, you should be willing to give the family assistance and not only on the basis that the family should put them in the parochial almshouse. There is a tendency that if people are poor, they must show absolute stringency. Many a poor mother would receive assistance, but if, say, the only way

for that person to receive such assistance is by sending them to the almshouse, even if the mother is working as a domestic servant she would prefer to provide for the child. I do feel very strongly that the age limit for the deaf and blind should be reduced at this stage.

11.00 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: At this stage, I would like to add my quota. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been an occasion since I came to this House when this question of Old Age Pension was discussed.

I know that I am singing my solo now, but while I appreciate what has been done up to a point, this is an increase of 50% which has been promised and which has at long last come before this Chamber for these unfortunate people. In examining this Bill, besides this 50% increase, the other amendment which the Government has made will have the general Public to believe that something else is being done. Let me say here and now that I do regret—and it is a pity—that they have not yet seen fit to appear that they are doing something by increasing the qualification for calculating the means test, and I wonder if I will live long enough to see a Socialist Government in power really reduce the qualifying age to 65 years. I wonder if they will remain in power and not really appreciate what the agricultural labourers—the people who went to the fields at 11 and 12 years of age and who are really broken down even before they get to 65 years—have contributed to this Colony. They have enacted legislation to the effect that English Civil Servants who come out here can retire at the age of 50 years, but can't they see fit to give a person an Old Age Pension at the age of 65? Well, if they can't God help them. Of course, it will cost money, but it will be money which will be well spent.

When I was invited to speak by the late Reverend Gentleman who agitated for bringing forward Old Age Pensions for the people of this Colony, I made it clear that America is a highly developed country and the qualifying age for pensions has been reduced to 65 years. People who reach that age can still push a button here and pull a ladder there; but how long can women in this country continue to head canes after they reach 65 years? My appeal whether there is a Socialist Government or a Conservative Government in power, would be to reduce the qualifying age for receiving this Old Age Pension to 65 years. Are we going to follow other places in some things and not in others? The Government will not have done the right thing until they have reduced the qualifying age for receiving these Pensions to 65 years.

I am wondering as far as this matter is concerned, whether the Government will not be guided by other places. The Government is saying that they are giving blind people these Pensions from the age of 25 years. That will cost about \$251,000. [Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Where did you get those figures from?] What I am trying to say to the Government is this: what is the point of reducing the age from 40 years to 25 years? I ask the Government what is the number of blind people in this colony? You are by legislation saying that those who are coming up now will draw this pension from the age of 25 years, while up to now people were drawing it from the age of 40 years. I am suggesting that under the Bastardy Act the father, or the putative father of a child must support it up to the age of 16 years; a father is responsible for the maintenance of the child whether it is blind or not. The Government should start at the age when the father of the child would not be any longer responsible for its support. In other words, if the child is born blind,

the father is responsible for maintaining it up to the age of 16 years. I have seen cases between the ages of 16 and 25 years; when the child reaches the age of 16 years the father says: "I cease to support this child." How many cases there are to be found between the ages of 16 and 25 years? You can prevent a lot of suffering by providing for these children from the age of 16 years. I have seen cases from the country, I have seen cases from the parish of St. Joseph and we have them in the City. I submit that as soon as the father ceases to support his child, the Government should take on that child. In the case of deaf mutes a similar thing should apply.

11.10 p.m.

Clause 2 (a) provides for the inclusion of deaf mutes. That is quite right, but why from the age of 25 years? It is ordinary commonsense that if you have a legal statute which says that a putative father must be responsible for the support of his child until that child reaches the age of 16 years, then if that child is afflicted with blindness or is a deaf mute, this Act should make provision for him from that age. That is my appeal to the Government tonight and I hope that the Hon. Minister of Social Services will confer with the Hon. Premier on it so that when this House goes into Committee on the Bill, he will see the necessity for the amendment. I understand that no honourable member outside of the Government can make such an amendment, because it will create a charge on the Treasury and that is why I am making the appeal. The Hon. Premier cannot say that he will have to take the matter back to the Executive Committee to be discussed because he did not take back the Resolution which made provision for the Federation Delegation. He amended it in this Chamber after prompting by members. You always allow precedents to be created and then you deal with subsequent matters on that basis. The Hon. Minister of Social Services was at one time Churchwarden of the parish of St. Michael and he knows that blind persons and deaf mutes were dealt with on the basis I mentioned. Let me say that if you work according to the Statute Law which deals with illegitimate children, you should amend this to read from the age of sixteen, because somebody will be responsible for a deaf mute or blind person up to that age, but cannot be held responsible after that age.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter dealt with the Beveridge Plan when dealing with this Bill. We all know that that plan is a big plan: I know I cannot make an amendment so that old age pensioners would be able to qualify for pension as from 65 years but I am appealing to the Government to make that amendment now. The Hon. Minister of Social Services knows just as I do that people in the United States of America draw Old Age Pension from the age of 65 years. Our people live in the tropics and you say that they must begin to draw that pension from the age of 68 years. The Hon. Minister of Social Services, who is a doctor, knows well enough that few people of the labouring type who are by far the great majority who qualify to draw this pension cannot carry on the work of cutting and heading canes after they are 65 years. As a matter of fact, they are not employed at that age today.

I do not think it will cost more than 7% of what it is now and even if it does cost more, what does it matter if \$1½ million is spent annually on this? After all, these old people deserve it. What we enjoy, we enjoy as a result of those people who worked hard in their days and got nothing. I will say that to the planter, the capitalist, the merchant and all people like that because it is well known

that the agricultural labourer who was working during the 1914 War worked for nothing at all and they contributed to the prosperity of this country. At 65 years, they are entitled to a pension and as long as I am in here I am going to sing that solo.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is refreshing to find in 1956 that solo which I used to sing in connection with the existing section 3 (1) of the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, has attained to the status of a small chorus, but unfortunately not a chorus of the majority of members of this Chamber. However, certainly it is better than what is was in the past. I was almost moved not to join in the debate after hearing the member on my immediate right (the honourable junior member for St. Peter) and the honourable senior member for the City speaking in the strain in which I spoke many years in the past.

In connection with the Report of Professor Richardson and this Bill which is the result of the Report of the Professor, the admission that the Government took a long time to bring down the Bill is quite correct yet it can be said that the Professor did not propose any help for persons below the age of 68 years. On the other hand, if the Government were to say that we should follow the Professor and do not reduce the age limit from 68 years, then we should adopt every suggestion which he made but which we are not adopting. As honourable members said, that is a matter for him and his point of view; so far as we are concerned, the people with whom we are dealing are people of our country, people of our kith and kin; and we know that when they reach the age of 68 there is nothing left in them. As a matter of fact this Government has laid down the law that those who work in Government offices should retire at the age of 60 years and it goes as far as to say that some should retire at 55 years and some at 50 years. Compare those workers with agricultural workers who have to work in the heat of the day and the onerous duties they have to perform. Yet they have to attain the age of 68 years before they can qualify for pension.
11.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact it is better if the money were not enough to reduce the age rather than increase the amount, but we can find money for both; and certainly there is no justification at all in not making an amendment to this Bill; and the most important section of the Act is the one we are not touching, that is section 3, of the original.

"Every person must have attained the age of sixty eight, or, in the case of a blind person, the age of forty."

You know this Act was originally passed in 1937, it was amended in 1949, 1951, and 1953, but we have not yet touched the vital section, the section dealing with the sixty eight and the blind persons.

Now, sir, as to the age, what is the point in making an age limit for blind persons, reducing it from 40 to 25? I do not think Professor Richardson recommended that. A person becomes an adult at 21, as the hon. member said just now, but why this 25, heaven only knows. Twenty-one is the adult age, 21 represents a guinea; it has the same significance in our way of thinking. Twenty-five represents another form. Government has demonstrated that it can accept suggestions of amendments to increase charges on the revenue and as I see, the Cabinet has been reminded of a precedent created this very year. Why not do the same, in an even more meritorious case, that is reducing the age for old people and removing the ridiculous qualifica-

tion of 25 years. Do not believe simply because Professor Richardson has said that he does not see that you can afford reducing it below 68 years, nothing is to be done to increase the amount. I do not agree with Professor Richardson and say that we can dare trespass on hallowed ground and go before that three score years and eight. Therefore, I submit we should make a real serious and vital amendment to this most important Clause in the Act, that is Clause 3(a) and Government should have no reluctance in accepting the proposal, and as it is a monetary measure, in letting it be made by a member of the Executive Committee in order to conform to the wishes of this Chamber, and of the members of this community and to do what without dispute would be justice to the poor old people in this country.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, no one appreciates more than the truly poor anything given by way of an increase in Old Age Pension or what not, and I am sure, sir, that in a short while these thousands of old and decrepit old age pensioners would appreciate the gesture of the Government—although somewhat belated in giving them this increase in their pensions, a thing which had been asked for quite some time now. I presume, sir, that if the hon. member for St. Lucy had continued agitating for an increase—and as he said, he started from 1937—these unfortunate human beings would have been in possession of such an increase already. Unfortunately the hon. member did it 19 years ago and then seemed to have forgotten his application. However, hon. members will remember—

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of correction. I said I started in 1937 and then carried on doing so. It is a pity the hon. member does not hear what is said, or pays attention to speeches other than his own.

Mr. ALLDER: However, sir, I must express gratitude for the decision of the Government in increasing this amount. It is now some five or six years when we discussed the estimates and when I thought that the age limit for the blind people should be reduced, and while the Government has shown its willingness to recognise the suggestion, yet it is not sufficiently satisfying: because I suggest today, and I stated my reason that the father of an illegitimate child is responsible for that child until it reaches the age of sixteen, and he is not obligated after that period. In many cases the child is left to suffer because of the fact that the mother of those who are responsible for it might not have the means to make provision for its maintenance. That is why, sir, I thought that the age limit could be reduced to the age of 14 years which I am told is that period before which by law the father has to provide for its maintenance. I do not think that out of a population of 230,000 people you can get more than a couple of hundred blind paupers, and therefore, if unfortunately these people are through no fault of their own incapable of fighting life for themselves, those of us who are able-bodied and who can see should be asked to make provision for them, so as to make sure that they are not permitted to suffer unduly at any stage in their lives. That is why I thought provision should be made for the age of 14 years; but nevertheless I must still say this: if it is being reduced to the age of 25 years, a blind person can suffer considerably between the period of his birth and when according to the law he is qualified to get assistance under the Old Age Pension Act. While it has increased that Head according to the Estimates to a considerable amount—I think I observe it is

increased by 50% and that makes it nearly \$¾ million spent annually on Old Age Pension—I want to say that this is a considerable sum spent for that piece of social service when we take into consideration the other commitments of the colony and its general finances.

11.30 p.m.

I am still hoping that in the not distant future, the Government will see its way to reduce that age limit as I suggested some time ago, and which I am further emphasizing now, to 14 years. I hope that that will take place because we see such persons daily trying to beg their way through life under great handicaps, and it would be doing a very great service to a very deserving group of people. While I am on that point, I should like to say that if by changing the Act, you open the door for more persons to be qualified under the scheme, I am hoping that the Government will make provision to extend the Department which has something to do with the distribution of this money. I will repeat that, in my opinion, to be able to spend \$¾ million on Old Age Pensions can be considered as a reasonable means of redistributing the wealth of this Colony. I must say that when we reach the Committee stage I will ask the Government to accept my suggested Amendment that is to say that the age limit be reduced to 14 years, if that is permissible.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that if we go on long enough some hon. member should discover that if the qualifying age for receiving Old Age Pensions is 68 years, the qualifying age for blindness should be the time you are certified that you are blind. If you are giving somebody something for being blind, from the time you certify that he is blind you should give it to him. [Mr. ALLDER: Well, make an Amendment.] I am glad to know that these improvements are being made in the granting of this pension. It is not as simple as just adding 50% to what you are giving people now; that will mean that you are leaving the means test just where it is now. I will tell the Government this; it is a means of circulating money by extending this qualification. It is just like if you give school children milk; so long as you send the money out of the Island, it will increase business.

This is something which I have been advocating for a long time. If the Government can give its employees a pension, if the Government can give persons who are employed by them Old Age Pensions, then it is the Government's duty to see that everybody gets a pension. The Government has no right to see that nobody pays a pension but themselves, that is by way of a contributory scheme. Do not let the worker contribute to the employer; let them both contribute to the Government, and let the Government be responsible for the payment of the pension. The Government will discover that countries which are considered to be backward have a contributory pension scheme, whereby the employer and the worker will give something to the Government as a guarantee that that person will get a pension when he reaches the age of 68 years. There are no half measures.

The means test is below subsistence level, therefore, what sort of means test is it? If the Government can guarantee these pensions, it should use the money which is put down in their schemes. The Government is supporting the Gas Corporation sending money to Canada to give people in Barbados a pension; but the Government is guaranteeing a Bank, and therefore why should it not try and keep the money here? If you spend the money here, you will make business in the place. Are you spending money to get tourists to come here and do that? Every person in this Island should get a pension or no Government employee should get one.

11.40 p.m.

It is no use reducing this to an absurdity. The Government should guarantee everybody a pension and employers should be made to make contributions to the funds that must accrue. Old Age Pension is one of the things that at least would cause me, if I were not converted, to say that no Minister of Religion has any right going to the Treasury for a stipend. We had the Anglican Church here from the time of the colonization of the Island and it took a Minister of Religion from another denomination to work out a scheme for Old Age Pension to put before the Government, before the old people in Barbados could get a pension. They started off, not with 2/6 but 1/6 per week and we have added and added on that until to-night we have got to the position where we can say that we are giving them a raise from \$1.20 to \$1.80 per week. We started off from as low as 1/6. Perhaps it was tried out to see if they could live on 1/6 per week. It is my contention that the quicker you do away with that the better it would be. It is no use saying 68 years; say any time that somebody is unable to work. That is the way to do it. [Laughter] It is no use sitting and laughing. You are not going to tax people to pay pensions but you are taxing them to keep people in almshouses! There are many people who can keep themselves better out of the almshouse than you can keep them in it, and it would cost you less. You want a new conception of these things.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, allow me to make a few remarks. Professor Richardson came here in 1954. One therefore assumes that in 1954 the Government's conscience was exercised on this question of the adequacy of old age pensions, and in assuming that this increase will cost the Government around \$300,000 a year, they themselves were not competent to decide that this expenditure should be introduced or undertaken; therefore, they brought in this expert to tell them that it should be done. They can with equanimity and with the greatest facility contemplate to expend around \$½ million on Government buildings but they had to hesitate and bring an expert to tell them whether or not to provide more money for old age pensions. Professor Richardson came here in 1954 and he made this recommendation about increasing old age pensions purely incidental in his comprehensive report on a general Social Security Scheme. I find it difficult to believe that a Government, constituted as this one is, has really had to sit down there and wait until somebody came in here to tell them they should increase old age pensions. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in my mind the idea of bringing Professor Richardson here should have been to report on the advisability of introducing even a liberal programme of social security.

Since the Government has decided to embark on this increase for old age pensions, these old age pensioners are entitled to the increase as from the time Professor Richardson came here. When Government invited him, they did not invite him to see his face; they felt something should be done to make life after incapacitation more tolerable for people of a certain age. Presumably, they were also concerned with the possibility of certain benefits for people of riper years. In spite of paying Professor Richardson to come out here to advise them on the implementation of a Social Security Scheme, they are not prepared to undertake any sort of social security for any section of the population at all; therefore, the least they can do is to advance this increase in old age pension as from the time Professor Richardson came here. As a matter of fact, we should thank British Guiana for bringing Professor Richardson out to the West Indies. At the time,

British Guiana was thinking of increasing their old age pension. They accepted his recommendation for an increase in old age pension as from the time he started work on it in British Guiana and there can be no excuse in this Government not implementing this increase in old age pension after this unconscionably long time they took to decide it, unless it will be given for the maximum period. I expressed the opinion that it was not fair to grant an increase only from the beginning of this financial year because this document has been in the hands of the Government for too long. They themselves will have to admit that before 1955 they thought of doing it and, therefore, if they were serious when they brought Professor Richardson here to find out what the position was then, they are bound to admit that they are morally obligated to implementing it as from that time, especially since they are not implementing any other part of his recommendations.

11.50 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there is an election coming off some time this year, and it is just as well that members on the Other Side should begin now; and therefore, if I were on the Other Side, I would be saying the same thing as they. I happen to know something about this; therefore, I cannot talk in an irresponsible manner as other members have done. As far as the reduction of the age is concerned the reason why we have not reduced the age is because it will cost more money. As the hon. member at my side would say, if and when we find oil, we will do better. This increase, an hon. member has said, if it goes through will cost in the neighbourhood of \$250,000. He is correct to a point. He forgets that as soon as you increase the means test, you bring in other people and it is estimated that this increase would cost \$460,000. That, added to the \$514,000 now on the Estimates, brings us nearly to the million. When we do have our contributory scheme, then the Government will be in a position to reduce the age limit and pay more. The hon. senior member for St. John is the only member on the Other Side who made a statesman-like speech. He realises that Government has other commitments, he realises that we have had the visitation of hurricane "Janet" and we do not know yet the extent of the cost of that, as far as Government is concerned, the hon. senior member for the City thought he should compare us with the U.S.A. and what is paid on the States. . . .

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No! I never did that at all, sir. He never heard me complain about what is paid in the States; I said the "age" at which he qualifies; and I went further to say a man at 65 can do more in an industrial community than in an area where it is an agricultural society.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I thought he was comparing us from the point of view of finance. I apologise if I misunderstood him.

So, sir, as I said, it is a question of money. If the hon. members on the Other Side feel they can stand a little more income tax then we can accept the suggestions.

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

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 — was called and passed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before you put Clause 2, with all seriousness, everybody appreciates what the hon. member says about the age limit and lowering it to 65 and so on, but let me ask the member this: in dealing with Clause 2, where it says that the age limit will be 25, would it cost you much more money? It could not cost \$100 a year more to reduce the age from 25 to 16 years. I ask the hon. member in all seriousness. We are only trying to move this amendment to include a small number and you would be doing such a service to those few who have passed the age when the parents are not bound to support them. I am asking the hon. member, if he would suggest amending it to read, instead of 25 years, 16 years.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I cannot undertake to tell the hon. member that now, but I do promise to examine it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That really does not need any examination—what would it cost? The Minister of Social Services knows we have under 200 blind people in this country. You are reducing it from 25 years, we are not going below 16 years; and it is the number between 16 years and 25 years, that we are concerned with. I repeat from the floor of this Chamber here, you cannot get 20 of them; therefore, how much could it cost? What do you have to examine the Clause for? Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of the Opposition scoring a victory. This is having some heart and that is why I appeal to the hon. member. That is the difficulty with the Government bench. What is there to examine? It is not one of those things where you give a form and leave it with the people to study. If I came in here and asked you to reduce it to birth, that would seem madness. You cannot say I did not give you a reason for making the reduction to 16 years, but because you want to score a point you bring it and say you are not changing it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on close examination, that is something you can agree on. It needs no examination, not from the point of view of a financial matter. Dealing with the mutes and the blind is not the same thing. If you are reducing the age from 68 years to 65 years, obviously you are dealing with a class that is so wide; but you know the class you are dealing with is infinitesimal, and if you reduce this amount by any amount from the time a child's parents no longer supports it, the amount the Government would pay out, would not be \$1,000. If this needs examination, I would move that further consideration of this be postponed because there would be no point in suggesting that you would examine this and come back next week to amend the Old Age Pension Act, as it would be nonsense: and anyone who is in his senses or who has been taught that 2 and 2 make 4, can make calculations to see that with the number of blind people in Barbados, the incident of blindness is such that the maximum amount that you are going to pay these people is \$1.80 per week. It has been drawn to my attention that this Bill was given notice of since September. Suppose we put down \$2.00 a week, that would be \$104.00 for 52 weeks. [Mr. ALLDER: You are getting back pay?] You are talking about back pay, but you don't know if that is going to continue. But the amount could not exceed \$1,000 per annum more even if you multiply that number by ten.

12.01 a.m.

It has been drawn to my attention that this Bill has been here since the 20th September last year. I want to say that \$2 per week for 52 weeks is \$104 per annum for the additional amount of people who

would be blind. Suppose you multiply that amount by 50, you will see what it is. The suggested amendment in itself would make it impossible to say that we can do it on the floor of the House. It would take many years to spend this amount of money as compared with the projects on which they have spent money; we have passed Resolutions here today for a lot more money. You could as well be plain about this matter and say that you are not in favour of reducing the qualifying age. The question of examination at this stage means no examination at all, because you cannot pass a Bill today and say that you are coming next week with an amendment. I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We could not just come in here today and say: "Let us reduce this qualifying age from 68 to 65," and do not ask the Hon. Minister to go into the matter; that would be a most unreasonable thing. I have expressed my view on the question of the reduction of the qualifying age from 68 years to 65 years and you can bring the Lord Chancellor or Sir Winston Churchill—neither of them can change my view on that. You cannot come in here and do a thing like that; it is unreasonable to ask them to make an amendment which would result in the expenditure of a considerable amount of money. I have suggested that a father should support his child up to the age of 16 years; and I do not think that you would find 10 blind people between the ages of 16 and 25 years. The Hon. Minister of Social Services knows that the percentage of people whom you find blind are those who become blind after the age of 16 years. In the majority of cases people become blind as the result of some social diseases, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services knows that the percentage of blind people between the ages of 16 and 25 years would be very small. I have not suggested that you should go below that age because I gave the reason that the parent would be responsible for these people. I can quote chapter and verse for what I am saying. The hon. member has appealed to me to help somebody under the age of 25 years from his own parish. Let them make up their minds on this matter. I want to suggest that the proposal which I have put forward could not cost any \$2,000 a year.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I do not remember off hand what caused us to decide on this age of 25 years in respect of blind persons, but I think we worked according to legislation from somewhere in connection with it. I do not know how many young people would come in; this is an estimate for a known figure.

Mr. ALLDER: I take it that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is serious when he says that he will have to examine the position and that he intends to give it favourable consideration. I think I can see where the Government will find it difficult to decide on an issue like this. Like the hon. senior member for the City, I will take the Hon. Minister's word for what it is worth, and we do hope that the number of people between the ages of 16 and 25 years will not be great; therefore the additional cost would not be beyond the financial ability of this Island.

I will not vote against the passing of this Bill now if I am assured by the hon. member that he will go into the matter.

12.10 a.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the motion that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS: The suggested amendment has not been turned down. In the case of the reduction of the age from 68 to 65 years, we have been told that this is what the Government feels it can afford now.

After all, it is a responsible Government and they have to decide what is the amount they can spend and abide by that. When it comes to the deaf mutes, we have been told that the suggestion has been turned down merely on account of money. Now, you should know how many children are blind up to the age of 25 years. The figures must be there because this must have been computed on those figures: therefore you can take a rough estimate of how many there were at the age of 40 years and by how many it has increased since you brought down the age of 25 years and work it out between year and year. The Hon. Minister of Social Services said he will consider it. This is something which will not take more than a week to consider, therefore he can accept a short adjournment and come back and say "I know where I got the 25 from and I now have the figures from the age of 16. I cannot accept it because we are not prepared to spend so much on the project at this time." The Hon. Minister can accept the motion for the postponement now and let us go on with something else. This Item has been on the Order Paper since the 20th September last, and whenever you pass it you are going to pay out the money retrospectively as from the beginning of the financial year so it will do no harm in your postponing it for a week.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am willing to support the motion for the postponement for a week. I was a member of the Executive Committee and if a matter came before the Executive Committee in order to get more information, there will be no question that it will not be given quick consideration and decided upon. The whole idea about this thing is that you have not given thought to the view expressed and because you know it will bring in a few other people you say you are going to examine it. You did not see that point of view at the meeting of the Executive. That kind of thing has happened at the Executive already. What is the harm that will be done to the people if you postpone it for a week? Certainly, that point did not strike you as it struck you today. The Hon. Minister has said that he will examine it, therefore it shows that the point did not strike him or members of the Executive Committee; therefore it is nothing wrong to postpone this issue and find out what is the position as regards your making provision for those of the ages between 16 years and 21 years and upwards to 25 years. All of us agree that the age of 25 years to begin at seems to be too high for people who are blind or are deaf mutes to qualify. If you want to put legislation on the Statute Book for once which is more or less the feelings of the Legislature at the time, what is wrong if you have to postpone the measure for a week or so in order to do it?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, surely the Government—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Do you think that the Government has the figures here in any file? We have to get into contact with all the Parochial Authorities so as to get the figures.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am the most surprised man to hear you say that. You have an Association in connection with the blind to send in such a Report to you. There is no point in saying that. The information is on my desk in my bedroom at home. It is right there; you do not have to ask the poor Relief Authorities to get it for you and that is a fact.

I do not like this unreasonable attitude in this House on the part of the Government. I am appealing to hon. members to let us amend it now; you do not need to postpone it. The Hon. Minister of Social Services said that he would examine it and the only reason why he is going to examine it is to see how much more money it is going to cost. Per-

haps he will come back in here and say that it is going to cost too much money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am going to repeat the assurance given by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. Already this vote has been given very careful consideration both here and when the matter was being discussed at the Executive meeting. We did not bargain to spend \$400,000 and it is already above that figure. I do not know what we are going to get from Colonial Office next week. We examined it with the many other things we have to do.

But when you had to spend a great part of your Budget for this Deep Water Harbour plus hurricane expenses, you cannot do this offhand. I go further and tell hon. members, whether they take my word for it or not, this particular sum of money very largely under all consideration is to our reason, a loan. I am saying what happens to be the truth. I have to go up there with the exact figures and now we are talking about postponement. I am asking hon. members to accept the assurance that the matter will be examined.

12.20 a.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, one could understand if the proposal involved the expenditure of another \$20,000 a year. This thing cannot cost more than \$1,200 a year. When you begin to talk about Deep Water Harbour costing millions, and other big responsibilities, this could not cost \$1200 at the most. The hon. member today said they agreed to spend \$6,000 merely to put new paint on the walls at the Ministerial Buildings, and to give a few people something, he is telling you about Deep Water Harbour. It is sheer nonsense. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that when it comes to the Colonial Office, that \$1,000 means something to them? It is the height of nonsense to come in here and try to push that argument down the throats of people. It has nothing to do with The Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I really give way to the hon. member for the explanation he has given. What the member for St. Philip said is right. I appreciate all you said. If we had asked today to reduce the age from 68 years to 65 years, thereby putting in the Government for \$2,000 \$3,000 or \$4,000, that would be unreasonable. [Mr. CRAWFORD: Sit down, man, we can sit here all night!] Alright, what I say is this, this is not 1820 and when you see a statement like that in the Press, nobody believes it except people in the Mental Hospital. Whenever you make a statement of that sort here you lower yourself in the eyes of the public. Nobody will believe that statement.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am going there to ask them for as much as possible towards hurricane expenditure, and one of the first things they did after the hurricane was to cable us for a break-down of our needs and resources. We are not making another charge until we know how much we are getting from the Colonial Office.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All that is well and good, but it would not be unreasonable if I ask to amend it from 68 to 65. You know there are not 50 blind people in Barbados. What we are asking is reasonable, however. The change of age from 40 to 25 is a farce, and you should remember there cannot be 20 blind people between the ages of 35 to 16 years. If you can find twelve people between those ages, I will resign this seat and give it to you. [Laughter] Laugh! If you don't know that, you don't know anything about your social services, and when the Hon. Premier says something like that to go on the records, what is that going to get you? I

would not be an idiot, an irresponsible person, if I came in here and asked to do that. That is trying to bulldoze people because you don't want to amend it. I bet you tonight, Mr. Chairman, if he looked around and saw no members to vote for it, he would want to postpone it. What political "kudos" would any member of this Opposition gain by asking them to put in twelve blind people? You don't observe everything; you don't see every point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I only want to try and make manifest how farcial is the attitude of the Government. To begin with, when the Government began to lower the qualifying age on blind persons from 40 to 25 years, it must have had before it a Report of the blind in the island. That Report would not have stopped at "age 25." It is the height of dishonesty if you have to examine that, because the Minister should be in a position to tell this Committee how many blind people there are in the island from one to forty. He has not got to examine it. We will agree to vote the money to bring Professor Richardson out to investigate the question for him; to let him tell the Government how many blind people there are and how much it would cost the Government to give them an old age pension from 16 years. Everytime he wants a justifiable expression in this country, the Premier trumps up talk about the Colonial Office and the Deep Water Harbour. He could not find money to send people to go to England, but he can find £2,000 a year for the Chief Liaison Officer, Mr. Pickwood; and so far as I know, all this is done without prejudice to the talk about the Colonial Office and the Deep Water Harbour. It is a shame to quote that moth-eaten argument all the time. Let us suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the expenditure on the Old Age Pension is now \$478,000 a year and we made it \$488,000, do you believe that a country that provides social security for every person in its confines from the cradle to the grave—because in Great Britain you will have all sorts of social security—would cavil at the additional expense of another \$1,000 for blind and Old Age Pensioners?

12.30 a.m.

Their social consciences have been so aroused in the matter of social security that people who go there for a little time receive these benefits and who would begrudge the spending of another thousand dollars in this matter? We are really making fools of ourselves to take the Ministers seriously.

The question that the further consideration of Clause 2 be postponed was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS LEWIS, F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD and E. D. MOTTLEY—5.

Noes: HON. G. H. ADAMS, HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS, HON. M. E. COX, HON. C. E. TALMA, HON. R. G. MAPP, MRS. BOURNE, MESSRS. BRYAN and ALLDER—8.

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

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

On the motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, while the Hon. Leader of the House is fixing the Order Paper, I would like to suggest that we meet on Thursday of this week. It was proposed to deal with the amendment to the Shops Act in order to cover a point which I intimated to the House I would like to have covered before leaving the Island, and to have the Amendment put on the Statute Book. I believe it is the feeling of some hon. members that that amendment would not be enough. The Government never thought that for a moment because we proposed to amend the Liquor Licence Act in order to deal with residential and proprietary clubs. In view of the fact that it is highly necessary to deal with the Amendment to the Shops Act now, the Hon. Leader of the House is going to ask for an adjournment of the House until Thursday. I believe that the Hon. Leader of the House will mention some Resolution to be dealt with also. This is easy legislation to be dealt with. I will promise that as far as possible, that is the business which we will ask the House to do on Thursday. I would like to point out that a barber's shop is included in the definition of "Shop," but not a club.

It would be unscientific to amend the Shops Act, for the purpose of a hotel. All that we mean is termed "shop."

12.40 a.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like hon. members to come at 2 o'clock on Thursday to deal with one Resolution in Committee of Supply and then give consideration to the Bill to amend the Shops Act—just those two things. As the Hon. Premier has said, this Bill is to enable Government to ensure that discrimination is not practised on premises such as shops.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday 26th January, 1956 at 2 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next 26th January, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

"Everdene"

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity of this motion for the adjournment to again remind the Government of a matter on which I did not take action today by way of asking a question because the Hon. Leader of the House said that he would communicate with some other Minister and make a public statement. I consider it is a matter of extreme public importance. It concerns the raising of that schooner "Everdene" which has been sunk in the Careenage. It is a very serious matter. The Hon. Minister of Social Services promised me that some statement would have been made today on the matter. As a matter of fact, it is preventing an hon. member from coming to the House and doing his duty. It is definitely a serious matter. Let us say for instance that amateurs are working on it and they drop it in the centre of the Careenage, what would be the position?

Mr. Speaker, the great thing about this matter is that this particular Government owes a duty to itself, to the individual who is doing the job and the Public about it. In their interest, I am telling them to say something about it. It is a member of the Government Party who is practically mixed up with the firm that has contracted for the raising of this Schooner and apparently that firm is making no progress. I am going to tell them that from the

engineering and other points of view, the member to whom I am referring, if it were anybody else that had contracted to do the job irrespective of whether that person was a member of this House or not, would have brought the matter on the floor of this House and would have spoken with some authority on it; therefore I say that it is in the interest of the Government to make some statement on it.

I came in here and said that there were three sinkings in the Harbour and the Careenage that were still a menace. The "Guyrany" was completely blown up; the "Potick" is still there. [Laughter] If they think this is a laughing matter, it is not. This is something to do with the hurricane. They have been accused of playing politics and this contract is mixed up with a politician who is a member of the Government Party.

This is a serious matter. If the schooner can be blown up, adopt that method. I was promised a statement on this matter today and that is the reason why I did not frame a question on it. There are all kinds of rumours about it as well as that Government property is being used with it; probably that too is damaged. I think it is something of sufficient importance to move the adjournment of the House on another occasion if I cannot hear some statement on it. As I have said, I know the interest I take in it, the particular member involved would take and perhaps from a different angle. Since a member of the Government Party is mixed up in this matter, we do not know how it has kept an officer like the Harbour and Shipping Master from taking action as he would have done if the person who was awarded the contract was an outsider. [A VOICE: That shows envy.] The Harbour and Shipping Master may have done something about this matter if it were some person unconnected with this House that was carrying out the contract [A VOICE: Why did he not do something with the "Potick"?] The "Potick" is no concern of his. He has nothing to do with that particular spot. [A VOICE: Who did you say is mixed up in it?] The Government is mixed up in it. They owe a statement to the public concerning the matter. I have no envy for anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I have had no information about the matter from anybody. Give the persons three times as much if they can get it up and move it.

12.50 a.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is referring to my Ministry, but I am not clear as to what he really wants, and until he puts the question in the usual manner, I will not be able to give a proper answer.

Mr. LEWIS: Why did you not say so last time?

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know what you wanted. All I am asking him to do is to put something to the House that somebody can work on, and anyone who listens to him knows he has not said anything on which you can work. Let him put something to the House, a Question, an Address, and let us work on that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, did you not hear me say that the Leader of this House said he would get in touch with the particular Minister and make a statement? Well, don't say I did not say anything. It was a promise.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member last Tuesday evening after the Minister for Communications had gone—

Mr. LEWIS: No, Sir, I did it on the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: He intimated to me that he intended to make this motion in order to discuss this thing. Well, I got in touch with the Minister, and he said he did not know what kind of statement the hon. member wanted.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not taking part in it. I am mystified as to what the hon. member is driving at. The public Press has done more than the hon. member. Divers are engaged in raising the boat, and I would not be surprised if when we go on the wharf tonight, we do not see it up. That was by the way. I only got up in order that it might not be thought that we are discussing the Deep Water Harbour any longer, and I am going to England to get money against what we spent in the hurricane. Things are being started and you can see the Deep Water Harbour is starting this year.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 26th January, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—4.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE and Mr. BRYAN—8.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 26th January, 1956 at 2 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr SPEAKER. I think the "Ayes" have it, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

1.00 a.m.