THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th February, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Dr. H.G.H.CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D.: C.M., (Speaker), Mr. J.E.T. BRANCKER, (Leader of the Opposition), Hon. M.E.COX, (Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour), Hon. R.G. MAPP, (Minister of Communications, Works and Housing), His Honour Mr. V.B.VAUGHAN (Deputy Speaker), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr C. B. SEARLES, Mr. L. St.A. THORNE, Hon. D. D. GARNER (Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries) and Mr. T.W. MILLER. Prayers were read.

Mr. Husbands entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of the 28th January, 1958, having been circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st December. 1957.

Hon. D.D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Executive Council of the Commonwealth Agriculture Bureaux for 1956-57.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. M.E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:-

Resolution to place the sum of $121,797 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No. 64, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of $82,840 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1957-58, No.65, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M.E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:-

Resolution to place the sum of $10,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1957 58, No.66, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier) Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

Hon. M.E. COX: I should like to say at this stage that as soon as we have a sufficient number of members in the House, I shall be asking for leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 in order to deal with the money Resolution for $121,797. I sought Your Honour's permission to circulate this Resolution. It is a non-controversial Resolution and, I should say, a mandatory one dealing with the contribution which this Island has to make to the British West Indies Federation. The matter has almost been agreed upon already.

Messrs. Tudor and Walcott entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. M.E.COX: I should like to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the other two money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon M.E. COX: I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949 be now read a first time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Speaker, the hon. Junior member for St. John, be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting. I think that that is in conformity with what goes on in the House of Commons. In the absence of the Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Speaker takes the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall not permit that; last Session I gave a ruling to that effect.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I was just about to say the same thing.

Hon. M.E. COX: I do not want to question Your Honour's ruling. I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

3.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour

do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1957–58, No. 62

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, there are three items under this Omnibus Resolution for the sum of $36,083.

The first item deals with extensive repairs to the scalding kettle in the slaughter house at the Public Market.

The next item is for $780 to supplement the vote under the Head - Widows' and Orphans' Pensions Scheme.

I think the Hon. Minster of Communications and Works will take care of the third item if there are any questions to be answered

The first item seeks to get $303 to repair the scalding kettle at the Market as set out in the notes. This work had not been anticipated during the last year. It is an emergency, because they have to use hot water for cleaning the pigs and other things at the slaughterhouse. It is therefore necessary to maintain the hot water supply at the slaughterhouse.

(Mr. L. E. SMITH entered the Chamber and took his seat amid Opposition cheers.)

Under the second item, Sir, a refund of $780 is sought under the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme...

(Mr. L. E. SMITH took the Chair.)

As I was saying, item 2 has to do with the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme. As is stated here, some people who were under the scheme have left the colony; their contribution had to be refunded and we are asking for this money to supplement the vote for that purpose.

The note to item three reads as follows:- "The necessity for this supplementary provision has been caused by the laying of a number of four-inch mains under agreement for private individuals, and the installation of a record number of water services to residences and housing schemes. The amount is recoverable."

This Government has embarked upon a big programme of laying mains in every little village, and when you lay mains in these villages, you get persons asking for water to be installed in their homes. We must have money in the first instance, but it is recoverable because a charge is made for installations.

Another big item too is the housing schemes; we are putting water in each house, and this entails a lot of expense. This Supplementary Resolution is to grant authority to use this money, and if we fail to vote it, the work cannot be carried on.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, may I pause to say how much I rejoice in seeing you back in the Chair. I know that augurs well for the coolness of today's proceedings.

May I seek a little information from the Minister about the unforeseen exodus of officers from the Civil Service? How does it come to be unforeseen? Is there not a list of officers prepared in advance every year of those who are about to retire, so that the Minister would know that at the 1st January so many people would be about to leave this year? In the absence of cases where illness has caused officers to resign, I am wondering how an exodus although it can be an exodus of one - of officers could be unforeseen even by the Ministry. If it is a thing which could never be foreseen, perhaps the Minister will be willing to explain how many there were, how many retired because they have reached the age limit, and how many retired for other reasons, and or what reasons. I should like to know, for instance, how many have retired to offer themselves as candidates for the Legislature.

As to the new water services, I am glad that Government at last sees the necessity for supplementary provision for laying a number of mains so that private individuals may get water in their homes. This Resolution is in the hands of the hon. junior member for St. Philip, and may I commend to him the idea of making this provision applicable not only to the metropolitan parish, but to the rural parishes of the island? It is good to see that this is in the hands of another Minister, because we will see if it really a matter of overall Government policy or the policy of a particular Ministry that when these mains are being laid for additional water supply, there is a tremendous concentration in St. Michael to the exclusion and detriment of the other ten parishes of this island.

3.35 p.m.

I trust the hon member will not emulate his other colleague and confine these new mains to the parish of St. Philip. I have some complaints in respect of applications by private individuals for new water services in the district of Checker Hall, St. Lucy, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister who is in charge of this Resolution will be the last to show a dislike or distaste for that parish. I appreciate having some information that the necessity for this supplementary provision has been caused by the laying of a number of four-inch mains under agreement for private individuals particularly in respect of the parish in which it is proposed to work.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this Resolution but at the beginning I would like to make this observation. This is an omnibus Resolution and though short, deals with matters which come under the supervision and the interest of more than one minister. In the first instance, Head IX - Markets, comes under the control of the Minister of Agriculture and in the case of Head XL - Waterworks, that comes under the control of the Minister of Communications. It might be all well and good for Government to send down this Resolution in this way but I consider it irregular, because, as it is, the Minister who introduced it is not responsible to Parliament for the affairs o the Waterworks Department. Another Minister is, and that is the Minister of Communications. It may be that Government thinks it economical on the time of the Ministers to have a Resolution brought down in this way but as it is early in this year, although late in the Financial Year, I think that Parliament would rather have Resolutions such as this brought down in the name of the Minister who is responsible so that we could put questions to the Minister who is really responsible for his particular Minstry and hear them explained by him. Here we have the Hon. Minister of Agriculture explaining a matter which really concerns the Ministry of Communications and as yet, the Hon. Minister of Communications has not said anything in Parliament pertinent to the matter. I do not consider it regular, and it is not good enough. If one is responsible to Parliament for a particular matter one has to make, or ought to make, the necessary explanations to Parliament. I am not saying that the Hon. Minister of Communications would refuse to make explanations but, as it is, to see this omnibus Resolution come down in this fashion (although short), and led off by a Minister who really attempted to explain matters which really did not belong to his Ministry is not something which I consider regular. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture spoke in relation to matters which more pertinently belong to the Ministry of Education.

As regards HeadXL- Waterworks, I would like to inform the Hon. Minister of Communications that many residents of certain districts of St. Peter - Potter's Bottom, Sweet Home and part of the land of Battaleys which is back of the Farm Road have for a long time been clamouring for an adequate water supply. I remember that the present Minister of Labour who was the Minister of Communications thought it was some concern of his and so much so that he visited the Battaleys area to investigate how it was possible to have these people better served. I do not think the hon.senior member for St. Thomas, the present Minister of Communications, has yet busied himself in this matter and I hope he will do so soon, because, there is still that need for an adequate water supply in Potter's Bottom. and Sweet Home- which is to the East of Potter's Bottom - and Battaleys, which is just south of the Farm Road. I hope the present Minister of Communications will busy himself in this matter and I think he will find something in his files about it.

The Resolution is not controversial. I very much regret the irregular fashion in which it has come down. I

have not heard the Hon. Minister of Communications speak in relation to Item XL and I think Parliament would like to hear him reply to any question which we put in this respect.

HON. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing irregular in this method of handling Resolutions. It is a Resolution like all the various omnibus Resolutions which have come down from time to time and if any hon. member wants to know anything in addition to what is set out under the note to the Item, the Minister is on hand to give Parliament any further explanation. It is just to simplify matters that it is put in this way.

I will take note of what the hon. junior member for St. Peter said of those three places in St. Peter that need water supply . As he should know, the usual practice, of course, is for requisition to be made for a water service by the residents to the Ministry and then refer the matter to the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department. The hon. junior member for St. Peter says that he thinks the requisitions for these places are already on my file. I will look for them and see if they are there; if they are I will have them investigated in the very near future.

In reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I may inform this Committee that last year 2,000 new services were installed and as the note to the Item in this Resolution says, this is a record number. It averages one hundred services per month now and the installation of the new services exceed 150 per month. Hon. members will see that we are not sitting down. We are expanding at a big rate and we are lifting over 8 1/2 million gallons of water per year. I do not know if the hon. Junior member for St. Lucy thinks all this water is lifted in St. Michael and that we install 2,000 in St. Michael a year. He may feel that that happens, but I think every hon. member knows that these services are installed all over the Island and that we are not discriminating. We give everybody equal facilities and equal treatment. Although this is an annual and occasional complaint of the hon member, I can assure this Committee that it is not so. The parish of St. Lucy receives just as much attention as any other parish. 3.45 p.m.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that there are any other points which have been raised. I can assure hon. members that there is nothing irregular in this matter.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have to support the hon. senior member for St. Peter as far as the water service is concerned. The Hon. Minister is quite right in saying that the number of the services has been increased from 1,500 to 2,000; but perhaps he forgets that the installation of water in the new houses in the Housing Schemes plus the private services has accounted for the substantial rise in the total number of services. However, I still contend that there are some old villages throughout the Island -- I know of some in St. John - which are certainly still desperately in need where water is concer ed. Standposts are scarce and people still have to walk too far in order to get water. We are contending about the public services where people have got not any water in their homes; those are the services which need to be increased.

If the Hon. Minister were to investigate the matter he will find that those are the services which should be substantially increased In this 20th century, we should not have people walking so far in order to get water when there is the increased supply of water about which the Hon. Minister has just told us. This supply of water should be translated into the public services so that there will be greater ease on the part of the average villager. I contend that there are still too many villages throughout the Island - Sherbourne and Venture in the parish of St. John and many others -- where it is very difficult and inconvenient for the average villager to get the public water service.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is nice to hear the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down; he seldom has that opportunity. However, I am afraid that his idea of what is necessary is not after all very up to date. It is not a question so much of increasing the number of standpipes so that more and more people can get more and more water from outside their homes; the whole point about increasing the water supply is that more and more people can get more and more water inside their homes. As I understand it, that is exactly what the Governmen' is trying to do. We must look more carefully at one or two things which the Hon. Minister has said. It is not impressive to say that whereas you had 1,200 water installations, you now have 2,000, because there are certain factors which have to be taken into account. The Government, by its own policy o making it possible for more people to get water, has also made it possible for more and more people to apply for the service and therefore, you must expect that there will be a larger number of applications proportionately, so long as people have hopes held out to them that they can get water cheaply on the instalment plan. That is the brunt of the quarrel. In my constituency -- I am glad that my colleague has mentioned it quite a lot of people complain that much delay is occasioned on account of the fact that after people make arrangements with the Waterworks Department for the Water service they are told that there is a shortage of material either of pipe or of something else That is the thing that is holding up the extension of the water services. It is not good enough to have the House of Assembly very generously granting money from year to year or the extension of private water services and then you have a talling down in the administration of the matter by not having the material on hand. I am certain that the complaint in St. Lucy is not confined to that parish, but it is the complaint which is heard all over the Island. The complaint is that persons have been made to wait unnecessarily long for the installation of services in their own homes, although they have prepared to meet all the requirements of the Department on the ground that the materials which are needed for doing the work are not available.

With only a little foresight, it should be possible for the Governmnet to plan well ahead so that in any particular year when the extension of the water service is contemplated and even started in a particular district, the people who have applied should be able to get their service without let or hindrance. The people of this Island really like the idea of having water in their own homes even if the particular privilege is confined only to a single pipe in the backyard; they would like to know that when certain promises are made they will be kept fulfilled and they would not suffer the inconvenience of being put off by excuses. The money is at the disposal of the Department; the Hon. Minister knows the policy and he should see that material is available. That is the only sensible way to go about the matter.

Before I sit down, I should just like to make one comment on the other part of the Resolution which refers to the scalding kettle in the Slaughter House of the Public Market. I am told that there are quite a lot of grievances and complaints among the butchers at the amount of heat which is given off by this kettle owing to the fact that it is placed in too awkward a position, and the steam is so great that people catch colds from it. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister might find it profitable to go into this whole matter and discover whether some other method should be provided for the purpose of obtaining boiling water or steam for dealing with the carcases of animals with the minimum of inconvenience to the butchers. In any market which is established it would be a good point to use the most up to date methods in that respect, because the people who work in the Slaughter House are exposed to air and draughts, and when they go from a great volume of steam into the open air, that is not good enough. That is a point which the Hon. Minister might well bear in mind.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would still be grateful for any detailed information which is available as to the number of four inch mains, where it is proposed to lay them, for how many yards or feet in each parish. I am quite certain that that information would be illuminating. The Hon. Minister said that the policy is not a discriminatory one. I did not blame him for that, but it is said that the Waterworks Department does not overlook any selection of sites and places for laying mains. That is not overlooked, but when there is a vacancy to be filled it is filled in the parish which is represented by the Hon. Minister and particular attention is paid to that parish. 3.55 p.m.

I am not suggesting that the Superintendent is discriminating. The gentleman has not failed to say he is ready and willing, any time there is a vacancy in that parish, to offer himself as a candidate in the parish represented in the parish by that Hon. Minister. We certainly have a lot of trouble in St. Lucy to get them not merely to promise to lay these mains or to provide facilities for putting water in the homes of people, but to keep their promise. They would come down with a Resolution to do the work, and then some time after they would say they did not agree to put it so far. That is the sort of thing which is very unsatisfactory. It should be the policy of this Government in this small island to put water in every home, but as I gather from the Hon. Minister, his aim and object is to see we get standpipes at reasonable distances from each other. I suggest it would be in keeping with present trends and what is needed in this island - and this would reduce the amount of medical services, because there would be less disease and less cases of certain ailments if we have more water - if water was installed in each home. "Water in every home" should be the slogan of the Government, not merely standpipes close to each other; that is not sufficient.

As to his taking charge of this Resolution or why it is the Minister who represents the parish of St. Philip, I take it in my innocence that the Minister was Acting Premier and Acting Minister of Finance.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am really intrigued by the statement in Note 3: "The necessity for this supplementary provision has been caused by the laying of a number of four-inch mains under agreement for private individuals, and the installation of a record number of water services to residences and housing schemes. The amount is recoverable."

Perhaps the Minister can shed further light on this. Four-inch mains are large mains, and I cannot imagine them being used for private houses. Perhaps the Minister would be glad to throw further light on the matter, because depending on what he says, I may have a few comments to make.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister speaks, I should like to know the nature of the repairs to the kettle at the slaughterhouse and what provision is being made at the new Central Market in this respect. Quite a lot of money has been spent under this Head.

I should also like the appropriate Minister to answer certain questions in connection with Item 2 of Head xxix as to what amount is now lying idle and pending on behalf of the Widows and Orphans, how many widows and orphans have been paid within the last year, how many Civil Servants have taken their exodus, either by withdrawing from the service or by being transferred. I should like to know how many orphans have benefited within the last ten years. Those are questions which should be answered, and if they are not, then there should be a revision of the Widows' and Orphans' Scheme or those who do not benefit from it.

I should like these questions answered and if they are not answered, the House will be moved for Five minutes to have them answered.

In so far as the third point on Head XL - Waterworks, is concerned, I agree entirely with the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Philip. I agree entirely, Sir, in that four-inch mains could hardly be the mains used in private homes; it is a general main from which one-inch mains are run; but if the policy is to assist private individuals, we welcome that, and we welcome the measures taken by the ex- Minister in that respect. What we would like to see is a scheme whereby standposts are removed in certain cases and placed in the centre of villages where people live, and not put along the main highways, because the method of transportation today has changed. There is no question of the horse and buggy. We want standposts placed in the middle of the villages where the people live. A few of these cases have been dealt with, but there are hundreds more, and the quicker we get on with that job, the better for all concerned.

I can understand the Hon. Minister of Agriculture handling this, because he may stand a better chance of getting this done in record time, and not, as the Government always say, waste time on a simple Resolution.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: Mr. Chairman, so many questions have been asked that some can be answered here immediately and others I think, dealing with rational human-beings, would have to be asked of the appropriate Minister by sending in written questions. We do not walk about with files in our hands; we do not claim to be walking encyclopaedias, and I think it is unfair to expect us to have all of this material to answer all the questions at this particular meeting. I appeal, therefore, to hon. members who are rational, that if they want to get certain information, they should write the question down and ask the appropriate Minister to forward such information. All that I am able to answer I shall answer now.

Now, as regards the replacement of the Scalding Kettle, I should like to say this: we are hoping in the near future to have the new market ready and we will have an up-to-date one; therefore, the necessity for that old fashioned one will not arise. When we get going, we will dump this old thing; but until then we must have it repaired. I have been there myself and seen it, and I agree it is old fashioned, but it is no use getting rid of it until we get the new abattoir and cold storage. Until the time comes we will have to carry on with the old one. I hope what I have said answers the questions, but if there are any further questions, I am willing to answer them so long as I have the information.

As regards Note 2, no record is kept of how many officers are leaving the service in any year.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I would like the Minister at least to make a relevant reply to the question asked. I asked how many officers have left.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Exactly what I said covered that. We have not got that fact; so the hon. member would have to ask the appropriate Minister to bring this information to the House.

Mr. TALMA: I asked the appropriate Minister.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: But he is not here. I said in a polite manner that there were certain questions I could answer, but there were others we could answer after getting the relevant files which are not here. (A VOICE: Don't get too hot!) I am not getting too hot, but I am putting emphasis on it. No record is kept, and if you want to know how many left during 1956-57 or in any particular year, a written question would have to be sent to the Minister who would search the files for the information. 4.05 p.m.

The facts that I can give are these: I have no record of that here. I maintain that if you want to know how many people left during 1955 or 1956, a question will have to be asked and the files will have to be searched. So far as this file which I have before me is concerned, no mention is made of how many people left in 1955. I have here that 19 left in 1957 and the money which was voted is not enough and , therefore, they are asking that you supplement the vote by this amount of $780. As I have said, all of the questions which you want answered can be answered if the appropriate question is put for the Minister concerned to get the facts to you.

I made a statement here and to allay the fears of all hon. members who do not understand what this thing is all about, I just want to say that at the beginning of the financial year , a notice is sent to the Commissioners of Health of each parish asking them to send in a list of the names of the street s and villages in which they want to put a new service. The Commissioners of Health will reply stating that there want so many roads or so many villages to be serviced in the particular year and the Government takes action during the year to meet their demands.

This should be noted: When you want to carry a water service to private people's homes, you must carry it with at least a three or four-inch main because you cannot lay an inch main for people to tap a water service from. It must be a three or four-inch main for the people to tap. This Government has been embarking on a programme of extending the water services of this colony from the time it took over, but hon. members must also be reminded that you have to balance your budget. You have to allocate so much money to one Department and so much to the other department, and so you cannot finalise this thing in five years; you cannot get rid of all your evils in five years. When your first Five Year Plan

is finished, you go forward to a further Five Year Plan. You have extended your water service to so many villages, and you have put down so many mains in the parish of St Philip. The same thing which is true of St. Philip is also true of the other parishes, even St. Lucy.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the public should be aware of the fact that we have the intention of carrying water into every village but the only thing that hinders us from doing it tomorrow is the finance. If we had the money we would do it: but we have to prepare Estimates each year of what we can do, do a certain amount of mileage each year, and after that hope for the best. That is our policy and I think we are doing fine. I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter who has travelled to certain parts of this world will tell you that we are doing very fine in this respect. I would not like to tell you of my experience in the country from which I have just come, but in certain places I could not drink water unless it was boiled. Of course, the Opposition is right to ask questions but I must still ask hon. members to be rational and when you want certain information you should ask questions in a written manner. If after you have asked written questions and the answers are not forthcoming, you can take action. How can you ask such questions in an ad hoc manner and expect them to be answered now, especially when the appropriate Minister is not in his place? The Hon. Premier is not in his seat and I am taking the opportunity to have this Resolution passed. I repeat, there are 19 people who have left the Service whose contributions are being refunded them. There are 18 bachelors and we need this money now to pay the other contributions which might come up during the year.

I do not think any points were made on the other parts of the Resolution. All I would say is that I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church. All of that would be taken into account when the cold storage plant is erected.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, very often Government prolongs debates in this Chamber for two reasons. On the one hand, it may be through the ineptitude of the Minister and, on the other hand, it may be through the silly way in which documents come to the House are worded.

If you read Note 3 with reference to the expenses o the Waterworks Department and compare it with what the Minister has just said, you have to wonder who wrote it and you will also have to wonder how the Minister who gave the answer which he just gave could be content to have his wording given to the House.

This is what the note says:-

"The necessity for this supplementary provision has been caused by the laying of a number of four-inch mains under agreement for private individuals and the installation o a record number of new water services in residences and housing schemes."

Well, now, any simple-minded person or intelligent person would understand from that, that you are laying these four inch mains for private individuals. What in the world would a private individual want with a four-inch main to have a water service? I say that the wording o this Resolution is absurd and time and time again we have asked the Ministers to see to it that the people who word these things in their department are pushed out and let somebody else who can word them properly take their places so as to minimise the time we spend debating these things. I could not conceive a number of private individuals calling on the Minister to lay four-inch mains.

Hon. M.E.COX: I f the hon. member would give way I would just like to say that under the present law - the Public Health Act - if people want to cut up land and sell it, they must lay down mains sufficiently large enough as to accommodate the number of houses for private services as well as for public standposts. The money which we are asking for in this Resolution will be reimbursed the Government, but the Government must lay the mains in order that these people get a water service.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is an entirely different explanation. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that the laying of this four inch main was in order to accommodate the number of individuals who want to be supplied with water services and that the Government was laying this four-inch main in order that these people might tap it with a one-inch pipe. Now, the Hon. Minister of Trade is saying that the four-inch main is laid down in cases of the development of tenantries.

4.15 p.m.

where land is cut up and sold out to individual purchasers and you have four-inch mains, you tap them with one-inch mains so as to carry the water service to a number of houses. Now, which of these statements is correct? Either one or the other is right. We have had three different explanations with regard to one single item in a Resolution; therefore, when we are finished, nobody is any wiser or nobody knows what we are really doing. If the explanation given in the first place is correct, it would have been quite easy to word the Resolution correctly and there would not be any debate. If the explanation given in the second case is correct, then the same thing should also have been done; but with regard to the note, the man who wrote it should not be allowed to write another one unless it is going to be given to first standard children in the elementary school. If they have these Departments with Permanent Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and what not, and they cannot even write down three or four lines to explain a money Resolution, what is the use of having them? The Ministers bring these things down to this Chamber without perusing them and without seeing that they correspond with the facts. That is why more time is wasted in this Chamber in this way than in any other Chamber. One Minister said something and then another Minister said something entirely different.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Agriculture made his second reply, he let slip some remarks which I do not think it would be in the interest of the Committee to go unanswered, with reference to the balancing of the budget and what he called the little amount of money which the Government has devoted to the extension of the water service. The facts are that in every year, and particularly in these last two years, the allocations for the extension o the water services have been part of the Five Year Development Plan; therefore, it could not be true to say that there is a lack of money, because in every year - I think you will find it in the current Appropriation Act -- a certain amount of money is allocated from the total amount, so that the delay could not be due to the lack of money. I was hoping that the Hon. Minister would have answered the point which I was making, that people complain that they are told, when they are dissatisfied with the delays in getting the water service, that there is a shortage of material. Is the Hon. Minister saying that the shortage of material is due to a lack of money? We do not think that the delays are due to that cause. We feel that there is not enough foresight and attention being given to the proper ordering of material in time. I do not think it is fair, even on the Government's own policy, to say that it is a lack of money which is holding up the extension of the water services. The budgeting has been clearly done, and I take it that the Government has to rely on its advisers to know what can be done. We may think that more can be done, but that it a different matter. I do not think it is fair to this Committee to say that what has been left undone is due to the lack of money, there must be some other reason for it, but certainly not the lack of money.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but it is a question of priority. It is not enough to compare the development of the water services in Barbados with that of Asia or any other given country. One may go to some remote district in Asia and find no water for a distance of miles, but, in the same country, you may find a steam plant and the Government may be concentrating on providing its own defence and what not. Where we differ is on the question of priorities; we feel that the available funds which are at the disposal of the Government can provide more water services in the districts than the Government is providing out of that money which has been allocated for this purpose. It is a question of whether you are spending "X" pounds for water services and "Y" pounds for something else. The money spent in Leave Passages could be spent on a further extension of the water supply. We are not suggesting that the money spent by the Government on water services represents the maximum amount which the colony's resources can afford; we are not suggesting that at all. Our quarrel is

that, in respect of the money expended by the Government under various Heads, in some cases the expenditure should be omitted entirely, and in other cases it should be reduced in favour of things like the further extension of the water supply or the provision of hot meals for school children. It is a question of what is greatest with regard to Government's arrangements of priorities If the Minister feels that, because there is no water available in certain parts of the world, we are doing well, our contention is that we feel a lot more can be done. With regard to such an important matter as the water supply, a comparison with other countries is out of the question We contend that more money should be earmarked for the extension of the water supply, because there are too many districts in a relatively small island like this, in which water should be supplied but which it does not reach; and at the rate at which we are going, they will remain unattended to for a long time. That is not good enough.

Mr. BRANCKER: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has said that they do not walk about with files in their hands and he appeals to us to give notice of questions in connection with matters which they cannot meet us; he appeals to people who are rational. He could only be appealing to hon members over there. In respect of our walking about with files in our hands, let me remind the Hon. Minister that we are asked to pass a Resolution which has been presented to us since we came into this House. It is true that we do not walk about with files in our hands but on the other hand, we have brains in our heads. It is essential for us to have time to consider matters which the Ministers have been considering at meetings of the Executive Committee and various other meetings, but they become annoyed with us, because we are unwilling to suspend the Rules. The Hon. Leader of the House need not be worried this afternoon, because we have given an assurance, and an assurance given by members on this side is always kept.

4.25 p.m.

I am referring now to the Resolution which we have been asked to suspend the Rules to do, because we are disposed on this side not to oppose that suspension; but I am saying that when it comes to a matter which could easily be given notice of the previous week, if members of the Government had been doing their jobs or if their secretaries had been briefing them properly, then we would not be asked as soon as we arrived to agree to suspend the Rules as if we walked about with files in our hands, because we would not know until we came the matter with which we would be presented in an emergency Resolution. In coming here to discuss the Waterworks or Public Works, they would know through having discussed this matter, or they would have their private secretaries from the particular Ministries available to assist in briefing them; but we cannot come here prepared to deal with any possible subject under the sun if we are only given ten minutes' notice after arrival in the afternoon. So the hon. member should be reminded of what he said. We do not walk about with files in our hands.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I should like to say that I admired the policy in the past, but I do not know what it is today. When I was Minister, an attempt was made to extend the water services of this island. Whether the policy has been changed in any way, I am not aware, but the former Minister of Communications gave some explanation with which we are satisfied to some extent. What we would like to know, Sir, if this $150,000 is recoverable, is on what basis are these plumbing expenses being paid or what arrangements are being made for the repayment of the installation service. I have heard no explanation given on that yet, Sir. I want to know if any hardship is being meted out to those people whom they are pretending to help; I want to know if you are making it so impossible for them to put in the service that they find themselves in a bigger hole when it is finished than they started. We want some explanation on that because if we are supposed to be helping people to install their own services, we should know on what basis they are expected to meet the water bills, pumping expenses and expenses for installations. These are things which the appropriate Minister should reply to. Nobody is trying to embarrass the Government. When I ask how many Civil Servants left within the last year, that is not embarrassing anybody. Those are questions you should answer, and if you are not prepared to answer these questions, you should not attempt to deal with the matter. This is rational and clear thinking; that is information the public should have; so that when you come here and talk about being irrational, there is the question of being irrational as compared with total ignorance of Ministerial duties.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that work is being done to assist in the installation of water services, but I should like to know if in an attempt to help you are embarrassing people financially. Government has come to ask us for $35,000 to install four-inch mains up to a certain point, but four-inch mains are really used in some cases for their benefit, because the main used in homes is really a small main. The former Minister, the present Leader of the House has explained, and we are satisfied to some extent. If he is more capable to deal with this matter, let him deal with it; but do not let people who do not know anything about it attempt to deal with it and then say that we are irrational

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

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I intimated to the House that I intended to ask leave to suspend Rules 88 & 89. I should inform Your Honour that I have consulted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he has agreed to the suspension in order to allow us to deal with the money Resolution, which, as I said, is mandatory - our contribution to the Federal Government. I now ask leave to suspend Rules 88& 89.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to suspend Rules 88 and 89, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended, and in so doing I have to thank the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee to deal with the money Resolution for $121,797.

Hon. D.D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting that motion, but before we go into Committee, I want to say how much we on this side deprecate the wording of the note circulated along with this Resolution.

As you will see it reads as follows:- "The Hon. Leader of the House has intimated his intention to deal with it at the meeting of the House to be held on Tuesday, 4th February." This means that by hook or by crook, by fair means or foul ones, or under any circumstances this Resolution would be dealt with. I feel that instead of using the word "intention" he might have said "desire", and I trust that that will not occur again, though I am not blaming the Hon. Leader of the House for that.

Hon. M.E.COX: I have to take the blame for that, because it was submitted to me and if I did not approve of it, I could have amended it. I should also like to promise the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that in future when I want to have anything put through at a moment's notice as this was done, I will consult him before it is circulated.

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

4.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1957–58. No. 64.

FEDERATION

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution, as hon. members will see, deals with part contribution to the Federal Government. It is for $121,797. The Addendum explains fully the Resolution and I do not think it is necessary to read it.

I will say that this money is needed urgently. It is hoped, although I do not see the possibility, that this money will be paid over to the Federal Government between now and the 2nd February. I know that is an impossibility because this Resolution has to be passed here and then go to the Other Place, and then it has to pass through the Crown Agents before it can go to the Federal Government. There is hardly anything more to add other than to say that this is mandatory. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr CRAWFORD: Sir, We are being called upon to spend $121,797 for our contribution to the cost of Federation to the end of the current Financial Year. We are also told that the annual estimated cost is $7,772,681, so that our contribution of 8% would amount to $600,000 up to the end of the first year. We have been also reminded in the Resolution of the possibility of further supplementary estimates. From my experience of what happens here, we can look forward to another expenditure of $120,000 before the first Financial year is out. Because of that, I think we should issue a note of warning. There has been an extravagant expenditure up to now on Federation, more especially with regard to the removal of the Headquarters from here to Trinidad and the settling of the headquarters staff in that colony. We should not be surprised at that. People are always prone to get the most they can from the Government: but then, it is the fault of the Administration if they allow themselves to be fleeced. Therefore, the Federal Adminstration needs to be reminded that these are poor colonies and that the utmost caution should be utilised in the expenditure of funds from the Unit Governments of the Federation. We cannot afford to waste any of them. Already, Sir, there has been increased taxation to meet the increasing Federal costs, and these Islands are already heavily taxed; so unless the Federal Administration is going to exercise the utmost caution in Federal expenditure, there are going to be very stormy days ahead.

Now, Sir, with regard to the Federal Expenditure itself, it is true that most of this money will be contributed by Jamaica and Trinidad, but already, to some extent these two colonies have been getting benefits from the Federation because a considerable portion of the expenditure will be centred around the U.C.W.I. which is, as you will know, sited in Jamaica. All the financial advantages in respect to the U.C.W.I. will accrue to Jamaica; so that Jamaica , in a way, although contributing the major portion to Federation, will be geting some back because of the large expenditure involved and the tremendous advantage of having the University College in its midst. And similarly in Trinidad. Trinidad is the Capital and, Mr. Chairman, I need not remind you of the tremendous advantages which will accrue by having the Capital there. The Federal Staff will live there and spend their salaries there; and in time all of your international embassies and Consulates will be sited in Trinidad. All the conditions accruing from having a capital will go to Trinidad, and that will go a long way towards offsetting the contribution made by Trinidad to the Federation. Barbados has nothing materially speaking so far to gain out of Federation The only other important thing to the Federal institution which would involve expenditure of a considerable amount is the West Indian Regiment when it is established. I am suggesti g to the Government which would be representing this Island to make every effort to see that the West Inidan Regiment's Headquarters are sited in Barbados. There will be, I know, an effort to get it sited in Jamaica for obvious reasons, or even in Trinidad; but in proportion to our resources, the 8% which we are contributing is not insignificant; and while we are not viewing Federation purely from the materialistic point of view, it would be of advantage to get something out of it. Therefore, I repeat that every effort should be made to have the headquarters of the West Indian Regiment sited here, and, if not here, in one of the smaller islands: but not in Trinidad nor Jamaica which are doing well within the Federation. At the moment all the important industrial developments are taking place in these two colonies and in a short while they will be the industrial centres of the Federation and we shall be the poor relations. We cannot start too early to correct this unbalanced situation between the small units and the big ones.

4.45 p.m.

Now, I should also like to say that in this matter, it seems to me as if the West Indian Governments are treating this question of Federation at this stage as if it were some glorified circus show or something like that I said earlier that the cost of Federation is not going to be insignificant. We have the Governor-General making a tour of the West Indies, and I am amazed at the manner in which the Territorial Governments of the colonies which he has so far visited have treated the matter of his visit. From the beginning we have had a wrong approach to this question of the Governor-Generalship of these Islands. We are not federating the wealthy American or Canadian States; we are federating a number of small poverty-stricken Islands. At the beginning I pointed out that the salary of the Governor-General was too much. Three million people in the West Indian Federation with a total annual revenue of slightly over $250 million are paying the Governor-General in salary and emoluments the same thing that New York State with its 15 million people and its annual revenue of $1 billion is paying its Governor. We are paying the Governor-General the same thing as is paid the Governor of New York State whose revenue is four times our own! As a matter of fact, now that the Governor-General is paying his initial visit to the colonies, they seem to be vieing with each other in impressing him with the high standard of development of these unit territories. He is supposed to be coming here next week.

The other day- I saw some men working in Gall Hill and I understand that they must get the Gall Hill Housing Scheme to some measure of completion, because the Governor-General must see it. It seems to me that it is the very denial of statemanship to show the Governor-General what we have been able to accomplish through squeezing every cent out of the taxpayers' money. Let them take the Governor-General over to St. Joseph and let him see some of the 10' x 9' houses and the slums in which people are living. The Governor-General of the Federation, we must remember, is a very charming man, but we are not concerned with him as a man; we are concerned with him in his official capacity as the Imperial representative of Her Majesty the Queen, and he is the pro-Consul of a Federation, the constitution of which gives him very wide powers. The Federal constitution is purely a Crown colony; Thanks to the people who formulated it, the Governor-General of the Federation will have more power than any Governor of a unit territory. And- do not fool yourself - he will use it. People believe that the Governor-General is going to be a mere figure-head, but he is not going to be any figure-head; the basis of this selection shows that nobody expected that a man like him would have been selected as the first Governor-General. By virtue of his training and the previous position he has filled, Lord Hailes would be more at home in the comfortable salons of the nobility and of the higher sections forming the Conservative Party in England, and what not than being in the West Inides among the by-ways and small houses of plantation workers. Although he is a man of considerable charm, as far as we know, he is not the best suited type of person to be filling this job at this time and it is a bigger mistake for the West Indies to give him a wrong impression on his first visit. Let him see what poverty-stricken colonies we are federating; do not let it appear that everything is rosy.

The Standing Federation Committee asked for £2 million last year and they were turned down; the only way to get anything done is to show that we need some help.

We should not have any dinners, or cocktail parties at all. If we can do these things, then we are not poor at all, and we do not need anything. Can you imagine Lord Hailes as Governor-General of the West Indies signing a report to the effect that these Islands are poverty stricken and in need of help if, on his initial tour through the Islands, every unit Government is trying to outdo the other in giving him a good time? That is all they are doing and it is all sheer nonsense. He is coming here not to dine, wine and dance with the Creoles; he is coming here to see the basic needs of the country, the people of which have been living in poverty for over three centuries, so that the people of Great Britain would get cheap sugar and cotton and cocoa. While he can see the project at Gall Hill and any other housing project in passing, let him also see what is in Suttle Street and Cat's Castle and let him see how the people are living; let him know that every one out of three men throughout the West Indies is not working.

The West Indian Governments remind me, Mr. Chairman, of an accident which took place in Russia many years ago and the name of the Prime Minister at the time has come down in history to represent a certain type of action at Governmental level.

4.55 p.m.

You might have heard, Mr. Chairman of the expression "Potenkin Villages". Catherine the Great at one time decided to make a tour of the interior parts of Russia.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going all the way out in Russia. Please deal with what is in front of us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I admire you for being facetious, but I am very serious. I said that the West Indian Government might have heard of "Potenkin Villages", and I am explaining what I mean for those who do not know it. I said that Catherine the Great decided to make a tour of the interior parts of Russia, and the Prime Minister of Russia made it a point to pay very special attention to white-wash the villages through which she would pass. In certain places, barricades were put up and painted in pretty colours. You know what happened after that; the Bolsheviks rose and wiped out the Czars.

To attempt to show Lord Hailes an untrue picture of the West Indies is what the Unit Governments elected to do; in Antigua, St. Kitts and Montserrat and other places where he has been, you will have thought he was a screen star or something. That is absolute tommy rot. By all means, let us show him that we are loyal people, and that we like him as a man; but let us remind him at first sight that he is not the sort of man we expected to have.

I remember that during the War the United Kingdom Government appointed a Governor to an Indian state. His name was Frederick Parris, and he used to be a former railway porter before he became a big Trade Union official in Ceylon; he was on the Constitutional Reform Commission and then became Governor of East Bengal. His first public speech in Bengal was to the effect that while previous Governors of Bengal were accustomed to hunting, he was accustomed to shunting railway trucks from one line to another. I am not saying that we want a railway porter of necessity as Governor-General, but certainly we are justified in feeling that our destinies might be in safer hands if the Governor-General were a man who had had some previous contact with the West Indies, and who by virtue of his upbringing and background might normally be expected to take an interest in developing a backward country. He should be a man like Creech Jones, a man in public life and who through his entire career had demonstrated his interest in backward people and in improving the status of colonial people. We did not get a man like that and we are making a cardinal error if we bring him to Barbados and wine and dine him at Government House and show him the few projects we have been able to establish by increasing taxation all round - Customs, Postage, Licences, everything we can squeeze money from - to do these things, because his impression is likely to be: "If you can do these things, what do you want money for?"

It is all well and good for you, Mr. Chairman, or myself who live here and know the background of our colonial existence, to admire the Gall Hill or the Deacons Road Housing Schemes, or admire a new Welfare Centre somewhere, because we are also aware of the fact that just behind these housing schemes there are thousands of people who live in 12' x 9' houses. This applies not only to Barbados but to the entire area that is federated. I say, Sir, by all means show Lord Hailes what we are trying to do, but we should also make it our business to impress upon him that this is a Federation of poverty-stricken islands, and of the three million people in the area, 1,000,000 are unemployed and prospects of emigration are closing rapidly. He must therefore be impressed that we need help.

I am not at all satisfied in my mind with the manner in which the authorities of these islands are viewing this question; we have too much of the colonial concept. When in the past, Mr. Chairman, a representative of Royalty was coming to the West Indies, it was the business of the Colonial Governors or the Unit Administrators to impress upon the Royal Representative how happy and cheerful the people were. The school children sang "God save the King", and they were provided with buns and sweet drinks when the visitor came; and the people tried to impress the visitor what efficient administrators they were. But when you have the people's representatives controlling things now, it is not their business to impress upon the Governor General or the Royal Representative that everything is well and rosy. Let them see the sheer results of centuries of neglect. We have no right building this big palace in Trinidad as the Governor General's residence, and spending all this money you are spending on it. By all means, the Governor General must be housed in a building appropriate to his position, but what we want to give him is a combination of King Solomon's temple and King Solomon's palace. You would have thought that he was the Maharajah of Patiala, and not the Governor General of a few half-naked million people. We are spending a $1 million on a house for the Governor General in Trinidad, and then expect to make out to the British Government that we want money. We are selecting the best furniture and the most expensive art objects and what not to adorn his palace, as if we were Canada or some big wealthy country. The entire West Indian Governments need to be told that this is the wrong approach. We should not give the impression of opulence or that all is well. Let the man see conditions in all their stark reality and then you would be doing the people a service.

It is all very well and good for the Hon. Leader of the House to come here and in two minutes ask us to vote $121,797 for three month's expenditure; that is what we expect from them, because they themselves have no proper outlook on what they are doing.

Last week they came here to increase the number of Ministers Two years ago when Rhodesia and Nyasaland were federated, the first thing Rhodesia did was to reduce the number of Ministers in the territory, because naturally if you are going to superimpose a federal structure on the e isting structure, automatically you diminish the amount of work falling on the territorial administration, and therefore the first thing Rhodesia did was to reduce their Ministers. They reduced the number from seven to five. We had five before Federation and now we are going to have seven. That is the way Government looks at things.

5.05 p.m.

So, therefore, we expect the Minister to come in here and say, "spend one million dollars in three months, spend any amount in three months," without any proper conception of all that is involved.

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for $121,797. We are committed to the principle but let us not mar it by stupid plans at the beginning. Let us be careful with every cent we have to spend and for Heaven's sake, let Barbados set the example to the rest of the West Indies that the Governor General is not coming here on any social visit. Let us show them that he is not merely coming here to

see the lovely beaches of Barbados, to drink Barbados rum punches or to dance with some lovely Barbadian girl, but that he is coming here to observe the conditions of the territory and on the basis of what he sees and what he will report to Colonial Office will depend the manner, financially and otherwise, in which Federation is treated by the British Government. The Governor-General is the Pro-Consul on the spot; he is the man to whom the British Government will listen; therefore, we are making absolute fools of ourselves if we just throw a red carpet down for him as one of the Leeward Islands did and if we bedeck him with flowers and what not.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Is not that psychology? That is sound psychology.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is sound psychology in that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member will attempt to justify anything in his present position. I expected somebody would get up and justify it. How in the name of Heaven can that be sound psychology? Mr. Chairman, God Help the West Indies if we have a man like him in the Federal Government. We do not expect that the hon. member who interjected just now would have seen it to make any divergent speech in this matter in comparison with what the other Islands have done, but I sincerely hope that hon. members of this Chamber will make their opinions on this matter public. I want Lord Hailes to know that in Barbados there are people who are infused with a certain amount of loyalty but they are not political parasites; they are not political stooges, nor have they been elected to covet imperial honours and what not. What we are elected here to do is to see to it that the people are well represented and that their money is well spent; we are not to do like what other compatriots in the other colonies have done - throw down a red carpet for Lord Hailes to walk on. We are not going to do the same thing. If we have been neglected and exploited by Great Britain for three hundred years, we are not departing from our tutelage provided she treats us as we should be treated. It is the very negtion of statesmanship to treat the Governor-General of the West Indies as if he were Princess Margaret.

Mr. F.L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to deal with this subject in the same manner as the hon. senior member for St. Philip who has made an able contribution. The emphasis of the hon. member's speech was on the Governor - General and in the main, what he said is true. It is symbolic of West Indian people., it is symbolic of Barbadian thinking, that they love pageantry more than they love the good things in life. This House is an example of that sort of thing. This is the last vestige of a man dressing up and coming here on the opening of Parliament. It is completely out of consonance with the type of climate we live in. Just fancy in the midst of the midday sun you get a man dressed in morning coat and beaver coming here.

I do not intend to look upon this Federation in the light of what the Governor-General is going to do. I must say that my criticisms today are not going to be on the Governor-General.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I hope the hon. member is not implying that I criticised the Governor-General. I did no such thing. All I criticised was the approach of the Unit Governments to his visit. That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, my emphasis is not on that, nor is it that I disagree with the hon. member, because when dealing with the vote for the visit of the Governor-General on the last occasion I said what I had to say in so far as welcoming the Governor General and spending that money was concerned when it was considered what the territories were called on at this stage to pay towards the bringing into being of Federation. I would like the hon. senior member for St. Philip to know that mine is not a criticism of the emphasis he placed on that, because I did the same thing when I was discussing the Resolution as regards the question of the Governor-General's visit. What I want to say is that today we are not discussing the question of the Governor-General's visit; we are discussing the question of the contribution to the Federation and that is where I am going to lay a lot of emphasis. I am not laying emphasis on the visit of the Governor-General but on the leaders of the Units and I am going to say things which are going to startle you.

Sir, I am as much a believer in Federation as anybody else. From my own intelligence, I do know that in all these territories of ours they are greater possibilities for the advancement of these three and a half million people on a Federal basis. I will start off by saying that I am a believer in Federation because I cannot see Barbados with 200,000 people only ever reaching out in the world and grasping all the things that a model state should be doing for its people, nor can I see Jamaica doing that by herself.

5.15 p.m.

I cannot see Jamaica doing that, although Jamaica is big; I cannot see Trinidad doing it. I have visited all the federal territories with the exception of Dominica and I can say that all of them are in need of this fusion and cohesion which is so necessary not only for nationhood but for the progressive development. I start off on that basis, and it will not surprise anybody if I should say something which seems to be paradoxical. The hon. senior member for St Philip laid a lot of emphasis on the Governor-General, but he did not lay any emphasis on the leaders of the West Indies. I want to say that all the leaders of the West Indies today who have carried the West Indies on to the way of Federation and now at this crucial stage are making the open statement that they are no longer interested in Federation, should be carried to their respective cemeteries and buried It is the essence of political dishonesty for those leaders who made this intellectual exercise as to the question of Federation and placed it on the people to make them believe that they were carrying them to the Promised Land or into a new millenium, and now at this stage they are saying that it is better for them to remain in their unit territories and build the Federation up from there than go to the Federal Parliament. Let us make an analysis of that. If it is better for them to remain in their territory until such time as they are strong enough to have this Federation, why do they not postpone the whole idea and remain in their territories, build them up and when they think the time has come, then say that the time has come for Federation? But what do you find? I am not afraid if any other hon. member is afraid. The Hon. Norman Washington Manley who is Chief Minister of Jamaica, the Hon. Dr. Eric Williams who is the Chief Minister of Trinidad, and the Hon. Sir Grantley Adams who is the Premier of Barbados -- those are the people who are supposed to be holding the respective reins of Government in the three biggest federated territories. It is on the action of these three territories that Federation has been pushed forward When Sir Alexander Bustamante was in power, the Hon. Norman Manley criticised him to the effect that he was not interested in Federation. When the Hon. Dr. Williams was a Lecturer, he wrote books as to the benifit of Federation; I refer to "Negro in the Caribbean" and "Capitalism and Slavery." When the Premier of Barbados was in the Opposition, he was one of the fighters for Federation when the powers-that-be were not apparently interested in Federation. I remember fourteen years ago a debate taking place on the question of Federation and the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke was subjected to criticism in those days. This is where you are getting this political hand-playing. I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not here He is not in a position to speak out for Barbados, but somebody must speak out for Barbados. If he is afraid, I am not, and I know that what I am going to day now, is symbolic of the thinking of Barbados. If any hon. member thinks that I am not right, then let us have an open plebiscite and let us get a vote on it. Hon Mr. Manley has said that we should postpone this matter of Customs Union for twenty years, and if what Hon. Dr. Williams has said is true, he has just made this statement that if Chaguaramus is not made the site of the Federal Capital, Trinidad will secede. I am saying now that the Premier cannot say anything, because his position is that a political party in Trinidad and in Jamaica decided who should be the Premier and if you want something in this matter you have to join up with them. But that is not the case with me; I do not want anything except what is offered me by the people of Barbados. When I vote against this Resolution tonight,

I am carrying out what the people of Barbados feel should be done; and what I say is symbolic of the feeling of Barbados. If the Hon. Dr. Williams has said that he will secede if they do not get Chaguaramas, as the Federal Capital site, if you have freedom of movement postponed for five years and if you have Mr. Manley saying that Customs Union should be postponed for twenty years -- I should like to say that I do not owe my seat to anybody in Barbados and I am not looking for any Ministerial post; nobody has promised me anything. If I go to the Federal Parliament, I am representing Barbados; I am not representing any small clique. If the Hon. Mr. Manley said that Customs Union should be postponed for twenty years, if Hon. Dr. Williams has said that if they do not get Chaguaramas, Trinidad will secede, and if the Commission says that they will not have Chaguaramas, Trinidad will secede, where are we going? Can we come into Federation in this way? I am not dealing with Lord Hailes, because he did not make this Federation; our West Indians are those who made the Federation. If the Leaders are saying that they are going into Federation on the basis of what Jamaica can get out of it, if Hon. Dr. Williams is saying that Trinidad will secede if they do not get Chaguaramas, then you must see that if they did not get the Capital in Trinidad, he would have seceded too.

I do not believe that the Capital should come to Barbados; I did not want it then or now. I am not playing into anybody's hands. The Premier cannot say what I am saying now; I am not looking for anything. I say now that there is this hypocrisy about Federation that the two territories, Trinidad and Jamaica, are running the Federation on this basis in so far as votes are concerned and of the forty-five seats, twenty-seven will be retained in those territories.

5.25 p.m.

This Government which is in power is supporting that idea. That is to say if this Government had to select seats for the Federation, they would select the twenty-seven seats from one group in Trinidad, and the five members from Barbados will be called upon to vote in this whole issue.

Now I do not want to lay too much stress on personalities, but it is difficult, Mr. Chairman, in a debate like this, which has been the subject of discussion in the West Indies for the last eleven years. I had the honour and privilege of being in Jamaica in 1947 on the eve of the Montego Bay Conference, and I had the honour too of hearing Mr. Norman Manley, who was not then a member of Parliament, speaking on Federation. If, eleven years ago, I was told that he regards staying in Jamaica as being more important, I would have said that was not true. If Trinidad's attitude today as spoken through its Chief Minister is that they would not go into Federation or would secede if they did not get the Capital, then I would say that Barbados - and I was not a believer that Barbados should get it - would have been on safe ground, if we did not get the Capital in Barbados after the recommendation by the Mudie Report, to say we would secede. I do not think that would have been the right attitude to take if we did'nt get the Capital; but what I am saying is that after eleven years the people who were dealing with this are not now believers in the project they have put on the people. If you are going to have a Federation in which the Federal Government is regarded only as something which you are going to godfather, and something you do not really believe in, how can we look forward to the future that Federation will mean what we believe it should be?

This Government is lukewarm about Federation. Why? Because the very background of the Barbadian is a very individualistic one and our economy in Barbados for all these years is built up by the private man in his own little shop, and it is difficult for him to join with other people. But what do you find? Today is the 4th February and this Government has brought down this issue. Do you realise that the date fixed for Federal elections is seven weeks from now? Do you know that March 25th is the date of elections, and 28th February is the day of Nomination? What has this Government done to let the electorate know that the elections are going to take place seven weeks from now? This is an election that has not taken place in Barbados before, an election in which the whole island is one constituency, and in which one hundred thousand people are eligible to vote.

You are not interested in Federation. Why is that? You want to say that if the people don't go to the polls, it symbolises a weakness; That is where I support the hon. senior member for St. Philip. You show this lukewarmness towards your own immediate problems, and then you are pretending to welcome the Governor General with all this splendour. You are a hypocrite. The Governor General in my humble opinion should be welcomed in a modest way, but the amount of money that has been spent on the Governor General's welcome in the respective territories could build a first class school for technical education in the area.

I do not subscribe to the view that £2 million is astronomical for the West Indies to spend; it would seem so if you think of that amount for yourself. The United States Government gave Iran in the Middle East $2 million, and a lot of the money went down the drain. But what is the position here? The British Government is not prepared to put the Federation on its feet, but the politicians in the West Indies are willing to see if they can crucify the United States by looking upon them at this time as if they were a rapacious Government putting themselves on the West Indies, and asking the Americans to get out of Chaguaramas and give the Federation the Capital. But I want to say this: if that base were owned by the British Government, not one of the Leaders would ask them to get out. Why is it that because it is owned by the United States you are making this unpleasant situation? They are not an unfriendly Government either, and those of us who live in the West Indies for the next hundred years - whether we like it or not - must realise that the United States must be the protector of these territories. More American money is invested in the Western Hemisphere than any other, and if we are looking in the future to industrialise this area, it is going to be based on how prosperous Latin America becomes. As an instance, the people coming from Venezuela to Barbados is an indication to show trade trends and what is taking place.

As a digression, Mr. Chairman, the United Kingdom Government has just sent the Minister of Trade to Latin America and Venezuela to explore tthe possibility of trade, because the area is becoming one to look forward to. So I do not blame Lord Hailes or look upon him in the same light as I would look upon our own leaders.

Our people are not looking to Lord Hailes for exploration, and that is where I join issue with the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the Governor General has powers similar to the powers of a Crown Colony Governor, but dare not use those powers if he has a Parliament of Leaders working along a certain path. You will see what would happen if the Governors of these territories used Crown Colony powers. They can use them, but do they? I am not afraid, therefore, of the powers of the Governor General. What I am afraid of are the Leaders, if they have so created in the minds of the people that it does not matter who goes to the Federal Government. It is just like in Barbados where you talk about a Second XI cricket team; but you send a "picked" team- you tell a man you are going to play a cricket match in Westbury Road and you ask him to pick a team; there is no order of batsmen, and a fellow goes in last if he does not come early; or if you get vexed, you do not get any bowling. This is like when you are playing a game of cricket where the last man is "batting out".

5.35 p.m.

You find this attitude of mind that it does not matter whom you send to represent you. Let us be quite frank, Mr. Chairman, of what is in the minds of the people If I do not vote one cent or this tonight I am sure that nobody would be against me for that. How can we ever become a nation when the leaders are not interested in Federation? You are now spending as much money on supplementing the cost of Federation as would give you a few more houses . The Hon. Leader o the House told this Committee that it was mandatory. I agree with him but are you satisfied with what you have done? are you satisfied with the climate which at present exists? Let us analyse the situation which obtains at present. Do

you realise that the West Indian Governments have spent as much money on Federal Conferences as would build a secondary school to accommodate more of our children? Do you realise that the last amount which we spent on Federation when we went to Jamaica was $20,000? That is what Barbados spent alone. An analysis of the money which we have spent on Federation shows that it is a great injustice to ask these poor colonies to spend this sort of money and now at the eleventh hour for the leaders to say that the Federal Government is not for them.

Sir, I am going to speak as a Barbadian. The Hon. Mr. Manley and the Hon. Dr. Williams are all nice men but they are taking our representative for a ride. One of our representatives sat on a sub-Commitee at a Conference and came back and said "Chaguaramas or nothing." I have been to Trinidad and nobody can tell you that Chaguaramas is the only place to build a capital. Do you know where the Capital of the U.S.A. is? It is in Washington, not New York! What do you find? You You send people who are only echoes of others. The hon senior member for St. Thomas is only an echo of the Hon. Premier. They were never nationalistic; therefore, they could not be respected.They can only be respected in the light of what they say they want. Barbados never held a commanding position in the Federation talks and the position in which we are is one in which the Hon. Premier is not backed by the majority. The Hon. Premier would not be selected as Prime Minister if Mr. Manley or Dr. Williams were going to the Federal Parliament. The mere acclamation with which Mr. Manley was selected as President of the West Indian Labour Party would show you that is so. Our politics in Barbados has reached the stage that even our own representatives who have gone to Federation conferences cannot speak as Barbadians. Because of that, Barbados is being taken for a ride by Jamaica and Trinidad. Mr. Manley is telling the Hon. Premier to come to Jamaica Unfortunately the Hon. Premier cannot invite anybody to any party conference because he does not believe in democratic processes. "Mr. Manley has now reached the stage in West Indian politics that God help us if he dies. We would have to sell the West Indies." Fancy, you have this nonsense in the West Indies Federation which comprises of three million people where only three persons can lead It is true that our whole political life is bound up in economics; therefore our whole political life must be geared for our food.Give me liberty in this House; I must have liberty. I want to shake o.f the shackles of colonialism; I want to shake of that sort of oligarchy.

I see the hon. junior member for St. John seems to be willing to get up and make a speech. We can anticipate what he is going to say. He is going to say "put down the red carpet." I would like to hear the Hon. Minister of Agriculture speak of this matter. He said a few minutes ago that he has just come back from India where he saw things. I know he met Mr. Nehru; therefore he met a man. With Mr. Nehru, there is no bowing and scraping. He shook Britain's hands but said: "We in India do not want any Governor General." Britain thought that India did not want to become a republic.

What is happening here in the West Indies? The leaders are saying that they do not want a strong Federation. What has taken place is that they have agreed to something which they do not believe in. They want to be members of the Federal Parliament and still retain membership in their home Parliament; that is to say, they want to be in both; and because they cannot do that, they want to send their little yard fowls to Federal Parliament. It is on record that Mr. Manley said that they want a strong local Government. Because they are not going to the Federal Parliament, their local Governments must be stronger than Federal Parliament! If the reverse had been the case they would turn the local Parliaments into mere parochial bodies. Mr. Manley has also said to postpone customs union for twenty years; I would say postpone Federation or twenty years.

In the Addendum to the Resolution, it is stated that the disbursement for Trade and Tariffs Commission for period 1st April 1957 to 31st January, 1958 is $6,059; therefore we are making a contribution towards the Trade and Tariffs Commission. This same Trade and Tariffs Commission is what Mr. Manley is fighting so hard against. He does not want it; he does not want Customs Union What is going to be the position of the new Prime Minister who has to fight for this Customs Union? The hon. senior member for St. Philip said something which we have to watch. Unfortunately, the Government of Barbados has not sent anybody out on an industrial mission. Even the present Hon. Minister of Trade has never had the opportunity of going on a Trade Mission. Let us see that you are interested in trade.

5.45 p.m.

What has happened in this: the Jamaican Leader does not want any Customs Union in Jamaica, but Barbados is going to be the buyers of goods and in Trinidad they are industrialising in full, but Barbadians cannot go to Trinidad in five years; they can only go when they go to the Federation! You are putting money to a Federation where people cannot move about in the Federation, and you are asking us to believe that the people are in earnest. A period of twenty years is a big slice of anybody's lifetime; it is more than one-quarter of any person's lifetime. When you postpone anything for 20 years-- I believe that if a girl was twenty-five years old and you talked about marriage in 20 years, she would talk about looking for somebody else. This is a serious thing for a small place like Barbados, because we are not too big and we are not too small. When Barbados is making a contribution to Federation out of its own revenue, it means that this is a question of taxation and it is a question of money which you said you could not find or spending on other things. This 8% which is this territory's share represents the view that it could not be found to be expended otherwise. I do not mind spending money along with other people in the Federation if they were honest and sincere. Barbados is now being taken for a ride.

I sympathise with the Hon. Leader of the House at this stage; whereas you did not want any Opposition, you have it now. They are trying to foist the Hon. Minister of Communications on people, but you do not get things so. He is no power in Barbados; therefore, he cannot be a West Indian power. Who is going to respect him as a national figure if he cannot stand on his own? What contribution has he made to the country in any field? From the Barbados point of view, the Premier could only carry a second eleven team, unless he carried a Minister in the context of our local politics. Where you need representation, you would have to look on this side of the Table. In the evening of people's days they need not try to aspire to West Indian politics; this is something for youth to do. It is not fair to carry old people; you want young and vigorous people with the experience and quality which people can respect. What do we have here? The Government is not interested in Federation now, and the Hon. Leader of the House in introducing this Resolution, made no mention whatever of an important matter. I would ask him this question.

What can he say about the Government's plan for the elections? I am an interested candidate in the elections and I made that known over a year ago.

I am not in agreement with the nonsense of making the whole Island as one constituency, but there is the old story of Hayman building a gallows for Mordecai; you build a gallows for somebody and you are hanged on it. We should let Trinidad hear that we are not looking for any plums from them; we must let them know that we must come into Federation as co-equals. When a Barbadian Minister goes from Barbados he will have to deal with the situation on a federal basis. The Premier as Prime Minister of the proposed Federation cannot rule it as how he would rule the Labour Party, because the people will tell him that they are not like the boys in Barbados where he fought for seats for them. We got our seats independent of him. I have friends in the West Indies too, and some of them are looking for me to come down and I say that I am working on the same basis. I put up my sails alone, because I have had too much fireworks with other people.

I am a believer in Federation, but unity for the sake of unity is not unity. This is something you have to work out,and if you fail, then you fail. Do hon. members realise what is taking place? If the alleged statement made by Hon. Dr. Williams is correct, look how powerful he feels: If he can make that statement even before the Commission presents its report, it means that he

is making a statemnet not against the Commission's report, but against other West Indians. He is telling you, who are supposed to be his colleagues, that he is not joining with you if these people do not give him what he believes should happen in Trinidad. Do you believe that Hon. Dr. Eric Williams would say that he would secede from the Federation if the Capital was put in Barbados? People cannot tell Dr. Williams that this statement is not so, because if they did so, they would not get any votes. Hon. Dr. Williams is my friend, but you cannot make this political bogus statement.

5.55 p.m.

Dr. Willaims is my friend, but when these bogus political statements are made, people get the idea that it is good for the soul. When a person like Dr. Williams talks nonsense, everybody wonders whether a man of his calibre can talk political foolishness. They think it is only possible with a person of lower eminence. It is foolishness for any man to make a statement such as he did, and it is not worthy of the position he holds.

If I had a strike in Barbados and I said no matter what the Committee investigating reported the strike would go on, they would send Police to my house to listen for any seditious statements. Dr. Williams made a statement which appeared in the newspaper; he has not denied that he said so, so one can only conclude that he made the statement. If he said that, then we have to be very chary and watchful. How can we enter Federation when the man, in whose island the Capital is to be sited, is going to get vexed at the first blush, and will want to secede? You cannot enter anything with that man. It might have been intellectual exercise for him as a student or scholar; but when he is saddled with power, it is different from writing a book or speaking to students.

We are contributing towards the cost of the University College of the West Indies, and recently we read a statement that was made by the Vice Principal, the Hon. Philip Sherlock. Let me tell the Vice Principal this: I am not accustomed to that type of conduct from University people in the United Kingdom. No Vice Principal of any University in the United Kingdom would go out of his way to make a political statement to prop up the Government in power. It is none of his business to say that the Hon. Norman Manley was right in saying what he did. If the University College wants to debate it as academic exercise, let them do that; but we cannot accept this by people going out of their way to defend the Government in power. He is making a tour on behalf of the University College to which we are contributing; so he should remain within his confines. What Mr. Manley and Dr. Williams say is none of the University business. Do you think you would find Sir Ellis Minus, President of a University in England, making a statement on what Sir Winston Churchill or Mr. Macmillan said about the Suez Canal? They want the Universities to be kept out of politics. What is the sense of a man saying something about a politician, when that politician can be swept out and another put in? The University must remain. You can express an opinion on the campus, but no public statement should be made on political issues. You will remember that some years ago the University College of the West Indies was accused of having Communist tendencies. As soon as you begin to get into politics, anything happens.

However, before I sit down, I should like to know - and this comes close to me what is the position in Barbados in connection with the Federal Elections. The news paper has been writing about the idea of broadcasts. If you have taken the island and made it into one constituency, you cannot now say that you do not have the means of meeting the constituents; so I should like to know what you propose to do along these lines.

I would conclude by saying that I believe we have a lot to gain from Federation; I believe we can go further through Federation, but at this stage I must be frank, by name and nature, in saying that through the attitude of the Leaders of the West Indies at this moment, I do not feel enthusiastic about it. I had the privilege of speaking to one of the Leaders in one of the smaller territories, and he said to me that if he felt that the attitude of the Leaders in the bigger territories was that they would not enter into Federal politics, he would not have voted for his territory to enter. That is only symbolic of the feeling of many more. It is symbolic of Barbadians; they feel that with this current attitude it is not the best thing for Barbados, and as a mark of protest I will reserve my right to vote for this until I hear something more from the Minister. I am not talking about the mandatory business; I am talking about their attitude to Federation. The Hon. Premier is not here; the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has been going to Conferences; therefore, he has been one of our Leaders. He has been to the London Conference and to the Conference in Jamaica, and though I am not asking him to divulge anything which is confidential, I should like to know what is Barbados' position tonight with the general attitude towards Federation. What is the attitude with Dr. Williams saying he is going to secede? What is the attitude with Mr. Manley asking to postpone Customs Union for twenty years? Do we agree? If we disagree with them, why are we spending this money?

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. D.D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Where is the symbol of your authority?

(Mr. Marshal placed the Mace on the Table.)

Mr. TUDOR: Make the motion now.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry. I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

6.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of an Address.

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

Hon. M.E. COX: Sir, The Address reads as follows :-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly views with deep concern the prevailing unrest in the neighbouring Islands of the Bahamas. The House of Assembly is of the opinion that the situation is of sufficient importance to warrant the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate and report thereon. The House of Assembly therefore urges Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to take steps to that end.

The House of Assembly requests Your Excellency to transmit a copy of this Address to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Sir I should like to say at this stage that the hon. senior member for St. Peter raised this question at the last meeting. As I intimated to Your Honour earlier today, I was waiting to see whether he was prepared to give notice of a Resolution or any sort of thing in connection with this matter but due to the fact that nothing has been done about it I now give notice of this Address and I hope the hon. member would take it in the spirit in which it

is given. It is not a matter of my cutting across him; I merely feel that we all should join strongly in voicing our views in the cause of what is going on in the Bahamas today.

I should like to inform the House that I would be asking at a later stage today permission to debate this Address.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. E. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not commenting on the principle of Federation, but I rise just to comment on some things which were referred to here with respect to certain Units of the Federation and the visit o the Governor-General This Resolution, as some listeners may mistakenly regard it, is not formally for the visit of the Governor-General. This money is for contribution to the Federal Government of the area. Let me say that Lord Hailes is more than a visitor to these islands. He is welcomed in the other places which he has already visited in the way he has been because he is more than a visitor, and I do think that Barbados will not give him such a welcome because Barbadians are not so emotional. To criticise St. Kitts for putting down a red carpet or him is something which I consider unnecessary. Mr. Bradshaw the principal politician in St.Kitts, impresses me to be a progressively mended politician who is opposed to colonialism; so he could not be accused of kow-towing or resurrecting colonialism. It is unfair to him to accuse him of that. Lord Hailes is the symbol of the first West Indian Federal Government; he is head of a new nation and it is in that spirit that you should greet him. No prime Minister o the West Indies Federation exists yet; no Federal Legislature exists yet; and it is unfair for hon. members in this House to criticise the spirit with which people in the other colonies have welcomed the Governor General. It is a spirit of oy and achievement and there is nothing wrong in his welcome. They are saying: "at last we have a new nation, at last the West Indies is a nation which can be counted with the other nations on the face of the earth: 'and that is the spirit of West Indians who rejoice in the birth of this new nation. Surely the other people in this Federation are more interested than Barbadians and I predict that Barbadians are going to be the last to be West Indians. To be a West Indian is an occasion for joy, and other people have shown it. We have to show things by personalities. Lord Hailes is the symbol of the birth of West Indian Federation and you do not show your guest your poverty. (Cheers).

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. senior member for St. Philip invites anybody home as his guest, he would spread a red carpet for them. You do not exhibit your poverty to your guest. That is human nature. You kill your fatted calf. Lord Hailes knows the poverty of the West Indies; he does not need any demonstration. I tell you this: I think it is Lord Citrine who said when the Royal Commission of 1937 visited some remote village in Antigua, he saw a poor poverty-stricken woman who would not let her children come out to see the Commission until she dressed them in their best clothing; that impressed the Commission. He said: "Here is a woman in her poverty still doing something." She forgot her poverty and welcomed the Commissioners. She did not bring her children in their worst to see the Commissioners. Do you know the psychological effect of that? It shows that these people deserved to be lifted up. It showed that their decency was inside while their poverty was outside. The Commissioners could say no more than that they are a decent people who deserved to be lifted up. That was the psychological reaction. (Laughter).

Let them laugh. They think that there is no such thing as the spiritual and innate state of character; they can only see the externals, they cannot see the mind, they cannot see the inside decency of a people; they cannot see why a people, although poor, aspire to higher things, but Lord Citrine, Lord Hailes and people like them can see beyond poverty. They know of the poverty which exists in the West Indies and it was fitting that the leading democrao the West Indies gave Lord Hailes a wonderful welcome. Trinidadians did not show him the slums of Trinidad and the wrechedness of the place. What is wrong with giving him a most hearty welcome? I am afraid that the least welcome he will get is here. As a matter of fact, I know that; that is Barbados (A VOICE: No.) (ANOTHER VOICE: We have a complex.)

Sir, as I have said, the Governor General is the first symbol of a new nation. That is a political fact. The day he took the oath it became a political fact that a new nation was born; it was not born before. I tell you that the wonderful reception which he has got is bound to impress him that the people in these parts deserve more British help. He is bound to tell the people in Great Britain that these people deserve greater concern. He has never been to the West Indies before. History will prove that this , his first appointment, was very unpopular.

Sir, the Hon. Dr. Williams of Trinidad is a new statesman, an inexperienced statesman. I contend that what he said recently has more strategy in it than what most people are thinking. I am sure that America would notlike to know that she is accused of breaking up the Federal Government of the West Indies. It would be the last thing of which Americans would like to be accused. Of course, Dr. Williams' statement is fantastic but it is not as foolish as everybody thinks, so I would not condemn him for it. As we all know, America has given up better bases elsewhere and on top of that she has given millions and millions of dollars to other places.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are starting on the wrong foot when we made all these criticisms of the other places, and what the other people are doing and saying. After all, Mr. Manley is Chief Minister of Jamaica. We have no idea that Mr. Manley's Party would be elected in the majority to the Federal Government. He may talk what he likes. He Philip must not interrupt.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on an issue which is the least important of all the matters discussed here this afternoon - that is, the visit of the Governor-General - the hon. junior member for St. John can manage to let loose such polished insincerities! If it is a matter of welcoming the Governor-General to this country when he comes, it will be done; but like everybody else on this side of the House who has spoken., I contend that there should be no fuss or no considerable amount of public money should be spent except on the Queen herself- nobody else. Anybody beneath the Queen is unworthy of that expenditure. That is where I stand.

Now, the point is this: talking about the Governor-General, I wonder how many members of this Committee realise that during the next three weeks this colony will have the privilege of seeing Mr. Vincent Massey, the Governor-General of Canada, spending his holiday here. He is the representative of that very nation which has done more for the West Indies Federation than anybody else. The Canadian Government has not only made it known that it is prepared to give help to the Federation, but the Canadian Prime Minister has found time to appoint the present Canadian Attache as first Commissioner of Canada to the Federal Government. That is the emphasis which the Canadian Government places on our Federation. If it is a matter of doing something for the West Indies in a ceremonial way, I should like to say that for the last three or four days of the Canadian Governor- General's visit he be entertained with all the honours which are due. That would be paying tribute and giving recognition to the Canadian people on behalf of the whole Federation. If you are going to have ceremonies, let them redound to the credit of the people of the country by offering that entertainment to the Canadian Governor-General; that would be most worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, two things stand out immediately about this Resolution. The first thing is this: this is the first occasion in this Island on which Legislature of Barbados has had a chance to comment on Federal policies, and to say in clear and unequivocal terms what is the view of thinking Barbadians on this matter of Federation. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, that the Government in power, which has committed this Island to Federation with all that is involved, would have come in here with this

Resolution and not have the decency to lay the Federal Budget on the table of this Committee? This $121,797 which we are asked to provide this afternoon, is a part of the$7 million which has been appropriated for this expenditure and so little has the Government cared of informing the House, so callous are they in disregarding the right of members of this Committee to get information, that they did not care to think of laying the Federal Budget on the table. I am informed that in the week beginning the 19th January, the Federal Budget was circulated to all the Territorial Governments. That is to say that, at least two or three weeks ago, the Federal Budget, so I am informed, was in possession of this Government. Would it not have been more in keeping with courtesy to hon. members for the Government to have circulated copies of that Budget, so that in this first Budget, hon. members of this Committee on being asked to provide funds, might be able to re lect, and even to make some comments, on certain vital aspects of the Federal financial structure? No such thing has been done, Mr. Chairman, and the backbenchers of the Government who do not care whether they are informed or not, have set a standard for the rest of the Committee, that because, presumably, they have not asked to be informed of these things, it little matters what the rest of us think. Are they seriously discussing a matter of such great importance as the matter of Federation - and it is even of greater importance to this Island than others without a knowledge of the Federal Budget and without having the provisions of the Budget before us?

6.55 p.m.

The second point is this: this is a purely personal opinion I am giving, but I think it deserves some attention. When you vote $121,797 as the contribution of Barbados to the Federal expenses, you are not really voting anything for the service of this colony; it is going entirely, at least in this initial stage, outside of this island. I hold, therefore, that they should in this case find a departure from the normal procedure, and that a separate Appropriation Bill should have been introduced almost simultaneously with this to make it quite clear and to set a precedent for proper accounting in the Federal Budget for the future. You cannot pretend to ask us to give $121, 797 just as if you were extending the Water Services, or the Housing Schemes of this island. It is something entirely different and I think it ought to be treated as being such.

This Resolution before us, Mr. Chairman, gives us an opportunity to speak perhaps for the first time in this House after the Federation has been established on Federal matters, and I am glad to say that it is a good thing for this Committee this afternoon that it has heard such forthright contributions to this debate coming from this side of the House, because this side of the House has not yet had an opportunity to make its views felt, these important matters which affect the entry of Barbados into Federation. We would do well to remember this: when we are expending these sums of money which as the years go on will be greater and greater, the Barbados House of Assembly has a heavy duty on it to make its views felt as forcibly as it can, because as has been said already, there is inevitable the tendency on the part of politicians of the larger units of the Federation to look upon Barbados as if they accepted us on suffrance. We have not been given our value in this Federal arrangement largely because of the quality of our representation.

What has been happening to us in the last few years is this: a one-sided point of view has been given to the other participating territories concerning Barbadian views, and it is significant that even up to now, within less than two months of Federal elections, there has been no large scale debate in this island as a whole on all these major issues, because people in the outside world, reflecting on the absence of Opposition members on the various delegations which have represented Barbados, cannot be quarrelled with if they got the impression that the political life in Barbados was not mature.

You may reflect, Mr. Chairman, that at the very founding of the nation, the very climax of the Federal struggle, the very occasion when the Governor General was being welcomed in Trinidad a month ago, two territories found it possible and desirable to speak with a united voice at that ceremony, but the Barbados representation was one sided. The Opposition spokesman, Mr. Allen with Mr. Manley and Mr. Glasspole was there; the leader of the Trinidad Opposition Party, the Hon. Bhadase Maraj was not only present as an honoured guest, but played his full part as leader of the Opposition. The only contribution that Barbados could make with all its best Constitution, and with all its highest this, that and the other, was an ignorant dissertion by the Premier on Lady Hailes' great-grandfather. That is how we rise to the level of our opportunities; that is how we showed the outside world how mature we are. Is it to be wondered at, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that politicians in Jamaica, Trinidad and indeed in the other territories have taken Barbados so much for granted that they come to the conclusion that we are no longer to be consulted or we have not got a point of view of our own? There is more to it than this and I want to set the record straight.

I agree that the Chief Minister of Trinidad has been very unwise and very silly in hinting that Trinidad might secede from Federation if Chaguaramas is not granted, but anybody who listened to the recorded speeches broadcast over Rediffusion at the May Conference in Trinidad, will remember hearing the Premier of Barbados say on the occasion of the opening of that Conference, that only a lunatic would say "Chaguaramas or nothing". If therefore the Trinidad Government and with them the whole West Indies find themselves in this dilemma today, they have to thank the Premier of Barbados for having led them up that particular garden path. While this was going on, Mr. Chairman, nothing was said in Barbados about these grave and important issues; no preparation was done among the people of Barbados to make them appreciate the responsibilities of Federation, and of what it means to become a nation. As a consequence, everything appears as if the Barbadian point of view is neglected, which in the circumstance it is; and even to secure our rightful place in the Federal scheme of things, we will find ourselves reduced to the level of the others in using threats and blackmail.

I do not approve o the decision which has been reached by the Government of Jamaica in wanting to carve out for Jamaica some special consideration in Federal matters; still less do I approve of the position taken by the Trinidad Government in making an issue of Chaguaramas; but if these two large units are prepared to argue that way and to show that their attachment to the idea of Federation is so thin and so weak, it behoves persons who speak in a clear and unmistakable way. What therefore is our situation? We are the poorest of the lot; we have something to gain from Federation although our Leaders have not told us that. Why can't we say we want freedom of movement and want it immediately? Since we are going to contribute our money in such large quantities to the upkeep of the Government, let us see in the very immediate future some of the tangible benefits of Federation. But that is not going to be; there is not going to be any forthright speaking on the part of Barbados, because we are not represented in Federal matters, That is the result of this neglect of speaking with the two-Party voice.

7.05 p.m.

All along, two and three years ago, it used to be thought on that side when the Opposition clamoured for representation on the Standing Federation Committee that it was for a matter of prestige. They said that we wanted to travel; we wanted trips. That was what was contended. The Hon. Premeir had his way about it becafise backbenchers in the last House have never had the realisation of what Federation meant and therefore never thought it worthwhile that Barbados should speak with one word, and the two-party system was best illustrated when in matters to be discussed outside of Barbados both parties were represented. Sir, nobody on this side of the House would have led Barbados in such an untenable position with all being demanded from her and nothing given to her in return. Nobody on this side of the Table would have allowed this nonsense of the Federal Capital to have gone on. Certainly, speaking for my own Party, any spokesman for my own Party would have said from the beginning that we do not feel it is right to press for Chaguaramas as the Capital site, bearing in mind the national agreement entered in between the British Government and the United

States Government. Not one of us would feel it is right All along, two and three years ago, it used to be thought on that side when Opposition clamoured for representation on the Standing Federation Committee that it was for a matter of prestige. They said that we wanted to travel; we wanted trips. That was what was contended, The Hon. Premier had his way about it because back-benchers in the last House have never had the realisation of what Federation meant and therefore never thought it worthwhile that Barbados should speak with one word, and the two-party system was best illustrated when in matters to be discussed outside of Barbados both parties were represented. Sir, nobody on this side of the House would have led Barbados in such an untenable position with all being demanded from her and nothing given to her in return. Nobody on this side of the Table would have allowed this nonsense of the Federal Capital to have gone on. Certainly, speaking for my own Party, any spokesman for my own Party would have said from the beginnng that we do not feel it is right to press for Chaguaramas as the Capital site, bearing in mind the national agreement entered in between the British Government and the United States Government. Not one of us would feel it is right to deprive U.S.A. of what is rightfully theirs. There was not one single member of the Standing Federation Committee, at least, not one single West Indian representative and certainly not one from this Government side who was bold enough to say that. Therefore, while it is true that the Trinidad Government is unwise for the stand they have taken, it is also true that they have been encouraged in that stand because no stateman-like voice was raised from this island to point out the folly of taking up the position from which if you have to retreat you will only lose face. It may well be in the immediate future, if world conditions change and strategic positions are different from what they are now, that America may re-consider the question of having a base in the Caribbean. If that time comes, that question could be decided between the two Governments with the West Indian Government or probably only between the West Indian Government and the U.S.A. Government. After independence has come we may be in a position on the basis of the reciprocity and the mutual respect of one Government for another to do this.

Let us come nearer back home to Barbados. This is what we find. There are not ten people in the whole Island who have a thorough grasp of Federation or even of what this financial expenditure means to Barbados. I asked the Clerk a little while ago to provide me with a copy of one of the Federation documents which has been issued so that I could refresh my mind on the financial aspects of it. It would surprise you to know that there is not one single reference in here that a member can use to refresh him on the finer points. I do not know if the Hon. Minister has the matter at his finger-tips but the grievance is not only in the immediate period but afterwards. It would be a good thing to be able to know how soon these interim arrangements with all their unsatisfactory features of them will be done away with and we get something of a permanent nature, because unless you know it you cannot properly assess its position in the light of Federation.

There too will be the question of the Customs Union. The Jamaican Government in recent years has gone a long way towards making Jamaica an industrial country. Many manufacturing centres have been going up and established in the recent past and that is the reason why Jamaicans are so reluctant to enter into a Federation As they view it, they see that they are subject to a situation in whch their own province is competing against the other provinces of the West Indies. That is an understandable fear. Jamaica would like to be in a position to be able to export all the products which they do not want for their own sell to some of the other islands. Thay would like to have a market of 3 1/2 million people to absorb all that they produce. That is understandable from the Jamaican point of view ut it is not good for Barbados because the industrial development of this Island must go on. We cannot af ord to continue as we were with 30,000 people unemployed; there has got to be a certain amount of industrial development of this island. This Government which is using its forces towards this end should be able to tell us soon the basis of its own long range plan. I am sure if we had thought out all these issues carefully and explained them to the people, we would get agreement on Federal matters.

As things stand, as we approach the Federal Elections, the population is bewildered and everybody hopes that sometime between Nomination Day which is February 28th and Election Day which is 25th March, enough enthusiasm can be whipped up among the electorate to justify them going to the polls. If the situation, as we know it is an indication of what the Government is thinking, don't you see that it is quite possible that five people will be elected to represent Barbados but that they will only be elected by a small minority of the Barbados electorate? Do you think it would be a good thing to send five people to represent Barbados who by the nature of their election cannot feel that they have the confidence of an overwhelming majority of the Barbados electorate? On the other hand, how can you get the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the people of Barbados if you do not encourage the people to understand federal issues? What is the medium of information you are going to use for this matter? How are you going to publicise it? Are you relying on editorials in the newspapers and bare newspaper comments? Is it not due time that all these federal issues - the Capital, freedom of movement, the constitution of the Federation, the trade between the units - all of them, be put into pamphlets and printed at Government's expense and distributed widely over the whole mass of the population? Is it not time that Government revises its whole attitude to the medium of broadcasting and for the purposes of this campaign, and after that for all elections, make arrangements that the facilities of Rediffusion be made available to all political parties, and as long as the campaign lasts, that every week you give half an hour's broadcast to each political party so that it can put forward its specific point of view on Federation so that the 80,000 people listening in might get some idea in as short a time as possible of what they are called upon to decide?

7.15 p.m.

It must be a terrible thing to ask people to enter upon a new venture and elect persons to represent them on a national level and at the same time deny the same people information on the very issues which they are called upon to decide. You must remember this too; they are somee of us in this House who take a deep interest in these matters and there are a few people outside of the House who take perhaps a deeper interest in such matters. However, interest is no substitute for knowledge and as the election to the Federal Parliament draws nearer and nearer, we are witnessing what should be the most shocking thing, if we have any conscience about these things. Arguments are cropping up now in the West Indies. decisions are being hurriedly made which will be bad decisions - because you cannot make decisions of far-reaching importance on the eve of the national elections - and widespread ignorance exists even on such every- day matters as to where and how people should vote on these issues.

If the Government of Barbados takes these issues seriously, it will take to heart the criticisms of the Opposition. Some of us on this side of the House are offering ourselves as federal candidates. We are old campaigners, we know how to win an election in an above-board and straightforward manner and we are asking individual politicians to explain the issue to any group of people who listen to us and persuade them that we are fit and proper persons to represent them. Speaking for myself, personally, now; even if I am fortunate enough to be elected to the Federal Parliament, I still feel in these circumstances that not enough has been done to enlighten the people/ on these issues. I would much rather not to be elected, than to be elected in such a way that only a minority of the population understands what the matter is all about. You are placing a heavy responsibility on the members of the Federal Parliament if you get them elected in such circumstances, because after they have been elected they cannot feel happy in anything. They do not know their constituents well enough, though not having explained the issues to them, and they are not providing their con-

stituents with sufficient background of federal knowledge. It is the ignorance of the people of Barbados which is the most frightening thing in this matter and it may be that if our people were better informed, Barbados might be able to approach Federation with much less hesitancy and reluctance and diffidence than we do now.

It is knowledge in the minds of people which makes them certain of their steps, and which makes it possible for them to take those steps without hesitancy. I certainly do not agree with the proposal that it is such a calamity if the three leading people of the Federation, people who it is said have led us into Federation, are not going to the Federal Parliament. I know that two of them are not going, and I know that the third is going, because he says he is not going. That is sufficient to tell me that he is going. Suppose he was not going to the Federal Parliament! I would count his absence from the Federation as a crowning mercy bestowed on the people of the Federation, because the further he keeps from it, the more prosperous it is going to be; but if, as I know, he is going, the people of the West Indies and those in the Federal Parliament will have to bear with him as best they can until the time comes for the next election. If, perish the thought, all three of them died tonight, life would still go on. They would be mourned in their several ways, I daresay, but life would still go on, and it may well be that they are not the people to start this new venture. It may be that their refusal to go to the Federal Parliament is the best thing that could happen to us. In this House, as to all of us who sit around this Table and those of us who may be in another Assembly - until that time comes, we have the responsibilities of the people of Barbados. These large sums of money which are called for will be increased as the years go on. I would counsel Barbadians to be careful about these matters, because when once approval is given to the expenditure on federal matters, there is nothing which can be done to recall it. The only way in which the Barbados House of Assembly as distinct from the Barbados Representatives to the Federal Parliament -- the only way in which we can be satisfied that things are being looked after in these federal matters, is to make our voices heard in such matters. We have to say what we believe and we have to say what we are willing to give to the Federation and what we expect in return. I think we should be proud and happy that we are giving more to the Federation than we are getting out of it, but this generous spirit must not be interpreted to mean that we are giving up all and are not getting anything in return.

The Barbados Government have let down the people in this respect; they have not seized the glorious opportunities which lay before them. To back up candidates, as I understand they are doing, and use the Premier's prestige, if he has any left, to put people in the Federal Parliament to represent Barbados, might be something which you could achieve. If people fail or that sort of thing, the Government Party might get its way, but is that all we desire in the representation of Barbados? It would be a hard thing, as the years go on, for the Barbados electorate to find themselves in a complete mess especially when elections to the Federal Parliament are held.

7.25 p.m.

But five years is a long time to suffer a grievance; life has got to go on in this colony; all our plans for development of Barbados, for the raising of the standard of living, for the expansion of social services all these must still go on in Barbados. But if these things are to go on these must be proper long-range planning, and this and all similar opportunities must be taken to criticise Barbados for entering Federation. We are not prepared to forego our own opportunities of doing what we can in our way for our own people to trail along behind other units who are now taking the bit between their teeth for reasons we cannot but condemn.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has given the House and Committee an opportunity of expressing an opinion on Federation on the eve of Nomination and Election. We agreed to this a long time ago, and the entire House has always been - at least it has said so - in favour of Federation. We on this side have always felt and still feel today that the people of Barbados, and I would say the people of the West Indies, know so little about the implications of Federation, that they are more lukewarm today than ever before. The reason for that is the decision of the Leaders to stand out of the election.

Only recently in discussing it with people in the country, I found that those who were lukewarm would hardly go to the polls, and those who are very fervent for it would have some difficulty in geting there. There have been various estimates as to how many will cast their vote on 25th March. The estimates are very small indeed, and I do hope they are wrong. All the opportunities for the people of the West Indies lie in a Federation; I am still convinced of that. We are a very poor people and the population is increasing at a very quick rate. The difficulties we have today will be multiplied in years to come; the services we are running today, the schools and hospitals, in another ten or fifteen years will have to take care of an increased population, and I do not know where the money will come from if we continue in this way.

The hope of Federation is to attract capital, and that capital is not going to come from where we have always got it, that is, from the United Kingdom, but, we hope, in a large measure from the United States of America and Canada, and it is regrettable that the Leaders at this stage are making this threat. I know that politicians have a way of doing things that one is not always clear on, but these threats somehow are hard; and though politicians may adopt the same methods that other countries have adopted and got away with, I think the time is just around the corner when the people in these countries, who are handing us millions and millions of dollars to keep things quiet, will get tired of doing that.

I know that in America people (not Congress) are beginning to wonder if the millions of dollars they are handing out are bringing in the returns they are meant to bring. Millions of dollars have been handed out to the East, to India and Ceylon, and other places, and unless we continue to prime that pump, they are going to withdraw this help. They cannot keep on putting in more for ever. They have put some $40 million in the economy of these countries. There has been a measure of success; they have stabilised some, but others have not shown any reward for the money that is being pumped in. If we are to do something in the West Indies, we are not only to beg for money, but we have to use it to good advantage. We can only improve our position by our own efforts, and we have to learn to do that from the beginning. Let us blame the people inside if they do not do what they should. We will get money if we go about it the right way, but no one will give us a second time if the money is wasted.

I agree with the reception for Lord Hailes when he comes here next week. I am not one of those who think we should treat him with discourtesy or anything like that We have always received Royalty or Governors - and he is more than a Governor of the West Indies - with respect and courtesy, and we shall continue to do that. We in Barbados have welcomed notables, and I do not think at this stage that we should be partial. No one said that, but if it were implied, I would not contribute to that view.

I do hope that the Federation will get off to a wonderful start, because this sum is the first payment of an amount of $600,000 which we will have to look for each year. Do you know what that means, Mr. Chairman? $600,000 could service a loan of $10 million; it could provide Interest and Sinking Fund for $10 million, which is half the cost of our Deep Water Harbour. That is going to be a re-current expenditure every year. Do not let us think of it as capital; let us think of what it can do. With that amount of money we can do a lot of things in Barbados, because we find that sum every We have a lot of things facing us; we have begun the Deep Water Harbour, but we have not begun to raise money for Sinking Fund on the service. We have been having wonderful crops and getting good prices; but you can see that the people are going to be called upon, if not tomorrow, in the very near future, to pull their pockets a little more. This is going to send up the cost of living

again. It means all these things to the people, and they should be told; do not tell them that this money is available and we can find it easily to do these things. $600,000 is a lot of revenue in Barbados.

I do hope, Sir, that when the people go next month to vote for the Barbados representatives, they will vote with their eyes open and send the most intelligent and capable people to represent Barbados. I hope they will send sutiable persons, because we need a strong voice in the Federation and we can only get that if we send worthwhile persons to the Federal Parliament. The time will come or me to say a lot more on this throughout the island, because although I am not standing for election, I am supporting it. We are supporting a very capable team, and I do know that at this stage in the history of Federation we need capable and able persons to represent Barbados and to give it a strong voice, because I know that Trindad and Jamaica are anxious to bring in things we dislike. Jamaica is speaking of postponing Customs Union for twenty years; that would not suit us. Trindad is talking about "no freedom of movement"; that would not suit us either. I we accept those, what are we going to get out of Federation?
7.35 p.m.

We have to ask these questions. We will only have five voices in the Federal Government: but so elect them that they will be equal to 20 voices! It can only be so if the people vote with their eyes open; and that is why I am going to ask the Government, if they want the people to play their full part, to see that Rediffusion is opened to all parties. That is a way in which we can put to the people in their homes the true facts of Federation and to let them know how to vote. I say open their eyes and you will never go wrong..Open their eyes to Federation and the implications that follow in its trend. Thev are going to pay for it; therefore they should have the full facts. Sir, that is what Government should do at this late stage. They have not done much up to now; so let them at least do that much so that the voices of those who know something of Federation will get to the people and give them a better opportunity of making up their mind.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr Chairman, I think I am entitled to a very brief rejoinder on the absurdities and lamentations of the hon. junior member for St. John in connection with the visit of Lord Hailes to the West Indies. Every single statement which the hon. member has uttered supports the contentions advanced on this side of the Table. The hon. junior member for St. John himself referred to the visit of Lord Citrine who was a member of the 1939 Royal Commission to Antigua where he saw an old lady; she dressed them in their Sunday-go-to-meeting best. Now, what was the riot in the West Inides for? If they had all the things they wanted and all the things necessary for them to go to Sunday meetings, would there be a riot? What did the Royal Commission come out here for? It came out here to investigate at irst hand the conditions which caused the riot. The fact that an individual old lady was decent enough to attire her children in their best to meet Lord Citrine although she lived in a hovel makes no difference; she could not dress the hovel in satin and silk.

All that I am contending, Mr. Chairman, is this; permit Lord Hailes to see for himself in the same way that Lord Citrine saw at first hand the hovel in which the old lady lived and the other hovels in the districts. We are not taking him to the hovels but to the fine hilly districts where Government is putting up projects. He is to be taken on tours and to places which Government wants him to see

That is not the important part. The important part is that the hon. junior member for St. John does not believe a single word of the statement he was trying to make out. He looked around the Chamber and saw the Hon. Premier was not here, and he boasts that in the absence of the Hon. Premier he is the only Government spokesman in the House.

Mr.VAUGHAN: I have not told the hon. member that. He is so weak in replying to me that he has to lie. He has no logic. What he said is totally nonsensical. Lord Hailes is bound to see it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has gone a bit too far. When the Knighthood was given to the Hon. Premier in here some months ago -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are going too far now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. John said that I have never heard him say what I have heard him say.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I repeat, the hon. member will say anything to gain an argument. He is dishonest intellectually.

Mr.CRAWFORD: Imagine, Mr. Chairman, a "moral leper" - -

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I take strong objections to such a statement.

A VOICE: You ought to be ashamed!

Mr. VAUGHAN: He is dishonest; he is intellectually dishonest. I take strong objections to his statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Of what?

Mr. VAUGHAN: "Moral leper". I object strongly, Sir, to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot abuse a man and then object. You cannot tell a man in Parliament that he is a liar and that he is dishonest. You cannot do it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I ask that those words be withdrawn. The hon.member said I made a statement of him which I never made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To what are you objecting?

Mr. VAUGHAN: That I am a "moral leper". I will not stand for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Allow me to speak. No quicker than the hon. senior member for St. Philip got up and said, "Imagine a moral leper", you did not wait to find out whom he meant. You jumped up and objected.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, may I speak? Whom do you think he meant?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have to wait to find out.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Just because a man cannot answer you, he gets up and calls you all sorts of things. He cannot answer my argument; there.ore he must abuse me. He called me a "moral leper"; he could not have called me anything worse.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking. Look how the Hon. Leader of the House is encouraging him.

Hon. M.E.COX: The ob.ection is taken; no hon. member can speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you know what is going to happen to the Hon. Leader of the House? He stood there and heard the hon. junior member for St. John call the hon. senior member for St. Philip "dishonest" and he is now talking something of taking down something. Mr. Chairman, you cannot encourage that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman it is about time that I make my sppech. You are absolutely correct in what you said. No sooner that the hon. senior member for St. Philip said "imagine a moral leper", the hon. junior member for St. John got up and objected. Naturally, I felt the hon. senior member for St. Philip meant the hon. junior member for St. John, but he did not say so.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, the objection is taken; no hon. member can speak.
7.45 p.m

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said already that, in my opinion, the hon. junior member for St. John was a little too quick in rising. He would have caught the hon. senior member for St. Philip if he had waited; but no sooner than the hon. senior member for St. Philip used the words "Imagine a moral leper", the hon. junior member for St. John jumped up.

Mr. VAUGHAN: May I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to whom do you think the hon. member was referring (Asides)

Mr.CHAIRMAN : I am speaking to the hon. senior member for the City, and the hon. junior member for St. John ---

Mr. VAUGHAN: If the hon. member did not mean me, then let him say so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling this objection out of order. The hon. senior member for St. Philip may proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the occasion some months ago when the House met to address remarks in reference to the fact that the Hon. Premier had been given a knighthood ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am nothing to do with any knighthood tonight. Let the hon. member deal with the Resolution which is before the Committee. I am not entertaining anything more.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am replying to the accusation that my remark was a lie. You may recall the occasion when the Premier was made a knight ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with the Resolution which is before the Committee; let us deal with the Federal Parliament.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have been called a "moral leper" to night, and I objected to it; you have not called upon the hon. member who referred to me as a "moral leper" to withdraw his words

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As the Deputy Speaker of this House, you should know as well as I do, and I have already said it, that you did not wait long enough on the hon. senior member for St. Philip. I cannot say that the hon. member was referring to you. I have already ruled the objection out of order.

Mr.VAUGHAN: You cannot rule an objection as being out of order when unparliamentary language has been used by one hon. member to another hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. VAUGHAN: This is very irregular to say the least, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat? (Mr. Vaughan took his seat)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Philip may proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, my remarks were that the hon. junior member for St. John did not believe a single word of what he was saying.

Mr. VAUGHAN: rose to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not giving away again.

Mr. VAUGHAN: What does the hon. member accuse me of now, when he says that I did not believe a single word of what I was saying? What kind of statement is that?

Mr.CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat; if he will not take his seat, I will have to deal with him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As to the remarks made by the hon. member in connection with the visit of Lord Hailes, I said during the course of my speech that the hon. member does not believe a single word of what he said; he was talking purely with his tongue in his cheek. The hon. member has said on many occasions not only to me, but to other hon. members of this House who are present now, that in the absence of the Premier there is none of them ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear that; I am nothing to do with that. The hon. junior member for St. John may soon get up and say that he did not tell you so. Let us deal with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When I said, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member did not believe a word that he said, he said that I was dishonest and I had to give the lie direct. If an hon. member makes an accusation against you and you cannot defend yourself, then you should not be here at all. The hon. member has repeatedly said that in the absence of the Premier, there is no one here to defend the Government but himself. He said that in the last session; he said that if he did not get a Ministry he would leave the Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That will not help the debate now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have to quote specific instances in order to support my contention that the hon. member has twisted his argument and does not believe a word he was saying and was hoping that by the speech he made he would trick the Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That would not trick the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Tell him so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: However, let us deal with this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is saying that he has never told me so. He told me when he made that speech congratulating the Premier on his having been granted a knighthood, that if he did not get a Ministry for that Speech, he would not get one at all.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, that is a total fabrication; that is a nancy story. it really does not trouble me, but I am amazed to see how a man could make up a story like that. That is a complete fabrication. I only want this Assembly to believe me that it is a total fabrication. The hon. member has made that up completely, from top to bottom.

Mr.CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. senior member for St. Philip, not to worry with this type of debate any more; I ask the hon. member to desist from that. 7.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Listen to me, Mr. Chairman, I am very serious on what I am saying. The next thing is this, Mr. Chairman; I repeat that the hon. member ..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. senior member for St. Philip not to go with that type of debate anymore. If you continue with it, I will rule out of order.

Mr.CRAWFORD: I am not like him to get up and call for your protection when he accuses me of lying. I am the last man in here to claim the protection of the Chair. Any hon. member who attacks me, I will attack him back.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have attacked him back and that is sufficient.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not craving your indulgence in having anything withdrawn when it has been said repeatedly.

A VOICE: How can you let the Deputy Speaker call a man a liar?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are interrupting the speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Because there are people in here who have heard what I said.

Mr. VAUGHAN: You are not going to lie like Crawford, man!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You know the Rules as well as I do relative to interrupting any speech, and you know the penalty for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I go on to say however, that every single argument used by the hon. junior member for St. John reveals the type of mentality which is in keeping with the aberrations ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything more relative to the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. VAUGHAN: You entertained worse than that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not getting any further in a debate of this sort. Let us deal with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have tried to submit ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. It would not look nice to see the Chairman name the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. VAUGHAN: You cannot name me; only the Speaker can.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All right, then. If you persist I will show you what the Speaker can do and what I can do.

Mr.CRAWFORD: I maintain, Sir, it is not good enough. There is no validity in the argument about an old lady putting a good dress on a little child to see the Royal Commissioner. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, anybody outside of the Mental Hospital advancing that as an argument against the contention I made this evening. In a nutshell, all I said was that the Governor General was coming to see what the Royal Commission came to see in 1937. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that a man's approach to life is his mental attitude; his physical and moral characteristics are an indication of how his mind works, and there-

fore, Sir, we are entitled to expect all sorts of aberrations from the hon., junior member for St. John. There is no doubt in my mind that nobody with the slightest vestige of intelligence can really believe the argument advanced by that member. In his heart of hearts he knows that it is not true, and therefore, the only deduction you can make is that the person who makes these statements has some ulterior motive for making them, not based on logic or a presentation of the facts as they really are. There must be something that makes a man stifle his conscience, and in this case I have already said what stifles his conscience. Are you suggesting that because an old lady put a clean frock on a child, that that can be used as an argument against showing the Governor General conditions as they exist in villages? Can that be on the same basis as the illustration he drew? If you have a guest coming to your house, you treat him with hospitality. He is coming here purely as a guest; he is coming to see whether we warrant the £200 million we asked the British Government for. If he comes to see people in old clothes or clean ones, that is beside the point. The thing that annoyed me was that I told the Committee that work was being done on the housing site at Gall Hill for him to see; there are other housing sites besides that, so why should he see only the housing project we are trying to get through? That is not important; he could read for himself that we are building a few houses.

In a Parliamentary Chamber any member speaking in the Chamber is entitled to expect to his remarks to be torn to pieces by the Opposition if they can, or by the opposing group; but for goodness' sake, let us have arguments based on sound logic and sound reasoning and commonsense. When arguments are introduced in a Chamber with mock solemnity, not because the person advancing them believes them, but because he is bowing at the shrine of personal ambition, and because he hopes by so doing his "chief" will smile on him and say "friend come up higher; you are the best person to defend me", then the principle of pros and cons in a Parliamentary Chamber is being completely sacrificed on the altar of personal ambition. In this case, Sir, it becomes even less acceptable when the ambitions of the person making these statements to be a Minister or Leader of the Government Party have been so loudly proclaimed from the housetops, on the cricket field and elsewhere. This is the sole interest of his ambition, and any remarks he makes in here must be viewed in that context, especially when they are so illogical.

Mr. VAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, if I ever become a Minister, you as an Undertaker will have to get a few coffins for the members over there; it is going to kill a few of them It is totally immaterial to me whether or not I become a Minister, but if it ever happens you will bury some of them. The hon. member who just sat down would not live much longer.

Mr. Chairman, the only way he can answer my argument - it has disturbed him so much and has demonstrated completely the nonsense which he talks - is to go to the depth of depravity to refer to me as a moral leper. He is a man whom I have defended publicly time and time again when everybody in the island accused him after the same Montego Bay Conference of saying that the West Indies should go over to America.

8 05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member knows what he is talking about, let him quote my remarks correctly. At Montego Bay, I never said that the West Indies should go over to America. What I said at Montego Bay was that if the West Indies are to remain as colonies and not to advance to self Government, then it is better that they be American colonies rather than British colonies because the Americans at least treat their colonials better than the British. That is in the official records. Do not let him misquote what I said; let him quote what I said.

Mr. VAUGHAN: You have not said that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. You made remarks as regards what the hon. senior member for St. Philip said at the Montego Bay Conference and he has replied I am not entertaining anything more with regard to the Montego Bay Conference.

Mr. VAUGHAN: You are not entertainng the right or me to defend myself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you listen to the Chair? Will you please take your seat?

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am listening.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well take your seat.

Mr. VAUGHAN took his seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have told you that you have made remarks relative to the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip at Montego Bay. He has replied to that and I am not entertaining anything more of that, because it will take us until morning and we are not getting any further with the Resolution. I am quite prepared to listen until morning to all that is said relative to the Resolution.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have defended the hon. member on several occasions publicly with regard to the Congress Party of which he was in charge.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to desist from that.

Mr VAUGHAN: When he said that a telegram had come from Brazil about ten thousand people being needed --

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you listen to me again for the last time? If you persist in doing what you are doing now, I am going to name you for disregarding the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The only way the hon. senior member can reply to me is to say things I have never said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have said all that already.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Then, I am not to talk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said it is totally untrue

The question that this Resolution do now pass -

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe my speech is going to be palatable to many hon. members. Long before I made my mind up that I was going to support Federation I gave very careful consideration to all aspects of what it would mean to Barbados and what Barbados would mean to the Federation and what Federation would mean in the future to Barbadians. I looked at it from every possible angle and from my limited experience, from the constitution of all the colonies including Barbados, what progress we have made - perhaps mine might be a conservative outlook - and what we had done over a period of years, I decided I would throw my lot in favour of Federation because I felt, despite whatever progress we may have made in the past, that it was a question of freedom for future West Indians. It was freedom in many respects in the building of a nation although I felt that we could get nothing in our time out of it, and that anything which would be done would not benefit Barbados even up to the next decade. Anyhow I felt I should throw my lot in and I did so

As far as this Resolution is concerned, I think we have all agreed to this when we discussed the matter of Federation and all its ramifications that we would vote this percentage which is our part to carry on Federation. Now, Federation has become a reality; it has become our lot to vote this percentage; but I am a bit hesitant this evening to vote for this resolution. I say that for many reasons. I have heard a lot of speeches on this matter this evening and there is one thing which I regret. I enquired what was said by the Hon. Leader of the House in presenting the Resolution and I was told that he said nothing more than what was contained in the Addendum to the Resolution.

Since we have decided on Federation, a tremendous lot of water has flown under the bridge; therefore, it is regrettable that the hon. and learned Premier is not in the House to clarify the situation in respect to Federation not only for the benefit of this House but for the general public because the turn of events is very confusing to members of the public as it is to hon. members of this Chamber. As a matter of fact, in asking us to vote for this amount to-night, I am wondering whether not only members of the Opposition but members of the Government themselves have not thought it should be better that this Resolution be postponed for the benefit of the Hon. Premier

to make clear the position. This is an opportunity for him to make clear the position.

I am not going to deal with Lord Hailes' visit or anything of the sort because I have my own feelings. I think, Mr. Chairman, that you have given a tremendous lot of latitude to hon. members and I shall only like to say in passing that I think it is our duty having decided on Federation and having accepted the Governor-General as the symbol and representative of Her Majesty the Queen to pay him due regard and high respect for the office which he holds. Of course, it is not our duty to bend backward. I do not subscribe to the people of the West Indian nation taking off their coats and spreading them down for any Governor-General to walk on, not even for Her Majesty the Queen. Gone are those days, whether that man be British or anybody else, that we should be laying down carpets for him to walk on. That is so much stupidity. I pass from that and I will say that we should pay high regard to the man's office, whether he be Conservative, Labour, a real layman, or what ever he is. Sir, I would be the last to subscribe to the view that Barbados should lay any red carpet from here to the Pier Head for any Governor-General to walk on, more especially when I think of the Mudie Report in which it is set out that we have the lowest standard of living in all the Federations that have been formed. I am not going to say much of the Governor-General because I have already spoken -- and the debates are in here - and said that the people responsible for fixing the salaries of the Governor General, the Prime Minister and that of the Ministers did not know what they were doing.

8.15 p.m.

You start a nation and somebody comes from England to Barbados to select servants; I suppose they want people with certificates for the Governor- General's office, but some people will never see a servant. Now, they are spending $50,000 on the Governor-General alone. I compared the salary of the Governor of New York and that of the Governor of New Jersey, and they are starting off the Governor-General of the West Indies with a national income which is not in keeping with the Mudie's Report. Do you think that people with such a low standard of living could afford to pay the Governor General this salary? When you compare the salary of the Governor-General with that of the Governor of New York State or that of the Governor of New Jersey, $50,000 is a lot of money. I have the greatest respect for the office of the Governor-General and we should pay high respect to that office; but what I say is that, at the beginning, the gentlemen who sat down as leaders of the West Indies and decided upon this salary were, in my opinion, selling the people of the West Indies down the river, be it Manley or anybody else. The Governor-General comes to Barbados as Her Majesty's representative, and we have to consider him; but where this salary is concerned, you have starving people in these colonies. You are starting the Governor-General's salary above the point where Canada and Australia started. We can find this money to pay the Governor-General, but the British Government could not give us the money for which we asked.

I should like to have the further consideration of this Resolution postponed. Barbados had two representatives from this Chamber at a Conference and the Premier was told not to come back here without having obtained Freedom of Movement. Both the Opposition and the Government said that. Let me say here tonight that if in respect of Federation Hon. Mr. Manley can say that there will not be Customs Union for twenty years, I feel that the Premier and the Leader of this Government should still tell the people what is meant by Customs Union. It is not for me to go into that matter now. However, Hon. Mr. Manley says that they are not having any Customs Union for twenty years. I should like to say that we are bringing people together as a nation; we are not bringing the waters together. Hon. Dr. Eric Williams has said that there is not to be any Freedom of Movement for five years and the Leader of the Barbados Government says that he is a pacifist. Watch this ganging up; this is purely a matter of politics. I will prove it to you. Hon. Mr. Manley is of the Jamaica Labour Party, Hon. Sir Grantley Adams - I should have said the Hon. Premier is of the Barbados Labour Party and Hon. Dr. Williams of Trinidad says; "I am no Socialist." Hon. Mr. Manley says that they will make room for Hon. Dr. Williams. He is not a Socialist, but he has ten seats! Hon. Dr. Williams has ten seats! Hon. Mr. Manley sees what is happening and in the ganging up he says, let the Premier come in, because Barbados has only five seats! We have only five seats, Jamaica has seventeen and Trinidad has ten. What is the position? Hon. Mr. Manley says: "I am not coming into this thing if I cannot get you to postpone Customs Union." All along it was considered that we must have Customs Union, but now you get to the real crux of the thing. I want the Government to go to the public and tell them what is meant by Customs Union.

We are asked to vote this $121,000 odd as the contribution from Barbados. We told the Premier this: "If you go away, do not join anything unless there is going to be Freedom of Movement." We gave him the authority to go away, but not to join in any Federation unless there was Freedom of Movement; we said that unless Barbadians could go anywhere in the West Indies, let us not go anywhere near the Federation. If Hon. Mr. Manley says that there is not to be any Customs Union for 20 years and Hon. Dr. Williams that there is not to be any Freedom of Movement for five years, then the Premier of Barbados should say "Let us call their bluff too." When you talk about being dishonest, all of us would be dishonest if we were to vote this money tonight. What are they doing now? There was a faux pas when the Minister of Communications never got up to nominate the Premier and Hon. Mr. Bird nominated Mr. Manley. The Premier of Barbados has been in public life for longer than Hon. Mr. Manley and if I were the Premier of Barbados, I would never play any second fiddle to Mr. Manley.

8.25 p.m.

I am warning you to watch what they are doing today. Dr. Williams and Mr. Manley are ganging up. Is the Premier of Barbados going along with Dr. Williams who is saying that not one person can come to Trinidad except to work on the Capital? The only thing Federation means to Barbados is freedom of movement. You are afraid of Trinidadians. They are as far apart today with Federation as they were slightly after 1870. Dr. Williams is saying he wants all Trinidadians. What beats me is this: how can you fool people in Barbados that you have a West Indian Federal Labour Party when the biggest capitalists in Trinidad are backing Dr. Williams, who has refused to let Mount Gay rum come into Trinidad, but is backing all the Vat 19 rum blended by Fernandes with all the money in Trinidad? I am not surprised at this hypocrisy. Mr. Gomes came here and abused me in Queen's Park.

Dr. Williams is saying either the Capital must be at Chaguaramas or nothing doing. (A VOICE: Mapp said so too) Ignorance is really contagious.

I agree with what was said here tonight by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. If the United Kingdom owned that base in Trinidad, not one of the Leaders would be saying "Chaguaramas or nothing". Some of you people feel, as the member for St. Peter has said, that Dr. Williams is an intellectual, a philospher, and therefore he cannot make mistakes or be criticised for saying something. I say he is just a plain fool for making this boastful statement; but there are those of us who can look beyond and see that that statement was made with a motive.

For us to make our contribution and to pay the percentage which we are called upon to pay, I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this matter should be postponed. The Premier, I understand, is indisposed; the Leader of the House has not made any speech on this subject, so who can deny that there is not some confusion in respect of this situation today? I am nothing to do with whom they run (A VOICE: They can run Belfield) But as the situation stands today, the House of Assembly wants to record that they did not give the Premier such powers plenipotentiary when he went to London. Hon. members were asked to express their views on this matter and we asked for freedom of movement or nothing. He said he was very glad that hon. members had expressed their views, because he felt very strongly on freedom of movement. Tonight we are being asked to vote this money withou the people of Barbados knowing what the true position is. (A VOICE: They know that it is true.) Of course, the Leader of the

House knows what I am saying is true. We have to watch the position of Barbados when we are being subjected to Jamaica. When you look at the position, it strikes you straight in the face that this is power politics. As a matter of fact, those gentlemen who were responsible for laying down the framework of Federation are all now backing out. Someone told me the other day that either Federation has come ten years too soon, or the development of the other colonies is ten years behind.

If you take Trinidad, you will see that the structure and foundation for dictatorship is being built up there. They want to keep all their men at home and not even the local Government men must move. You can send whom you want to, but you have to do what they say or be put out. None of the Leaders want to go to the Federation and be out of the unit Legislatures, but they had to agree to it because it would be absurd and an unusual form of Federation to be in the unit Legislature and the Federal Legislature at the same time. Now you get the two non-Socialist Parties coming together and Barbados is being squeezed, because all Barbados will get is to be used to pay taxation.

An hon. member said to me that Dr. Williams is saying that people can come to work on the structure of the Capital. We do not want that; we want freedom of movement. We want to be able to pay $16 to get on a boat and get off in Trinidad. You can name me for saying that it would be intellectual dishonesty if the Premier were to sacrifice the interests of Barbados to become Federal Prime Minister.

8.35 p.m.

That is how I see it. We have agreed to Federation. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he said that this is the time that the Premier needs the Opposition to help him. Who over on that side would have said it? Somebody has to let the people in Trinidad know that they are taking Barbados for a ride.

Jamaica and Trinidad have 27 seats out of the 45 in the Federal Parliament. What will be the position when two countries like Jamaica and Trinidad get together to squeeze us in this way? Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in whether Mr. Manley or Dr. Williams becomes the Prime Minister; I am interested in the people of Bridgetown who sent me here. I am interested primarily in them because, as I have said, we have nothing to gain out of Federation unless you can let our people move freely. Some people are interested in whether Mr. Manley should have the Premiership of the West Indies or whether our Premier should have it. They are dogs of one mother. It is power politics which they want and it is dishonesty. It is not a coalition. How on earth can they sit down together! Dr. Williams says: I am no Socialist; I do not agree with any of your socialism but I am going to ask the Hon. Premier of Barbados to talk to the people in Woodford Square. They are the biggest bunch of racketeers outside of the Al Capone gang.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, surely it is utterly disgraceful of the hon. senior member for the City to speak of the Chief Minister in a neighbouring island like that. Surely, Mr. Chairman, you should not allow that. By the Rules of this House, you cannot say that of members of this House, and to say that is utterly disgraceful. I am saying that the hon. member should withdraw it. It is absolutely disgraceful. I feel absolutely ashamed.

7/11/58

Mr. MOTTLEY: Shut up ! What is wrong in saying they are a bunch of racketeers?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St Thomas referred to the Rules of this House. What rule are you referring to?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Rule 129; "No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did you say that the same thing applies to members of Legislatures outside?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member said that the Chief Minister of Trinidad invited the Hon. Premier on his platform and he went on to accuse them of being a bunch of racketeers. He also used other offensive words which were stronger than political racketeers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not take it that the hon. senior member for the City was referring to the Hon. Premier as a racketeer. I did not take it that way. I took it that he was referring to the other people.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I must say that I support the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Communications. After all, we have to be orderly in this House under the rule which the Hon. Minister quoted. The hon. senior member for the City said that the Hon. Premier was asked to speak in woodford Square by the Hon. Dr. Williams nd that he, Dr. Williams and Mr. Manley are political racketeers, dishonest and everything. The hon. member knows it is not fair to say that, especially behind the back of the Hon. Premier. I am appealing to Your Honour to ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks. I am sure the hon. member knows that the Hon. Premier is not a racketeer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Let me put it in this way, Sir, You really heard what I said. I am the last man to say anything behind the Premier's back and the reason is because I am not afraid to say anything in front of his face. I can repeat what I said. Apparently the Hon. Minister of Trade was not listening. I am not surprised at the action of the Hon. Minister of Communications but I leave it to my colleague to deal with him. I said that you have a West Indian Federal Labour Party in which they said they started with people who were all socialists. Jamaica has 17 seats in the Federal Legislature, Trinidad 11 and Barbados 5. I said that the Hon. Premier of Barbados fought the West Indian Federal Labour Party and he did not want to accept Dr. Williams and his Party to the Federal Labour Party The Hon. Premier said: "This man is not a socialist it is not fair to take him in." Is not that paying the Hon. Premier a compliment? But because they want to get power politics and they are mad with power politics they open the door and say: "let us keep it open." It is Dr. Williams who told us that he is not a socialist and that he is backed by all the capitalists in Trinidad. The people in the West Indian Labour Party said that they are not opposing Dr. Williams. Did they not open the door and take him in? What did they take him in for? Not for Dr. Williams but for the ten seats of Trinidad. Dr. Williams asked the Hon. Premier to speak in Woodford Square. If they ask a Socialist to come and speak in Woodford Square, what is that but political racketeering? If the hon. members cannot appreciate what I am saying, then they are idiots.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to the hon. member as an idiot?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, No. I mean those who cannot appreciate what I am saying. Putting that case like that, is not that political racketeering?

Hon. M. E. COX: The mere fact that a member of an organisation speaks on the platform of a member of a different organisation does not necessarily mean that he is a racketeer. After all, it depends on what contribution you make. Hon . members ought to know that in the West Indian Federal Labour Party there are two lines of associations: one is a member and the other is an associate member; and in so far as the hon. Dr. Williams' party is concerned, that is an affiliation of the West Indian Labour Party.

Again. I am appealing to Your Honour. It is not in keeping with the dignity which this House once had for hon. Members to get up and speak so disparagingly and to vilify other members especially when those members are not present and especially so when under the Rules of this House it is out of order for a member to refer to another member as a political racketeer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not referring to another member.

Hon. M.E. COX: With great respect to Your Honour, I believe I have a modicum of education and I can understand the English Language.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can understand and I can understand. The hon. senior member for the City can proceed.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a matter of fact, the speech which I was trying to make over here was actually in support of his party. I feel myself that in this matter the

Opposition tonight can give that moral support or courage to the Hon. Premier who, apparently, on the face of it, is going to be selected as Premier of the Federal West Indies. I am absolutely sure that if I wanted a seat in the Federal Legislature none of the people in the Labour Party could stop me from getting it. As I was saying, Sir, as far as I am concerned, it was unfortunate that the Hon. Leader of the House gave no explanation of the position: I understand that in presenting this Resolution, he spoke for two minutes, twenty-five seconds, and I thought that he would have developed more points on the Resolution. As a matter of fact, with the atmosphere as it is today, not only the people's representatives in this House, but the general public on reading about Dr. Williams and Mr. Manley and the comments in the West Indian Press, and hearing nothing from Barbados -- it seems to me that in a matter of this magnitude, we should at this stage hear a little more of it.

We heard that the Premier was invited to go to Jamaica to make a speech. Nobody in his right senses could say that it would be a question of political racketeering when the Premier is with Mr. Manley on a platform making a speech. For those of us whose mentality is not warped, it would be just like saying that in my party we asked the Premier to get on a platform in Queens Park and boast our politics. If you ask somebody who does not share your political views to go on a platform, and because you have a number of seats, do you call it political honesty? That is Sunday School politics. As far as I am concerned, I do not envy the Hon. and Learned Premier. The position must be a very difficult one for him, more especially on account of the fact that he cannot even run the risk of taking certain people away from this country.

According to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, four weeks from now there will be a general nomination, and seven weeks from now, the elections will be taking place, and not one thing has been said to the people about the matter. Is that to prevent as many people as you can from voting? In a community which is lukewarm and where there is disinterestedness shown -- nobody can say that the Premier within the last couple of months has not shown disinterestedness in Federation. We have agreed on everything and I am going to say this now; I understand that the Premier was invited to Jamaica by Mr. Manley, and Mr. Manley was the man preferred to be the Premier of the West Indies because he is Mr. Manley. Let us come down to sound reasoning. Mr. Manley has considered the position in Jamaica and for a lot of reasons he is not going to the Federation. Dr. Williams has only been in politics for a few years learning the political economy of Trinidad and what not; he has not shown any political statesmanship and the people look to the Premier of Barbados. As to the Premier going to Jamaica on the invitation of Mr. Manley; we wonder if the Premier would have the courage to say that, before this Resolution is passed at all, he should let the people of Bridgetown know something just as Dr. Williams told the people in Woodford Square: "I am going to keep out Barbadians, because if they should come in here, one thing they will do is to work. "Let me keep them out for five years. After five years everything will be over." Hon. Mr. Manley is saying: "No Customs Union for 20 years." Dr. Williams is backing him and he is backing Dr. Williams who says that there must be no freedom of movement for five years. We are not pulling out of Federation and even although Dr. Williams in his dogmatic style says: "No Chaguaramas, no Federation," we take that with a grain of salt. Mr. Chairman, I am among those who feel that the further consideration of this Resolution should be postponed.

I am sorry that His Honour the Deputy Speaker is not in the House, but he went swimming in waters which were too muddy. I have always considered the hon. member--

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing anything with reference to the hon. junior member for St. John.

8.55 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All I am saying is that I consider him to be a very good Parliamentarian. I would be the last to consider him a moral leper, because I am not in those streets; but I say it is a pity. I have been in here a long time and have heard members say a lot things against each other. Members over there have told me worse things than that, but I say it is a pity that he launched into the little tirade for the simple reason that it had nothing to do with anybody in Barbados. The West Indian islands have a lot in common, and poverty is the first thing. This is where I do not agree with the hon. senior member for St. Philip: there is nothing wrong with the hon. junior member for St. John having the ambition of becoming a Minister, because it carries respectful emoluments. I do not agree either with the Minister who said the member wants to become a Minister. As a matter of fact, he could have gone up to the Garrison during the Billy Graham crusade and be ordained. But that is not the type of Ministry he wants, because the emoluments there are not so handsome. My friend the hon. junior member for St. James would like to be a Minister too, but age prevents him from so becoming. To be a Minister, to some hon. members, is a sort of sinecure and they can draw emoluments. I would be the last to be annoyed if a man became a Minister and drew $720 a month.

The Hon. Premier should be in this House tonight but in his absence the Hon. Minister in charge should give us a sort of resume of the situation in the West Indies. I am moving that this matter be postponed until we get a statement on this matter, because we do not know the situation tonight. It is absolutely obvious and abundantly clear to anybody watching the situation that Jamaica and Trinidad are ganging up against Barbados. As a Barbadian and a s a West Indian, I am saying that these two big "Mc.Guffies" - one a political economist and the other a strategist - are ganging up against Barbados, and it is unfortunate that the Premier does not see it. The moment he accepted these non-Socialist Parties, the foundation was laid for him. It does not matter what votes they have; Trinidad and Jamaica are ganging up against Barbados, and I do not think it is fair for any of us to sit here tonight and vote blindly for this Resolution when we told the Premier that as far as Barbados was concerned, we had nothing to gain at present except freedom of movement.

I beg to move therefore, that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. It is left for the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with it if the Premier is not here.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I am seconding the motion for the postponement.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, you do not seem to be looking at me at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: You are not going to do me as you did the hon junior member for St. John. Get that into your head. And I will take my seat when you tell me that the hon. junior member for St. Peter will speak and not the hon. junior member for the City. I rose and you did not look in my direction; so I appeal to you to tell me what to do. I am not disobeying the Chair, but I want to know if I haven't the right to speak; and I repeat you will not do me as you did the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for the City is out of order. Please take your seat.

(The member took his seat.)

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, we are all fairly hungry, but I will still use my privilege as a member, having seconded the motion for the postponement.

I think this is one of the occasions, Sir, when members of the Government Bench are happy that there is an Opposition present in this Chamber tonight. That point was mentioned by my colleague, and I very much agree with him. Sir, this is the first slice of money that we are asked to vote for the Federation which is now a fact. Federation is already a fact and we have to face it. We are now called upon to deal with a money Resolution to finance the Federation. This is the first slice on account. Later on, as this Addendum explains, we will be asked when we consider the Estimates for the year 1958-59 to consider other amounts which are to be allocated and paid into the Federal Treasury.

On an occasion like this, Sir, we are bound to notice what is happening on the political horizon in the West Indies. There is no doubt about it, Sir, and this is no laughing matter.

Sir, man does not live by bread alone; so let me warn hon. members who are voicing the word "dinner."

I will not be in a position to say what I am saying now; those who come after me will have to say it. I am doing my duty now to myself and to posterity, and I am going to take full advantage with your permission to join in this debate.

I remember fully well when the Premier of Barbados went with plenipotentiary powers to the United Kingdom to the Federation Conference, that he was told in very plain, unequivocal language by this House, and in terms agreed upon by both sides of the House, that as far as Barbados was concerned, if freedom of movement was not granted in the Constitution, we would not feel happy about it, and Federation would mean nothing to us. We see what happened today and we cannot neglect it. Jamaica is talking about postponing Customs Union; you know what that means. It is no laughing matter. We have had Commissions delving into this matter, and hon. members who are not new to this Chamber have in their possession a Report on Customs Union in the Caribbean.

9.05 p.m.

Our Customs Union means that as far as Jamaica is concerned, she would dominate trade in the Northern Caribbean and Trinidad would do the same thing in the Southern Caribbean. And they are not prepared to separate on matters economic. This is no laughing business and if they can make threats today, we are jokes if we do not make threats too.

What is happening now? The Chief Minister of Trinidad is saying that if Chaguaramas is not given as the capital site he is thinking of withdrawing from the Federation. He is thinking that this is a Federation of Trinidad and Jamaica. This is money which we are asked to vote. If Trinidad secedes from this Federation what action would we have? We all have to pay a mandatory levy to support Federation. Trinidad knows that Barbados can be stiff and hard too. Trinidad knows that they cannot call the entire tune because we are paying a percentage according to our population and in doing so we are paying as much as anybody else. At this stage, what are we doing?

I am not prepared to take up the trend of argument i which the hon. senior member for the City spoke. I do not know if the Chief Minister of Jamaica and the Chief Minister of Trinidad can come together to put anything over the Hon. Premier of Barbados . In my considered opinion , the Hon. Premier of Barbados is about the shrewdest politician in the West Indies. I might be stupid but I do not think that the Hon. Premier is in any corner. Nobody knows on what side he is going to jump and that is paying him a compliment. The Chief Minister o Jamaica may be radiant, may be suave, and may have a pleasant manner. The Chief Minister of Trindad may not be as radiant as the Chief Minister of Jamaica but he is a learned professional man. When it comes to the Hon. Premier of Barbados, he is shrewd; therefore. I do not think they have got him in any tight spot.

Sir, let us postpone this Resolution until we have the opportunity of getting an expression of opinion from the Hon. Premier, because, as I see it, not even the Hon. Leader of this House nor the Hon. Minister of Communications seems as yet to be in the position to tell us why we should pass this Resolution tonight, taking in view the political outlook in the British Caribbean. The Hon. Minister, of course, will have the right to reply and I can anticipate what he is going to say, but I fail to see how I am to discover anything more by the paucity of remarks with which he introduced the Resolution. He told us little or nothing. Mr. Chairman, apart from being a politician, you are a hard-headed businessman. This $121,797 is not a mere bagatelle.

Hon. M.E.COX: If you give me an opportunity, I will explain.

Mr. HUSBANDS: You will have your opportunity. According to the Addendum, the Estimates of the West Indies Federation show that the Expenditure is $7,772,681, and that the Revenue at Mandatory Levy is $5,770,689 and from other sources $2,001,812. We are expected to pay at this stage $1,500,000. Barbados' share which is 8.552% amounts to $128,343 but as we have already paid $6,546 towards the cost of the Interim Federal Government, the net amount now payable is $121,797. That is quite explanatory but that is not all there is in this matter - not at all. What are we going to get from Federation? The one thing which we are going to get is freedom of movement but in view of what responsible West Indian politicians are saying, I do not see any freedom of movement for us. What is being said now is that you go to Trinidad to work at the Capital site. If hon. members listen and hear and read, they will understand what is being said. Do you think these things which are written should not be taken account of here? Do you think we should come here and vote money on the basis of just voting it? Am I expected to do that? I am not here for that. I will not vote for one red half cent of this money; at least, not yet I will not vote for it until the Hon. Premier or some other authorised member deputed by him is going to tell this Committee that the Federation o the West Indies, federated as it is, means what we have been made to understand. If that is told us, well "yes, we will vote for it," but otherwise we say "no"; the present outlook is not good enough.

Sir, I am not going to enter into any talk about Chaguaramas; I have my own opinion and that is a legal point. I will say that there is not as much bluff as lay members think. There is a legal point in that which international jurists would have to ponder upon, because if you hope to become a sovereign power and you begin your national power with a possible foreign policy tacked on to it, you will never become an entirely sovereign power. I am not a lawyer nor any international jurist, but I do not think there is so much bluff as hon members think. A 99 year lease should be honoured but when you come to national sovereignity, do you think you must o necessity honour an obligation for which you were not responsible? The lawyers who are knowledgeable may have to ponder out points in connection with this aspect some day. Personally, I think there is not so much bluff as any layman thinks.

Sir, I am formally seconding the motion for the postponement because we are going into this matter too blindly; you cannot see daylight because things are too dark. Now that we come to Federation, there seems to be some dark cloud before us. I am not going to commit myself to the voting of this Resolution, which is the first slice we are giving, until I am made aware of the true position. I am not happy about it and I am no hypocrite. I would tell the Hon. Premier that, if he were in his place. As a responsible politician, I cannot vote for this; therefore I am of the opinion that this Resolution should be postponed for further consideration, when this Committee can get a statement which give us encouragement, we will vote for this We are still masters in our own house in Barbados. We do not have the constitution of the Federation. We have a Premier; we have a Cabinet System. The Governor is a mere figure-head today. The Governor-General of the West Indies has just made legislation but he can do that as things stand. In Barbados our Governor cannot make legislation for us. Mr. Chairman, I am conscious of your powers in this Committee.

9.15 p.m.

Mr. T.W.MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention particularly to speak on this Resolution. This Resolution for $121,797 is a part of the contribution from this territory towards the federal set up. I am not against the Opposition expressing their views one way or another on this matter, because I am one of those who stand for freedom of speech. However, it hurts me when any member like myself is denied the right to speak and as long as I am a member of this Chamber, I am not sitting here quietly and allowing the rights of any member of my Party or of the Opposition to be infringed upon. I have no intention of preventing anybody from going to have his dinner; if I have to lose my seat as result of my outspokenness, I am going to my home and from my home, I am going to my business place Whatever the other Islands have done by way of welcoming the Governor-General of the West Indies, I would not say, as some hon. members feel, that it is stupid. If they lay a carpet on which the Governor-General may walk, that is how they feel towards the Governor-General as such, but they have long thirsted for Federation to become a reality in order that these countries might come together as one, and the hope of attaining dominion status is one of the reasons why they went thus far.

I am not against Grenada, Montserrat or any other colony as to any form in which they welcomed the Governor-

general. I will welcome him too; but what I abhor is the hon. senior member for St. Philip going out of his way in speaking on Federation -- I am glad to see that the hon. member has come back in the Committee -- to attack the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What does the hon. member mean by saying that I went out of my way in speaking on Federation? So far as I know the matter before the Chamber was that of Federation.

Mr. T.W.MILLER: What is the point of order? He is not speaking on any point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat, and let me hear on what the hon. senior member for St. Philip is speaking?

Mr CRAWFORD: I heard the hon. member say that I went out of my way to speak on Federation; I believe he understands that we were discussing the matter of Federation and therefore, I could not have gone out of my way to speak on Federation.

Mr.T. W. MILLER: I have the ability to express myself; otherwise I would not be worthy of a seat in here. I remember that the hon. member ceased to speak on Federation and attacked the hon. junior member or St. John.

Mr. Crawford: On a point of order. I did nothing of the kind. I spoke first and I spoke of the manner in which the Governor-General of the West Indies was welcomed in certain colonies. The hon. member attacked me and my submissions and I had to reply to him; I did not go out of my way to attack him.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I will make a statement now even if I have to withdraw it; the hon. senior member for St. Philip is the most dishonest member in this Island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman -

Mr CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not refer to another hon. member as being dishonest. The hon. member should not speak like that.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: I will not only say it, but I will prove it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. T.W.MILLER: I will withdraw it, but there are two things which you cannot withdraw, the spoken word and ----

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak on the Resolution and he can do as long as he likes; but I am not entertaining any reference to the hon. senior member for St. Philip I am not entertaining anything of the sort.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have a stealer of books call me dishonest; this is not the St Michael's Vestry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a full- fledged row now. The hon. junior member for the City has been unprovoked and I cannot sit here and allow it to be noted that an hon. member quite unprovoked has looked at another hon. member and said that he is the most dishonest member in Barbados. The hon. member should be made to lose his seat for that; he should be suspended or expelled. Any hon. member who can get up in this House unprovoked by any statement - the hon. junior member for the City got up quite clearly and deliberately and said that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is the most dishonest member in Barbados. Mr. Chairman, you cannot have a statement like that; the hon. member cannot make an unprovoked statement like that. 9.25 p.m.

It is debauchery in this Chamber for the hon. member to get up unprovoked and look upon the hon. senior member for St. Philip and say he is the most dishonest man in Barbados, when no reference at all was made to the hon. junior member for the City.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Peter to listen to the Gavel. When the Chairman knocks the gavel he is calling or the attention of the hon. member who is speaking. You are not making a point of order; you are making a speech. The hon. member was speaking and you rose to apoint of order

(Mr.WALCOTT took his seat)

(Mr Searles and Mr. T.W. Miller rose).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. junior member for St. James speaking on?

Mr. SEARLES: I want to move that you report progress.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that, because the hon. junior member for the City was speaking. You will have to wait until the hon. junior member for the City sits.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, nobody took me out of obscurity; so I have nothing to fear.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. junior member from the City to desist from that kind of speech.

Mr. T.W.MILLER: I made it clear why I was speaking I realised that the rights of certain members of this Chamber were being infringed upon, and I am going to speak if it takes the whole night and if I have to withdraw. I suf er no fear, and any statement I make I will prove despite any electioneering things being said here tonight. Anything I can say I can prove, and I will prove it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was just about to speak. I am warning the hon. junior member for the City. When you say that you are going to make remarks even if you have to withdraw them , it means that anything you say will not be an accidental slip of the tongue. I am warning you that you can be punished for that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for the City got up and made it the brunt of his speech so far to make reference to Your Honour's handling o a member in this Committee. Now, Sir, unless the hon. member is going to bring a substantive motion against Your Honour, he has no right in this Committee to make any such reference to your handling a member in this Committee, and the hon. member is therefore out of order. I ask you seriously to take note of that. He is challenging your authority. The moment he says he will not stand in his seat and allow the rights of a member to be infringed upon - by whom? - obviously by the Chairman, it is tantamount to intimating he means to bring a vote of censure against Your Honour. He is rather young in Parliament, and that sort of sneer to the Chairman or Speaker is not permissible in Parliament.

(Mr. Searles and Mr. T.W.Miller rose.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. James is out of order.

Mr. T.W.MILLER: The point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, was that nobody would deny the latitude which the hon. senior member for St. Philip was given.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want the hon. member to speak on the Resolution. From the time you got up you were referring to the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. T.W. MILLER: I want to refer to the remarks made about the Premier too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will rule you out of order for the second time if you continue with this sort of debate. (The member took his seat).

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. WALCOTT: I beg to second that. In seconding the motion, I want to say that I have respect for all the members who were elected here. I have a regard for the hon. junior member for the City as a Parliamentarian, but if the hon. member does not have any regard for other members in here, I want to say that no matter how I feel about him personally, if he can get up and deliberately say that he is going to say something even if he has to withdraw it, it is just like my coming here with a gun in my pocket and saying that I am going to shoot the Hon. Leader of the House no matter what happens to me. I am sure if anyone from this side had got up and said what the hon. junior member for the City had said, the Hon. Leader of the House would have been the first to make a motion for him to be expelled. His conduct merits expulsion.

So far as his reference to me about obscurity is concerned, I will say that I prefer to be from obscurity and be an honest man; and I challenge the hon. member that he cannot bring anything against my honesty and integrity. If some of you people did not feel that by the deeds of your forefathers who put you in position you were able to abuse people, you would not have said that. I have never been charged before a Court; so I am the last member he can make that statement to. He used the filthiest language against the Hon. Leader of the House, and he ought to be ashamed to be in the Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Please refrain from such remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am finished

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question

The question that the CHAIRMAN do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting for three quarters of an hour.

9.35 p.m.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE

On reassembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. Hon. members spoke at length and brought out quite a number of points: but, first of all, before I touch on the subject I should like to reply to the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he referred to what he considered as an attack on the hon. senior member for St. Philip by the hon. junior member for the City. He said if it were a member over here, I would have jumped up and made a motion for the suspension of the member. He went further and said that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy had done nothing at one time and I moved the motion for the suspension of that hon. member. I just want to explain my position - and I am sure that you and His Honour the Speaker will bear me out - that so far as the Rules of this House are concerned and to which we so often refer, it is the duty of the Leader of this House, never mind how unpleasant it may be, when His Honour names a member with the view that he be suspended - and as far as I remember, the rule says that there should be no debate - the Leader of this House makes the motion and it is put to the vote.

I should like my position to be made crystal clear. In so far as any ill-will against any hon. members is concerned, I have none; I speak strongly at times, but if any hon. member feels I speak too strongly, it is a matter for him. I am sure on the last occasion when I made the motion for the suspension of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I said that it be for one day's sitting only because it is my duty to do something when the Speaker names an hon. member. I want that clearly understood and I hope that the hon. senior member for St. Peter and no other hon. member will refer to it as a question of my moving a motion for the suspension of any hon. member because he is not a member of this Party. I just want to say too that Your Honour did not name the hon. junior member for the City; therefore I could not make any motion.

Now, Sir, many criticisms were made in connection with this Resolution. I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I credited hon. members for knowing more about the Federal constitution than they do know, and I say that because I am sure if hon. members knew the constitutional set up of the Federation, they would not have made the remarks that they made tonight; some event so far as to say that they would not vote for this Resolution. As I said in my opening remarks, I think hon. members were well aware of what was decided at the Governor-in-Advisory-Council in Trinidad which took place sometime around the 8th of last month. Whether or not this Committee votes the $121,797 of this Resolution, or whatever money is required from time to time to run the Federation, the money will be found from the Public Treasury. I said in my opening remarks that it is mandatory and so it is. The hon. junior member for St. Peter in his remarks when he stated that he would not support this Resolution said that we were still masters of our own country; the Governor was a figure head, we have a cabinet system and things of that sort. We have a cabinet system but if hon. members remember, for the first time in the history of Barbados - and I think it was on the 6th January, when Federation of the West Indies became a living being - the right which was never conferred on any Governor of Barbados, that is, to legislate in Council, was conferred on the Governor-General of the West Indies; and in that case, we having joined the Federation, we are in the same position as Trinidad, Jamaica, Dominica, St. Kitts or any of those colonies for whom Her Majesty the Queen could legislate in Council all the years. We are in it now and we can no longer boast and say that there are no reserved powers, no Order-in-Council for us; we are in it. All we can do is, if after five years we are not satisfied with the working of the constitution, then we can withdraw. But saying that you are going to withdraw is one thing; withdrawing is another thing. By an Act of Parliament we today are a Federated West Indies whether or not we like it. What I am trying to point out is this. As I have said, I think we have wasted time in saying that we would not vote for this Resolution when it is already within the power of the Governor-General to make any laws he seems fit to make. (A VOICE: We know that.) Mr. Chairman, a member on the opposite side said: "they know it was so" and yet when an hon. member on that side spoke, he said it was not so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we knew that all the time, but we protested because of what those people said. From what appeared in the Press of the West Indies since then and since the last meeting, that is the meeting of the Governor General Advisory Council, we knew whether or not we voted for it, this money would have to be found because of what has happened. Dr. Williams knows that as well as Mr. Manley; yet the learned doctor said that if we do not get Chaguaramas that Trinidad was coming out of the Federation. We know if we do not participate in it we would still have to give them the money.

Hon. M.E.COX: I regret that they did not explain what I am now trying to explain to the House. since they know it, I will not worry to read it, but it can easily be found on page 30. If I remember correctly, when the Federation delegation went in 1956 to England it was discussed in this House and elsewhere that the powers of the Governor General to legislate on financial matters were too important and they were not prepared to agree with those rights, privileges and powers. To my surprise, and I believe to the surprise of a number of people, when the delegation came back, they came giving the Governor General general powers; in other words, the powers were no longer confined to finance but any other matters which were defined at the time. The Governor-General had been given general powers to legislate in council; that is the position today.

10.30 p.m.

Whether or not we vote this so; that is why I did not speak at any length on introducing the Resolution. I started off by saying that the Resolution was a mandatory one, that the Addendum was full and quite explanatory and therefore - there was no necessity for my having to say anything much on the Resolution.

Since hon. members appreciate the fact that whether we vote this money or not, it will be paid out of the Treasury, we can discard that point. Now, Sir, hon. members spoke about the Hon. Mr. Manley purporting to have said -- I do not know whether or not he said it, because you cannot always follow what is published. We hear that the Chief Minister of Jamaica was not in favour of Customs Union; we heard and we read that It was said that it was the feeling of people in Jamaica, especially that of the Chief Minister, that the question of Customs Union should be postponed for 20 years. If that is the expression of opinion of the Chief Minister of Jamaica, it does not necessarily mean, in actual point of fact, that it would be so.

I pass on to make this point; say what you like, having joined the Federation, all the unit Governments become subordinate to the Federal Parliament. We can

say what we like as individuals, but in case there is any clash of opinion or law in a constitution such as this - I refer to the Federal Legislature vis-a-vis the unit Legislature - the Federal constitution will prevail. If it is said that the Chief Minister of Jamaica does not want Customs Union before another 20 years expire and the Federal Parliament, when it meets in April, decides and passes the law that there shall be Customs Union, then there must be Customs Union.

I think we all know what Customs Union means. The point which hon. members have failed to bring out is that there is at present a commission sitting on Customs and Tariffs under the Chairmanship of Sir William Croft. That commission has not yet reported and until such time as the Report is presented and revealed to the unit Governments, nobody can say what the future of Customs Union will be. However, I have reasons to believe that the Report will be one which is reasonable and which will meet the situation as it exists today.

On the question of Hon. Dr. Williams, who is Chief Minister of Trinidad, saying that there must be no Freedom of Movement for five years, I think we have all read and heard that that is being said. If I remember correctly, when the delegates returned from the Jamaica Conference at which the Federal Capital site was selected, it was said then that the Trinidad Government would allow people from other West Indian Territories to come in to work on the construction of the Federal buildings. That was said at Piarco when Dr. Williams returned to Trinidad. Of course, we did not kick up any fuss at that time. Again, I think that hon members will remember -- I think it was some time in February -- that a delegation went to Trinidad headed by the Premier, as usual, and this question of Freedom of Movement of the population was discussed. Hon. members will also remember that in the Report of that Conference quite a number of prohibitive restrictions were removed as a result of that meeting. But there again, as I said, although it is said that this prohibition should remain for five years, if the Federal Parliament decides to pass a law to wipe it out on the day after it is inaugurated, then it will be wiped out. That is the position.

If hon. members are assuming that these people are going to gang up, then they are also assuming that a one-party Government will get all the seats. I agree that it may be too optimistic to hope that immediately after the Federation is inaugurated, the law which prohibits the Freedom of Movement of the population will be wiped out, but there can be no Federation in the true form if there are barriers set up to prevent people from going from one country to another.

10.40 p.m.

That has been discussed on all occasions, because it is tantamount to a man from St. Andrew or from St. Lucy, for that matter, not being able to come to town unless he has a permit to let him enter temporarily, after which he returns to where he belongs. If I understand it correctly, in a Federation, all the units are like parishes; so that Trinidad being the city, all the other units would be parishes and you could not prevent people rom moving from the country into the city. We agreed on that long ago; so it cannot be wiped out tonight by refusing to vote for this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not mean it in that sense. We cannot wipe it out that way, but our argument is that you should strengthen the position which the Premier will take up. Jamaica is asking to postpone Customs Union, Trinidad wants Chaguaramas or nothing, and all we can ask for is freedom of movement.

Hon. M.E. COX: There was a point made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, and I must say I agree with him, that the Estimates of the Federation should have been seen by members of the House. I should also like to tell him that these Estimates were only agreed on at a recent Meeting in Trinidad, went before the Advisory Council and were then submitted to the various Governments. I say that because I feel that in view of the fact that we are now debating part of the contribution towards Federation, hon. members should have seen how the budget is made up, and I would like to assure the hon. member that at the earliest opportnity, maybe by next Tuesday, I will try and get a copy for the House.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church suggested that Government should allow candidates to use the Rediffusion Service to broadcast to the people. That is something which I will refer to the Cabinet. I cannot give any guarantee that the Cabinet will agree, but I will put it to them.

The hon senior member for the City, in order to make things appear big, said that we were spending $50,000 on the Governor General. That is not strictly correct. As far as I can see, Sir, it is $28,800 as salary and $12,000 duty allowance, making a total of $40,000.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think it was yesterday's copy of the Trinidad Guardian which gave a little sketch of part of the Federal Budget. If he looks at it, I think he will see that the amount allocated to the Governor General is well over $200,000.

Hon. M.E.COX: That is something different; that includes the amount for salary along with other items.

Now there was a point made about the Chief Minister of Trinidad not allowing Barbados rum to go into Trinidad. That statement, Sir, is incorrect. A considerable amount of the rum manufactured in this country still goes to Trinidad. It is true that our bottle and carton business is not as large as it used to be, but there is still a considerable amount of alcohol which goes to Trinidad. I understand the major part of it is brought by Fernandes who blends it and sells it as Trinidad rum. I will admit, however, that the duty has recently been increased, and our rum has to carry an additional ten cents per gallon; but I do not think that would prevent us from selling a lot of rum in Trinidad because the rum is of a high standard.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister should have made a note that I said Mount Gay Rum, and for his benefit I will say this. Since the new Government came into power you will see what is the spirit towards Federation, because in the last few months only a trickling of Mount Gay Rum has been going to Trinidad, and we are losing thousands of dollars per month.

Hon. M.E.COX: If Bryden's Barbados Rum can go into Trinidad - and I hear the advertisement over Radio Trinidad after the religious service on mornings - then surely Mount Gay Rum can go also.

I think I have covered all the points made. As regards the statement made about Chaguaramas, I would say that the remarks that if Chaguaramas is not granted for the Capital Trinidad will come out of Federation are childish, because after all, Federation is bigger than Chaguaramas. If you cannot get Chaguaramas, - and I know it has been very helpful to us during the War, and without that base we would not have been able to keep the population with ood during the last war - I do not see any reason why you could not go to Waller Field. To tell me that you are going to wreck a Federation purely because a particular site is not given to you gives me the impression that you really never intended to federate.

10.50 p.m.

I was saying that I feel federation is too big a thing for mr. Manley, the Chief Minister of Jamaica, if he said "I do not agree with Customs Union, I am coming out," or for Dr. Williams, the Chief Minister of Trinidad, if he said "i I do not get Chaguaramas, I am coming out" to say. That is not good enough. I feel that we should approach this matter of Federation in the sense that it is the people that matter and what we are doing for a nation We are creating a new nation; birth is given to a new nation and it is so irrespective of where the Capital is sited. It can be in Barbados, St. Lucia or anywhere else. The things that mater and which should be our purpose is to get the people together and to command respect with other countries and to be a self-governing territory in the not distant future. The question as to where.---

Mr. CRAWFORD: When the hon. member says "our purpose", does he mean the Government's position?

Hon. M.E.COX: The question as to where is a matter of indifference; it is what you do. Now, Sir, I would like to say that I do not agree with the caustic criticisms which were levelled against the Hon Dr. Williams and the hon. Chief Minister of Jamaica and, as you know, most

of all, against the Hon. Premier. It is a fact that since the talk of Federation and more particularly, since the Order has been signed and Federation has become a living entity, that we have heard many remarks and statements which, if there is any truth in them, would tend to prevent people from taking an interest in Federation as they should. As it appears, I would say today that we are not as hopeful now about it as we were, and from the remarks it would appear that although Federation has been talked about on the house top, it certainly has not yet reached the hearts of the people who are prepared to join in the Federation. However, like all adventures, like all new ideas and schemes and things of that sort, I feel if goodwill can exist, if encouragement can be given to this Federation, despite the fact that at the present moment there is no doubt strange relationships here and there and the feeling by many people that the Chief architects of the Federation are not quite interested as they were, it will be a success. I do feel that all this criticism can do us no good. I still feel that we should approach this thing with a feeling that it must succeed and practice a system of give and take. I feel that in the other islands, those who are responsible in their own interest and the interest which is deserving to people in the area should be leading the people on to a higher life whereby, as I have said before, the people can be regarded as a nation. If they would be prepared to sacrifice a bit, I feel federation will succeed.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Minister who has just sat down for the very interesting way in which he has put his point of view. Yet I am afraid that it has caused me some disquietude because the Government of Barbados has now spoken with two distinct voices. On the one hand, we have heard from the Hon. Minister of Communications: "Chaguaramas or nothing" and he has not contradicted himself against that stand, and on the other hand, we have now heard from the hon. Leader of the House an entirely different approach made to the whole matter. We have heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that Chaguaramas is not big enough to wreck federation on That is the pronouncement which he has made.

As a matter of fact, a case has been made out more clearly now for the postponement of the Resolution. You have heard two Ministers of the Barbados Government speaking with two voices on the same problem. Admittedly, they have not both spoken on the same occasion but the Hon. Premier of Barbados and the second delegate from this House, now present but silent, have committed themselves to 'Chaguaramas or nothing.' The Hon. Leader of this House is diametrically opposed to that view and he told us quite clearly that he does not think Chaguaramas is big enough to wreck Federation on. Which is the authentic voice on Federation?

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr Chairman, there is a lot I should say but I do not intend to say much on the speeches which were made tonight. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I can add to the trend of debate to say what I have in mind to say if I say it now; therefore, I withhold my fire for a more appropriate occasion. I can refute much which has been said tonight and many of the allegations made against other leaders in the West Indian Federal Labour Party. I can clear up many omissions which have been spoken of regarding Customs Union and even the red herring which was brought across the trail on freedom of movement apparently to confuse the issue. I can show that it is nothing else but a red herring, but I say again that I am keeping quiet until a more appropriate occasion.

11.00 p.m.

I am going to say this in reply to the last speaker who, as was to be expected, would take cognizance of the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the House about Chaguaramas. I am going to say this in reply to him; as a Minister of the Government, and as Chairman of the sub-Committee which recommended Chaguaramas, until tonight, my understanding was that all members of this Government supported the claim of Chaguaramas for the Federal Capital; and that this Government as a whole joined the Trindad Government and other Governments in the area who have supported Chaguaramas from the claim of the Standing Federation Committee. That is my understanding of our position in Barbados as a Government and if it were not so, I would take a most serious view of it.

..... Again, speaking as a Minister of the Government, I am saying at this stage what anyone who knows about our Report would say. We still hold the view that Chaguaramas is the ideal spot in Trinidad for the Federal Capital; it is the most suitable spot in Trinidad for the Federal Capital. I believe that Hon. Dr. Williams has been absolutely misquoted when he is supposed to have made certain remarks in a confidential manner; and these things can be absolutely twisted by journalists in the area, especially in Trinidad, people who are opposed to this suggestion of having Chaguaramas for the Capital site. This matter has been taken entirely out of its context. I have a Report of the speech made by Hon. Dr. Williams in Woodford Square in which he made it quite clear that the only reason why the choice of the Capital site of the Federation was limited to three Islands, was because in those Islands a suitable city could be found a good base capital for the Federal Capital. Bridgetown or Port-of-Spain or Kingston would be suitable from the point of view of prestige to be used as a base Capital and as far as the Federal Capital is concerned, it should not be situated further than seven or eight miles from that base capital. If you go outside of that concept, as was recommended by the Mudie Commisson, you could as well throw the whole issue open again. That was Dr Williams' point. The reason why the choice of the Federal Capital was limited to one of these Islands, was that if you go outside that twin town concept: you could as well go further afield and throw the whole thing open again. I say, that that was Dr. Williams' point and it was a good point.

Let us take the question of Customs Union. The Commission which is sitting in connection with this matter is still deliberating, and while we will have the official vew point of the Jamaica Government on the matter, I say again, that that report was based on rumours. We all know the position of Jamaica in the matter of Customs Union (Mr. WALCOTT: And you stood quietly). This is what the Federal West Indian Labour Party outlined in the matter of Customs Union and this is what Hon. Mr. Manley subscribed to. It was outlined that there should be the achievement of Customs Union with all possible speed and of free trade among the units. The hon. senior member for the City was apparently moving like a hare rabbit

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. A hare or a rabbit will move with speed, but some dogs hardly move at all. I am saying that it is common knowledge that Mr. Manley has put it down in writing - he has suggested that Customs Union should not come until 20 years' time. If you press me, I will say where I got that from.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, history and events have a habit of altering people's attitude towards things which they really believe. Even if what the hon. member has said is true, the Australian Federation was not achieved with any magic wand. Each state had to fight because of the attitude of idealism which was built up, and they had to deal with local problems and local feelings. Why should the hon. member bring up something which may not be true? I am still challenging it. Why should we put these difficulties in the way of Federation? If hon. members are really in favour of Federation they will say; "Let us start the Federation and we are bound to go clear." If hon. members would read the Report of the Sub-Committee of which I was Chairman, they would adopt a different attitude. The hon. member made a statement to the effect that it was said that Chaguaramas was wanted or nothing. The Report of the sub-Committee of which I was Chairman, stated that Chaguaramas was the selected site. We have rejected Waller Field.

11.10 p.m.

The Sub-Committee appointed by the Trinidad Government made a Report, and I refuse to say what it said because it is confidential. There are a lot of people tonight in Barbados, and the hon senior member for the City belongs to a Party which comprises some of them, who put up their hands in horror when we were talking about Cabinet

System for Barbados, and they would still like to see it fail. While they are laughing and making sport, we are trying to build a nation. A lot of them say we haven't the capacity to behave ourselves; look at the way they are carrying on. It should be quite clear that all the interruptions do not prevent me from talking, and you must resign yourselves to it (Mr. WALCOTT: Oh, I see! I will be dealing with that.) Do hon. members want to tell us that Trinidad is hoping to benefit most from Customs Union will join with Jamaica in delaying it for twenty years? That is absolute nonsense. What has Jamaica to gain from that? Jamaica has built up a protective area through imposition of high tariffs, and they would lose considerable revenue if Customs Union were introduced immediately. If we had hoped that our industrial fruits would flourish in the same way, we would adopt the same attitude; but are we going on with that? We are defending our natural interests.

I am not quarrelling with hon. members; I am on all fours with them on Customs Union and freedom of movement, which is granted in the Constitution. Why raise the issue now when the Conference in Trinidad of all the units agreed on it? Nothing was said about it then.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We said we wanted it now.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Read the Constitution on Freedom of Movement and see it is bound to come. Why do you seize on it today and say that we have let down Barbados? We are quarrelling with the insinuation that the Leaders of the Caribbean are joining to let down the people of Barbados. We have never ....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did I say that you joined to let down the people in Barbados? I do not walk on all-fours like you. I never said anything like that.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: The hon member said that for reasons of gaining power, we were affiliating with another Party not of the same views to let down Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not true. I said you were doing it for power. I said that two Parties were joining together as a matter of power politics. In this way Jamaica is ganging up with Trinidad to delay freedom of movement for five years, and in turn Trinidad is backing Jamaica in delaying Customs Union for twenty years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said it was not a question of letting down Barbados, but it was a question of reaching the stage where Trinidad was asking for no freedom of movement for five years, with Jamaica delaying Customs Union for twenty years, and in turn squeezing Barbados. What I want to know is whether the hon. member whom I have just interrupted knows well enough that it is an absolute fact that Mr. Manley has put up that Customs Union should be delayed for twenty years. What is the point of defending it when it has been published?

Hon. M.E. COX: Just one thing I would like to say. Less what I said just now be misunderstood, I should like to say that I am not at cross purposes with the Government or with the Federated units for fighting for Chaguaramas as Headquarters, because through some of the remarks that have been made, I can see there was some misunderstanding. I can stand on whatever I say all the time. What I said was that the statement made about "Chaguaramas or nothing" was childish. I am in agreement with Government and the Federal units for fighting for Chaguaramas, but if they cannot get that I do not see why they should withdraw from Federation. Federation is bigger than Chaguaramas, Barbados or anywhere.

11.20 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Any hon. member with any modicum of commonsense would see from what was said by the Hon. Minister of Communications, who was one of our representatives to this Conference, that he is not fit to represent us. (Hon. R.G. MAPP: Your views do not matter to me.) I mean more to this country than you you do not mean anything; somebody has to put you somewhere. You are not fit to represent us and that is why we find ourselves in this position. When we have these unfit persons representing us, that is the sort of representation we get. The Hon. Minister goes to a Federation Conference; look what he is telling you tonight!

Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

Mr. WALCOTT: Are you interrupting me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I knock the gavel for you to stop from being personal.

Mr. WALCOTT: Before you knock the gavel at me, you should be knocking it at the Minister. How long is it that you ask an hon. member who is speaking to stop for one to interrupt him?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I knock the gavel for you to stop.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is the uncouth behaviour of the Hon. Minister with which you have to deal. I say that he is unfit to represent us and what he said here tonight is a classical example o it. Look at what he said. He said that we must resign ourselves to the fact that they are going to get through what they want. He wants to a big dictator. It does not matter what we think is good for Barbados; it only matters what they get through.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Even if I said that, what does it matter? What I said was that the hon. member was keeping a lot of noise but that would not prevent me from getting through with what I want to say.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that you said these things. I wrote them down.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am appealing to the commonsense of the hon. member. So far as I am concerned, I am accustomed to all these attacks. If I said that which he said, I would stick to it. I am saying that he misinterpreted me; he deliberately misinterpreted me. (A VOICE: You may not have meant it that way but you did say so.)

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not have to lie on him. I wrote these things down when he said them, and if you want to find out whether or not I am correct, challenge this Committee by asking them if he did not say: we must resign ourselves to the act that they are going to get through with what they want. I sat through his whole speech and when I wrote it down I remarked, sotto voce, "I will reply to that when I speak again."

Now, Sir, in less than ten minutes he is making a categorical statement denying something which everybody heard him to say That is only an example of the mentality with which we have to deal. He is not willing to abide by words which he said less than ten minutes ago. I say again that he is un it to represent us, and I will proceed to show why I said so. He is one of those Ministers who believe that all hon. members on this side or people who do not believe n that Party are not interested in the people. Can he ever begin to challenge anybody over here by saying that we are not interested in seeing that the West Indies get nationhood? Let him analyse himself against some of us over here, and he will see the contribution which we have made towards the people as compared with the contribution which he has made. Let him see that there are those of us who have been struggling for years and years to establish what he is now enjoying, and let him compare that with the struggle which he has made. Those of us who desire Federation are not looking upon it for gain on the basis of what power it is going to bring to us as individuals; we are looking at Federation from the standpoint of what it means to the community in which we live. My interest in Federation is not based on whether I am a Minister or not or what position I am going to hold; my interest in Federation is based on the fact that I know in this crucial moment Barbados cannot afford to have its best people not going forward, and because of that, I feel that I have a contribution to make among those people.

When he makes capital of what the hon. senior member for the City said about freedom of movement, it is agreed that freedom of movement will come about after five years' time. I never said that was not an agreement, but what have we said here tonight? I want to say this: I do not want to see any rift between the Ministers.

I have no desire to be among them again; therefore, what I am going to say I am not saying because of any desire of mine to be with them. You must pay a compliment to the Hon. Leader of the House, because he did make a commonsense statement. If you think you are living in a palace or a place with ivory doors, if you think that the Hon. Dr. Williams or the Hon. Mr. Manley is going to run Barbados, then you are mistaken. The Hon. Dr. Williams is as good a friend of mine as any other friend. I will say that I was associated with Dr. Williams in his movement even when the Hon. Minister would not have associated himself with him in his movement. He has only associated himself now with Dr. Williams since he has come into power, because there was a time when nobody thought that the Hon. Dr. Williams would have been able to command a ma ority in Trinidad. In the early stages I spoke on the same platform as Dr. Williams in San Fernando, and that was long before he became the Hon. Dr. Willams. We say that if Dr. Williams made this statement about Chaguaramas, it is childish, and we can enter into Federation feeling very happy about it.

11.30 p.m.

He is making an excuse for the inexcusable. Anybody could go to the people of Barbados and ask them if they agree with the statement made by Dr. Williams. The hon member is saying that the Newspaper take things out of their context; well, he knows more about that than anybody else. He controls a Newspaper; so he knows what he does. The debates in this House will be distorted from Saturday to Saturday and even this debate is likely to be distorted at his hands. If Dr. Williams' statements were distorted - we are not saying that Dr. Willams' statements are facts; we say that if these statements are correct, he has no right to make them. If he can make that statement about Chaguaramas, we can say the same thing in respect of other issues too, we could say the same thing if Barbados does not get the Capital - and the Mudie Report recommended Barbados as the first site of the Federal Capital.

Dr. Williams is a historian. Let me tell Dr. Williams and the Hon. Minister and his Committee this: we can build the Capital wherever we want it built, if we succeed in Federation We are not saying that Chaguaramas is not the ideal site for the Federal Capital; we are saying that you should not fight for Chaguaramas. I do not think that the Government's policy is a policy should be involved in any way as has been already pointed out. What do you think about this matter? Do we have the right as legislators to say that we cannot support the statement made by Dr. Williams that if he does not get Chaguaramas he is going to secede? How can you ask us to agree with that?

The Hon. Minister might be looking for favours either from Hon. Dr. Williams, or Hon. Mr. Manley, but I am not looking for any favours from anybody apart from the people who have sent me here. How can the Hon. Minister say that that statement was confidential, and if it were confidential, how does he know that it was distorted? Not only that, but Hon. Dr. Williams has not yet denied that statement and we are saying that if Hon. Dr. Williams can say what he has said, then we can say our venture in the Federation does not look so rosy. I cannot remember where I read it, whether it is in the Jamaica Gleaner or not, but I have a faint recollection that the business people in Jamaica seem to have pressed this question of Customs Union, and they have pressed this matter on Mr. Manley. What has the hon. member said in reply? Jamaica has put up high tariff walls in order to protect local industries and she is likely to lose income. Mr. Manley is reported to have said that if you have Customs Union, it will bankrupt Jamaica. Therefore, he says that they should postpone this question of Customs Union for 20 years. The Hon. Minister has now added grist to my mill; Jamaica is likely to lose income in this matter.

The statement is not based on what the Report is likely to be, but on the facts as they are. We have already agreed on Customs Union; we are not discussing now whether we are agreeing to it or not. The Report came down here and we discussed it. You have set up a Commitee on Trade and Tariffs and this Committee has to report. We do not know what the Report is, neither does Mr. Manley know what it is but he issues a warning. The Barbados Labour Party has issued a Manifesto. (Mr. MAPP: What was submitted?) You had no power in your submission; in Barbados you said you wanted Freedom of Movement and yet you have to work for five years before you get it. Where is your power?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that that is in the Manifesto?

Mr. WALCOTT: I have been associated with the Barbados Labour Party for nine years, and I know what was submitted from time to time. I know that you are respected in the West Indian Federal Labour Party as a Party; you are respected in the Federal Labour Party which is carrying on the Government. Tomorrow if somebody else comes into power, this Government would ask that Government to make treaties with it. I quite realise that some of them do not know to what they subscribe. One hon. member says that we have to mind what Mr. Manley has said, because he has been acclaimed as a West Indian Leader, and this same Mr. Manley is putting forward these things; therefore, let us be practical about our politics. How did Barbados lose the Federal Capital? Barbados lost the Federal Capital because Jamaica did not support Barbados; if Jamaica had been in support of Barbados, the Federal Capital would have been here. The West Indian Labour Party did not look at the Capital issue, but they left it to their own individual likes. The majority of the votes which went for the Federal Capital are those of the same members of the Federal Labour Party and therefore, there is no point in a Barbados Delegate coming here today and asking if we thought that the Capital was going to be elsewhere. In the Capital issue, they did not gang up for Barbados, but for Trinidad. We all know that, because Dr. Williams could muster the majority of votes around the Table.

11.40 p.m.

I have to compliment the Hon. Leader of the House for his speech. This was not made with the intention of creating a breach or playing up to anyone. He has made a commonsense statement which any politician should make. The danger that is going to sour Party politics is that you cannot say anything. The moment the hon. member said that, other members became restless; but you have been elected to come here like me; so sit down and do not become restless. If it is a fact that they have made this statement, the good of our political life is that we can say so. What is going to happen is that this rigid party Politics is going to sour your life. I say that because if the Premier had made the statement which the Hon. Leader of the House made tonight, one Minister would not have walked out; but again I say this is only the beginning of the writing on the wall. Among your own people you are still snobbish; you still expect statements to be made through certain people. If the Hon. Premier had said what the Hon. Leader of the House said, you would have accepted it, because it is the basis of commonsense. That is why I am over here, and not on that side, where I can express my views without anybody getting vexed and walking out because I did so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in view o the statement which the Minister made, I think it is fair to withdraw my motion for further consideration, because he has clarified the point to our satisfaction. I am perfectly satisfied that the debate has done a tremendous amount of good, and the view expressed seems a commonsense one. I therefore ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw his motion, and unless there by any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in winding up this debate, I may say that I am in total agreement with this Resolution, more especially in view of the fact that we are committed to the idea of Federation and must of necessity vote for it as mandatory.

As to the point raised by my colleagues about Chaguaramas or nothing, I regard it as being very illogical and irrational. The statement may have been made as a matter of strategy on the part of Dr. Williams; it may be that Trinidad does not want the Capital in Trini-

dad any longer; it may be said to win votes for the P.N.M. Party, but we cannot expect such ridiculous suggestions to come from Mr Manley or Sir Grantley Adams. Any suggestion of this nature which on the face of its ridiculous, fantastic and wrong, should be rejected without any undue sense of consideration, because Chaguaramas is a naval base or which there was a quid pro quo during the war years. Are we going to turn our backs on a legal agreement and contract and break up Federation? The whole thing is illogical and senseless. If Dr. Williams no longer wants the Capital site, let him say so; or if Sir Grantley Adams is trying to get it here through that strategy, let me say that it would not be a good thing for Barbados if it were sited here.

Now Trinidad is sited as the Federal Capital and the Minister of Communications who is a member of the Advisory Council, and who was a delegate at the last few meetings, told us a few minutes ago that he sat as Chairman of this Committee. As far as I know, the phrase "Chaguaramas or nothing" was first coined by his Committee, but the Minister is saying tonight that he said that Chaguaramas was the best site.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: To get the records straignt, these repititions can throw a very wrong light on things. At no time did any newspaper accuse the Committee of saying "Chaguaramas or nothing."

Mr. TALMA: "Chaguaramas or nothing' is a phrase known to everybody, and it is mad to suggest to the Americans to give up their base which cost $300 million and upwards, whereas the British Government is only willing to grant us £1 million. If Dr. Williams is trying to secure votes for his Party and this is strategy that is an entirely different matter, but neither Dr. Williams is trying to secure votes for his Party and this is strategy, that is an entirely different matter, but neither Dr. Willams, Mr. Manley nor Sir Grantley Adams should feel that they can throw any monkey-wrench in the works Federation is a reality and whether they unite or not, it is going to live and go on: everybody has that down in his mind. Whether the Premier of Barbados is backsliding, whether he thinks it is more interesting to control $18 million or $20 million locally; whether Dr. Williams thinks $139 million is more attractive than $6 million; or whether Mr. Manley thinks $130 is more attractive than $12 million, that is a different matter But the fact remains that Federation will go on irrespective of whether or not they particpate.

As far as the Governor General's visit is concerned, I feel that now that Federation is a reality and the Governor General is a symbol of the Queen, he should be granted full honours and respect at his reception. Whether or not you should lay a carpet, I would not go into; but we have a carpet here for that reason, and the same carpet could be used. In as much as he is the symbol of Royalty, I think everything should be done in the right way, but we have to vote for this money whether or not we want it. Trinidad will have to make her contribution to Federation too. I should like to say here that Dr. Williams was not one of the foundation architects of Federation; he found himself in Federation when it was already a reality. It was people like Mr. Gomes, Victor Bryan, Sir Lennie Hannays of Trinidad; Marryshow of Grenada, Rawle of Dominica; Manley, Bustamante, Glasspole and Allen and others who laid the foun dation. But referring to Trinidad, it was not Dr. Williams who was the Alpha and Omega of Federation; he knows very little about it, and his statement might be strategy to get votes and seats for his P.N.M. Party.
11 50 p.m.

He fought for the Federal Capital which apparently he does not want now, or it may be just strategy in order for him to secure votes. Whether he is not using his Ministers or all of his members in the Legislature and all of the Mayors and City Councillors, all of them down the line, and gets new members for the Federal Parliament such as the Hon. Premier is doing - whether he works it that way or not - or whether he is carrying his nitwits in order to try and find seats for them and that is the strategy he is working out to pitch-fork some of his other men in power - in a few weeks history will prove what all these things mean or what "Chaguaramas or nothing" means. Of course, that is only just a foolish joke; it means nothing.

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

On motion of Hon. M.E.Cox, seconded byHon. R. G. Mapp, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Liquor Licence (Amendment) Bill.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I hope that hon. members will just wait for a few more minutes. There is one little bill which I would like to deal with tonight. I refer to Order No.3, Bill to amend the Liquor Licence Act, 1957. As hon. members will see, it is a simple Bill and it would not take more than five or ten minutes to get through with. After that we will deal with Bahamas Address.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No.3 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957 and to Validate all such appointments as members of the licencing authority under that act as were made before the commencement of this Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, this Bill is very simple. When we passed the Liquor Licences Bill last year, it did not appear then when the Bill was proclaimed law that Section 10 appeared to be capable of two interpretations. Section 10 of the Act provides that the two members of each licencing authority appointed by the Governor in Executive Committee shall hold office from the 1st December following their appointments until 30th day of November next ensuing. There has been some doubt as to whether we would be in order to appoint the licencing authorities in time after the 1st Day of December, 1957 or whether it would apply to December, 1958; and so His Excellency has drawn that to our attention.

As a matter of fact, the licencing authorities have already been set up and in order to validate and to make clear and to put beyond any shadow of doubt the legal position, this Bill seeks to legalise anything that is done before in so far as the appointment of these licencing authorities is concerned.

The opportunity is also taken to repeal the same section and to substitute therefor another section. The new section provides inter alia that every person appointed by the Governor in-Executive Committee to be a member of a licencing authority shall hold office for a period of three years from the date of his appointment and it also gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to revoke the appointment of any such member for misconduct or misbehaviour or where it is otherwise expedient. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I hope that hon. members will just wait for a few more minutes. There is one little bill which I would like to deal with tonight. I refer to Order No. 3, Bill to amend the Liquor Licence Act, 1957. As hon. members will see, it is a simple Bill and it would not take more than five or ten minutes to get through with. After that we will deal with Bahamas Address.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No.3 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade: Second reading of

a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957 and to Validate all such appointments as members of the licencing authority under that act as were made before the commencement of this Act.

Hon. M.E. COX: Sir, this Bill is very simple. When we passed the Liquor Licences Bill last year, it did not appear then when the Bill was proclaimed law that Section 10 appeared to be capable of two interpretations. Section 10 of the Act provides that the two members of each licencing authority appointed by the Governor in Executive Commitee shall hold office from the 1st December following their appointments until 30th day of November next ensuing. There has been some doubt as to whether we would be in order to appoint the licencing authorities in time after the 1st Day of December, 1957 or whether it would apply to December, 1958; and so His Excellency has drawn that to our attention.

As a matter of fact, the licencing authorities have already been set up and in order to validate and to make clear and to put beyond any shadow of doubt the legal position, this Bill seeks to legalise anything that is done before in so far as the appointment of these licencing authorities is concerned.

The opportunity is also taken to repeal the same section and to substitute therefor another section. The new section provides inter alia that every person appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to be a member of a licencing authority shall hold office for a period of three years from the date of his appointment and it also gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to revoke the appointment of any such member for misconduct or misbehaviour or where it is otherwise expedient. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I have only two brief comments to make on this Bill. One is, I think that the time should really be passed since we have an Attorney General appointed and we have strengthened the Department of Crown Law Officers, that we should have this bad draftsmanship still persisting. I happen to know that one of the Crown Law officers at least, one Police Magistrate, who pointed out that this Bill was so worded that it was capable not of two interpretations, but of the one interpretation that any appointment of the licencing authorities made beyond the 1st December, 1957 should not be appointed until the next year - 1st December, 1958 The result is that the appointments have been made and the original Bill as is drafted, provides that the appointees are not entitled to hold office until 1st December, 1958; consequently, they are not entitled to function. It is high time that Government let its officers in the Crown Law Department know that their work should be better done. The mistakes, the errors and omissions which are still occurring should by now be stopped. When we had no Attorney General we said no matter, but now that we have an Attorney General the work has not shown any remarkable improvement and it is not good enough for what we are spending on this Department.

The other comment is that one wonders if the person who are to be appointed members of the licencing authorities realise the conditions of their appointment and how much self-respect they have. Will anybody appointed with the knowledge that their appointment can be revoked for any reason which the Governor-in-Executive Committee thinks it expedient accept an appointment on that basis? Will any person accept an appointment when for any reason at all the Governor-in-Executive Committee thinks fit, it can revoke the appointment and it will go on record that the person was appointed and his appointment was revoked? I say it is a matter for the individuals who accept an appointment on those conditions.

12.01. a.m.

One wonders what type of persons can be expected to accept appointments when they are subject and liable to be exposed and humiliated as they are likely to be under the terms of this Bill!

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

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the remainder of the sitting.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. T. W. MILLER being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX; seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, the ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADDRESS RE UNREST IN THE BAHAMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relative to the recent unrest in this neighbouring Island of the Bahamas.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Address, I am sure that every hon. member of this House will agree with it. For some time now, we on this side of the House or rather we in this Island have been viewing with great concern the happenings in the Bahamas. As hon. members will have seen, a strike has taken place and that strike has led to a considerable amount of dislocation in the transport. As a matter of fact, the transport strike has led to a general strike in the Island. Perhaps, Sir, I should preface my remarks by saying that our Council met last night and having agreed on the matter, we sent a cable to the Secretary of the British Labour Party urging him to press for the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the causes of the unrest in the Bahamas with a view to reporting and making recommendations in so far as the political, social and economic position and improvement of the country is concerned.

I cannot say that I was surprised, but I regretted quite recently when I read in the Press that this matter was raised in the first place by a Labour M.P. that the Secretary of State for the Colonies remarked that this legislation was made for the Bahamas Legislature and the proposed changes had the majority support of the Legislature. While in theory that may be so, in actual point of fact, it is not like that. This is not a question of facing the issues existing. In so far as Barbados, the Bahamas and Bermuda are concerned, they have enjoyed representative Government for many years. The Queen could not legislate in Council for any of these three Islands; but while that is so, there is absolutely nothing to prevent the British Parliament if they consider it expedient and in the interest of the people to legislate for any of these colonies.

As regards the constitution of the Bahamas, there is a House of Assembly comprised of 29 members elected from 15 districts. The qualifications for membership is the possession of real or personal property valued at £2000 and a member must be a British subject of 21 years old and so on. In so far as the voting is concerned, a voter must be 21 years of age and there must be the ownership of land to the value of £5 or the occupation of houses of annual rental value of £2. 8s. Women have not got the vote in that country. As far as we can see, the franchise in that country is very limited now and it

is not at all representative of the people of that country 12.10 a.m.

Trade Unions are restricted considerably in so far as land and hotel workers are concerned, and the people, as I can see it, have absolutely no means of airing their grievances and therefore no hope of redress of these grievances.

Sir, we feel that the House will agree with us tonight that the time has come when the British Government cannot say with any measure of justification that it is a matter for the local Legislature, because they know very well that the Legislature as presently constituted would never bring pressure to bear in order to give the majority of people an opportunity to vote in that country. That is contrary to the democratic set-up existing in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in so far as democratic Governments are concerned. I go further and say that if there were the question of this country becoming a Communist one, the same thing that was applied in British Guiana would have been applied to the Bahamas in a different manner, in that instead of an Order in Council the British Government would have passed a law suspending the Constitution of that country.

Although it is true that the country has enjoyed this right for all these years, I feel that just as was done in British Honduras and British Guiana, the Queen should legislate in Council to give the people in this colony an opportunity to vote, because as in the case of British Guiana and British Honduras the Houses as they were then constituted would not have voted for adult suffrage. I think it was in the Waddington Constitution that adult suffrage was recommended for British Guiana and British Honduras, and I feel that the British Government should bring pressure to bear on the Bahamas Government to make them liberalise the franchise, and if Government refuses, then the British Government should take the initiative. After all, we are living in an age where it is said that democracy is the essence of good Government.

I would like to say that as far as I can see, the British Government has in recent years gone down in the eyes of the international world. I happened through fortune or good luck to be in Geneva attending a Conference some time last year, and the ugly question of discrimination, racial and otherwise, which is disturbing the world today was being discussed. I happened to be a member of that Committee and the workers group, although drawn from every part of the world, supported the total abolition of racial and other discrimination in employment. At that Conference the British Government was opposed at the time to making discrimination a convention; they felt that convention was too strong and powerful an instrument and favoured what is known as a recommendation. They gave the excuse which was led off by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Slater that such a thing did not exist in the United Kingdom; but they were well aware of the fact that it existed in other parts of the world, and I felt that the British Government should be the last person to initiate opposition in so far as total elimination of discrimination of race and labour was concerned.

I said then and will say now that in my humble opinion, Sir, God did not make people like us for the Caucasian races to discriminate against and to treat in such an inhuman manner as some of them do, but rather as a demonstration of his creation and glory. I am still convinced on that, and if it were not so. I hardly think he would have wasted time creating us. I feel that holds good throughout the world, and the time has come when the British Government - I know that they will take a long time in deciding on Kenya and other parts which they control and which they would like to hold on to for economic and other reasons - should give the non self-Governing territories a larger share in the administration and otherwise of the various Governments, and this, no doubt, is logical and reasonable. The British Government cannot shelve this issue or bypass it as has been done in this case, and say it is a question for the local Legislature.

I have here a copy of the Law regarding what the United Kingdom Government would do as far as the colonies are concerned, and there is nothing to prevent the British Government, if it saw fit, from passing a Law enfranchising the people of the Bahamas.

And so, Sir, I have very much pleasure in moving this Resolution. I am sorry it is so late; otherwise I would say a lot on it. I should also mention that the Hon. Premier has already sent a cable to the Secretary of States for the Colonies urging him to set up a Royal Commission to investigate the unrest at present in the Bahamas

The Address reads as follows:

The House of Assembly views with deep concern the prevailing unrest in the neighbouring Island of the Bahamas. The House of Assembly is of the opinion that the situation is of sufficient importance to warrant the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate and report thereon. The House of Assembly therefore urges Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to take steps to that end.

The House of Assembly requests Your Excellency to transmit a copy of this Address to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in moving this Address, and I want to say quite frankly that we of Barbados House of Assembly are one hundred per cent behind the progressive forces in the Bahamas in their struggle for independence, and in their struggle to throw off the old shackles which held them down for so long and which are still around their feet.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for the passage of this Address which I now formally do, I would say it is appropriate that an Address of this kind should come from one of the three Legislatures which is regarded as amongst the oldest in the British Empire. This is all the more so because another of the three is one which is as backwards as it is old.

As you know, the Bahamas, Bermuda and Barbados have three most ancient Legislatures, and it is I think most appropriate that we in the Barbados House of Assembly should be passing an Address such as this. 12.20 a.m.

It is a great pity that we have not dealt with it before and I was quite surprised to hear that it was only last night when the Council of the Barbados Labour Party passed a Resolution on similar lines to the Bahamas. One would have thought thay they would be in the vanguard. Only last night they galvanised into action to pass so obvious a Resolution from the party in power to the Labour Party in Great Britain.

Now, Sir, What I have noticed in some contri bution by the Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies in connection with this matter is that he is alleged to have said that here and there improvements will be made to the constitution, which appears to me to mean that trivial amendments may possibly be made to that constitution. That seems to be the possible effect of that phrase, so it is well that he should have it forcibly brought to his mind by Resolutions passed by the various Colonial Legislatures that something should be done, and done immediately.

I would now suggest that certain changes be made to the wording of the Address. In regard to line 2 of the first paragraph, it says "in the neighbouring Island of Bahamas." I am not sure that the Bahamas is a neighbouring Island. (Hon. M.E. COX: That is cut out.) I also hope that "Islands" is substituted for "Island." In regard to line four, my suggestion is that the word "immediate" be placed between the words "the" and "appointment." We are now saying that "we regard the situation is of sufficient importance to warrant the immediate appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate and report thereon." The reason why we are passing this Resolution at this late hour when we have done a day's work and when some of us have done two day's work because some of us were in our private employment working before we came in here, is because we feel that this is urgently necessary. That is why we are suggesting the inclusion of the word "immediate" between the words "the" and appointment." I hope it will find acceptance by the Hon. Introducer. I will also like to suggest that the words "the fundamental causes therein" be also placed between the word "investigate" and the

word "and" in line five. We do not want merely to have the actual unrest investigated by the Royal Commission but we want them to go to the root causes and investigate the fundamental causes thereof; hence I suggest the inclusion of those words between the words "investigate" and "and". In line 6, I suggest that the word "strongly" be placed between the words "therefore" and "urges." That sentence would read thus: "The House of Assembly therefore strongly urges Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to take steps to that end."

We then proceed to the second paragraph. I would suggest the usual thing that we insert in the second line the words "by cable" after the word "transmit" in the second line. We usually insist upon that and it is more necesary than ever that in this case this Address be transmitted by cable. I think if we do that, that should be sufficiently strong to forcibly impress upon the mind of the Secretary of State for the Colonies that we in this Legislature which is one of the three most ancient legislatrues, expect them to do something quickly and to do nothing less than to appoint a strong Royal Commission.

We know that the Bahamas suffer from a colour problem. Many people from other colonies have suffered discrimination there. A newspaper editor and a ormer member of this House when the two of them were intransit through that place were being discriminated against and it is not to be wondered at because not only the influx of the Americans are of value to that country but it is also because the Bahamas is so backward from the political standpoint that not only women have no vote but there is no universal suffrage.

I do not think this matter requires any more preaching from me even if the hour were not so late. I hope that we would give our wholehearted support to this Resolution recommending the appointment of a Royal Commission immediately to report on the fundamental causes of the prevailing unrest in the Islands of the Bahamas, and to report thereon.

Hon. M.E. COX: Sir, I accept the amendments.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I request that the hon. Mover of the Address and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition present this Address to His Excellency the Governor.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 11th February, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

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

12.30 a.m.