

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th August, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A. (*Minister of Education*); Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (*Premier*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; and Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*).

Prayers were read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that His Honour the Speaker who is not immediately available, will take the Chair before the business of today is concluded.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement showing net customs and excise receipts for four months ended 31st July, 1962.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the half-year ended 31st December, 1961.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Ministers and Officers of the Federation) Order, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,706 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1962-63, No. 16, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcels of land described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of Highway Improvements for the use and benefit of the public.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to repeal the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945 (Act 1945-29).

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 4/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on 16th January, 1962, is now ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 20/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on 13th January, 1962, is now ready.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

In view of the Statement made in the Honourable House that the operators at Bagatelle Quarry were operating illegally and that Government is awaiting the return of their Legal Adviser to the Island, will the Honourable Minister, at his earliest convenience, make a Progress Report on the operations of the Quarry?

Also, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that grave dissatisfaction exists among the Staff at the Deep Water Harbour, due to alleged delay in making the appointments necessary for the complete establishment at the Port?
2.50 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government consider the advisability of converting some of the Government-owned buildings at the Garrison, known as the "Barracks", into secondary schools?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to repeal the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945 (Act 1945-29), was read a first time.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY TO HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the House proceeds with its business today, I am sure hon. members will willingly assent that some expressions of sympathy from themselves should be made to the most senior member of the House on the occasion of his very personal bereavement. It will appear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as if the Great Reaper has pursued with somewhat unflagging energy his task on members of this House so far as their immediate families have been concerned in recent months.

It was not so long ago that we gave our sympathy to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas; before that, to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and a little before that to the hon. senior member for the City, all of whom on those occasions lost near relatives. So today, regrettably, we have to extend our condolences to His Honour the Speaker on the loss of his mother.

His Honour will need no assurance from hon. members of this House as to how deeply we sympathise with him. We would have done it in any case had he been merely Speaker of the House, and not, as he is now, a friend of all of us. How much more so do we do it today when we reflect that he has been adorning this House for over a quarter of a century and is therefore *persona grata* with all of us. Therefore the personal bereavement which he has suffered must certainly be reflected in the sympathy which we extend to him.

The late Mrs. Brancker was perhaps not very well known to large numbers of people due to her very shy and retiring nature, but to the wide circle of friends which His Honour the Speaker enjoys, she was well known and greatly loved and respected. Her life was not cast in high places nor did she make any well known and therefore well publicised contribution to the life of her times; but she did what any woman thinks must be the greatest thing to achieve; she produced a son who was a support to her declining years and who provided her honour upon honour in her old age. I think amidst the many personal pleasures which she enjoyed must certainly be the one that she lived long enough to see him occupy the position of Speaker of this Assembly, to be at the head of the legal profession and to be well respected by large numbers of persons. That is the contribution which he has made to her life and times. If she enjoyed no more than that which I have just said, it is true to say that she had a happy life because he who was the centre of it had justified her training and upbringing of him and her love and affection for him. It must be a very regrettable thing to lose one's mother. It is an experience, thank God, I have not had; but I think it must have been eased somewhat by the many and sincere appreciations and sympathies which have been paid to her memory and to him.

I have very great pleasure therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving that in due course you will direct a letter of condolence to be sent to Mr. Speaker from the entire House — and here, I believe I can speak for the servants of the House; that they be included so as to console with him on the loss which he has sustained.

3.00 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the last speaker in his motion of condolence to His Honour the Speaker. I, personally, knew Mrs. Brancker; I also knew her husband many years ago. As the last speaker has said, Mrs. Brancker was of a retiring nature; but she was very devoted to her son and he was also very devoted to his mother. They were inseparable from each other, and it was a great joy to her to see her son rise in the political life of this island, from a member representing the parish of St. Lucy for an unbroken period of 25 years' service to the Speakership of the House. Mrs. Brancker has been in failing health over a period of months. On my return to the island it was my first duty to ask Mr. Speaker how his mother was, because when I left here she was not in very good health. It was a surprise to me to hear that she had passed away so suddenly because I had learnt that she had somewhat improved. I think that

all of us will associate ourselves with the motion of the last speaker in the expression of condolence to His Honour the Speaker; and on behalf of my Party I wish to say how sorry we are over the loss which has been sustained by the Speaker. We realise what a sad moment it is for all of us when our parents go to the Great Beyond.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party, the Barbados Labour Party, I should like to join in the remarks of condolence with the Speaker in the loss which has been sustained by the passing of his mother. I knew Mrs. Brancker for quite a number of years and I was rather close to her at one time. I believe it is correct to say that in the last ten years or so her devotion to her son's career was so marked that I do not think that anything else served any purpose whatever. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of my Party should like to add our expression of condolence to His Honour the Speaker in the passing of his mother, both of whom have made a tremendous contribution to public life.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not a member of any party, and therefore on my behalf I should like to express my sincere sympathy with His Honour the Speaker in the loss which he has sustained by the death of his mother. The Hon. Minister of Education has said that he has not had the experience of losing his mother, but those of us who have had that unhappy experience know that one's mother never grows too old in your life. The devotion which existed between His Honour the Speaker and his mother was of a mutual nature and we know how he feels about it. I would like to add my sentiments to what has been so eloquently expressed by the Minister of Education and I feel that those sentiments are shared by all who know the Speaker and all who knew his mother. I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by other hon. members in their expressions of sympathy to His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also rise to make a few remarks of sympathy to His Honour the Speaker on account of the loss of his mother. I offer him sympathy on behalf of the people of St. Andrew and on behalf of myself. I must say that everyone who has lost his mother will know our feelings for Mr. Speaker. We know that sometimes we lose our wives or our children, but that does not affect us as much as when we lose our mothers. When a mother is gone we have not another. We can have one hundred wives, but only one mother. There is nothing which can shock us more than when we see our mother leave to go to yonder field and cannot return. We have to say "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh: blessed be the name of the Lord". With all our wishes and sympathy for His Honour the Speaker, we hope that Almighty God will let his mother rest in peace until the day of reckoning comes.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the various speakers. I myself was stunned by the news which I have received since we last met in this Chamber about the death of the mother of His Honour the Speaker of this House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to convey to the Speaker my deepest sympathy in his bereavement. I am well aware that words cannot adequately describe the sense of loss which His Honour the Speaker must feel on an occasion such as this. I think that he will accept from me my deepest sympathy in his bereavement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must associate myself with the feelings which have been expressed by hon. members. As a mark of respect, hon. members will please rise in their places for two minutes.

Hon. members rose in their places for two minutes in accordance with the request of Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk is now directed to write to His Honour the Speaker a letter of sympathy in respect of his bereavement.

3.10 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, during your temporary absence, the House expressed its sympathy to Your Honour

in the recent bereavement you have sustained, and Mr. Deputy Speaker has given Mr. Clerk orders in connection therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very grateful to hon. members for their expression of sympathy and for their kind gesture in giving instructions for this letter to be written. I am profoundly indebted to all hon. members for their gracious consideration, kindness and thoughtfulness on the occasion of this bereavement.

LEAVE TO ASK QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave at this stage to put a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned member for St. James is seeking leave to put certain questions at this stage. As hon. members are aware, he could not have put them whilst he was occupying the Chair. If there is no objection, leave will be granted for him now to put those questions.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the damage which has been done to the houses and furniture of the residents of Hoytes Village, St. James by the operation of the quarry worked by Costain Brothers and Quarry Products?

2. Has any representation been made to Government with regard to compensation for these residents?

3. If the answer to (1) and (2) are in the affirmative, will Government take steps immediately to assist these residents in repairing the damage?

4. If Government has decided to compensate these residents, will Government give this matter priority and grant early relief?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 3.15 p.m. when we revert to Private Members' Business, Question Time having expired. Under that Head, the first Item of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City, to resume debate on a Resolution re the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. When the House last adjourned and this matter was under consideration, the hon. junior member for Christ Church was addressing the House. The option is now that of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, if he sees fit, to resume his address.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I was just completing at that time, and I think my observations of the Budget would have been completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other hon. members who propose to speak on this matter before the hon. senior member for the City exercises, if he sees fit, his right to reply?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, since it appears that the motion has been fully debated, I am asking leave to withdraw the motion which was made for the purpose of expressing our views which we have done, and there is no useful purpose to be served in continuing the debate since there is no reply from the other side. I therefore ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution which stands in his name. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for leave to withdraw, this is not exactly a reply.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has only asked for leave to withdraw.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to answer one or two questions arising out of remarks made by hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the Hon. Minister that he technically object to leave being granted at this stage?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If there is no motion before the House, I can speak on the original motion. Either I am speaking on the motion for withdrawal.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There has been no motion for withdrawal. The hon. member only asked leave of the House, which leave would be granted if there is no objection.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then I am speaking on the original motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would assume that the hon. member is speaking on objection to leave being granted at this stage.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your Honour's assumption may be correct. There are two hon. members, Mr. Speaker, who have led, I would not like to call it, an attack, on the Budget.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, when Your Honour questioned whether there were any other members willing to speak on the Resolution, I hope I did not give away my right to reply to the motion which I made when I intimated that I was asking leave to withdraw it. I only did that because it seemed to me as though all members of the House had, by their absence of acknowledging their right to speak, agreed that they had made a contribution. I hope that will not bar me from making a reply, because I gave notice of that Resolution, as you are aware, as a means of discussing the Budgetary Proposals. Now I understand from the Hon. Premier that he is replying to the motion and not to the question of withdrawal; therefore I hope that would not prevent me from replying to any statement made to my former motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far the application for leave to withdraw this Resolution not having been granted, the Hon. Premier may continue to speak because I deem that he is implicitly or otherwise to be deemed to be opposing or to be objecting, by implication at least, to leave being granted to the withdrawal now; otherwise, the withdrawal will take place.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well then, is he speaking on that or is he replying?

Mr. SPEAKER: He is entitled to speak on it so long as there is no leave being granted to withdraw the motion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the debate which followed the introduction of the financial proposals and budget statement has been useful in disclosing that some, if not all, of the Opposition Parties have not really put themselves in a position in which they understand the finances of this Island. I say so particularly because at one stage of the debate when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was stating that they should put a tax on shoes, I asked the hon. member how much money that would bring in.....

Mr. SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I never said that they should put a tax on shoes. I said: "Why the hon. member did not say that?"

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member now, after several weeks of agitation and reflection on it has said that he never said that there should be a tax on shoes. I want to say that I never made a statement which could not be backed up by the written record. At that stage, I asked the hon. member how much that was going to raise and he said that I was the Minister of Finance and that was what I was to find out.

In my brief reply, I just want to say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph summed up the whole thing.

He said that I am Minister of Finance and it is for me to work out what is in the best interest of the finances of this colony. However, that does not mean that I am insensitive to constructive criticism when it is offered. When members do not understand what they are talking about, but make certain statements and take advantage of playing in matters where the spending power of the community is concerned, it is better for them to restrain themselves from speaking instead of getting up and making disclosures which only prove the depth of their insincerity. I say that because it is difficult to understand how any member can sit down and say: "Put a tax on shoes and gasoline", when he did not take the trouble of working out what would be the effect of this taxation.

I find it extremely difficult to understand how anyone who is not playing politics could stand up on the other side and, instead of saying that he is very glad that the Island is not being in debt, talk about taxing poor people's rum, projecting to people of the outside world that the working class man who has suffered and sweated so long under the negligence of the last Government Party is the type of person who goes about drinking rum, tottering and reeling, and gasping for breath if he was deprived of rum. That is the expression and the image which have been created by the speeches of members on the other side. I will exempt the hon. senior member for the City from that, even at the expense of being accused of being in collusion with the hon. member, because he did not make this criticism. He did not project to the people of the outside world that the Barbados working-class man is the type of man who goes about drinking rum and gasping for breath if he was deprived of rum. If that is the image which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has projected to the people of the outside world as the image of the Barbadian working-class man and that rum was more than food and work and salvation to him — if that is the image of the Barbadian which they want to project to the outside world instead of the Barbadian being a hardworking industrious man who pays hard for the little leisure which he has at his disposal — then I say that those people who are projecting that image are doing a great disservice to the people of this country.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, make no apologies for anything which I have said on my introduction of the budgetary proposals or what I have said now. It is very good to sit down here after working for a very long time to try to put the finances of this country on a sounder basis than that in which it was left, if it were left on any foundation at all, to hear the kind of statements and pronouncements from people who participated in what is described by a Leader of a country which is now projecting independence as the worst possible Government in the world and in the history of all mankind, and from the evidence of their separation now from contact with the masses of the people of the West Indies to hear those so-called leaders telling people what should be done and what should not be done. How much qualified is that gentleman for the right and privilege of dictating to this Government, which is the first democratic Government that this Island has ever witnessed, and to tell us what to do with finance when he never opened a file, far less a book, on financial matters. If you go lower down the scale of the lesser order of the hierarchy in the Party to which that gentleman has the honour to belong, you find the hon. junior member for St. Joseph advocating a tax on footwear of the people of this Island.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker — I rise on a point of order. I never advocated taxing footwear. I can remember pretty well, when the Hon. Premier asked what to tax, if shoes, I said that it is left to him to do what he likes. I also said that if he was taxing shoes he would be getting very little because one pair of shoes served the particular person of whom I was speaking five years and that person drank at least half a gill of rum every day. The Hon. Premier has now found out his mistake and is trying to correct it.

Mr. SPEAKER: This can be settled by getting the record of the debates.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will direct the Clerk to get it. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that a pair of

shoes lasts a man for ten years and that the best thing to do would be to put a tax on shoes. We have 17% of the children since the last Government was in power for seventeen years going to school barefooted, and you would be making shoes more difficult for them to get if you were to put a tax on shoes. If I were so misguided as to have put a tax on shoes, you would have heard the howls of protest from members on that side.
3.30 p.m.

We put a tax on motor cars and they say that we should put a bigger tax on the more expensive cars. Some of the organs of the Press go so far as to malign the Minister of Communications and myself and also the Leader of the Opposition by stating that we elected to buy new cars before the tax was imposed. But we have not got new cars. It is not anybody's general business, but I think we should get the record straight. I have not got the time to deal with the bankrupt organisation for maligning Ministers of Government on facts which are unfounded, but this is the kind of low gutter politics indulged in by people who have not got the interest of the electorate of this island, because the amount of money which they are paid by certain vested interests in this island they find insufficient to support them in the manner of life to which they were not accustomed before they became politicians. We did not wait until we are Ministers to get motor cars; one Minister over there was driving an old truck all the time. When we come to this side of the House, the Minister of Trade was one of the first people to own a motor car; and when it comes to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Education, none of us waited until we came into this House to buy a motor car. We would not have taken advantage of the position in order to get motor cars for ourselves; but, on the other side, there is not a single member of the Labour Party who had bought a motor car before he became a politician.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the Premier should descend to gutter politics. I do not know if there is anything which has caused him to descend into the slime and gutter atmosphere in which he now is. I should like to inform him that M 22 was the number allotted to my father long before I became eligible to drive a motor car. I got into trouble with the Police because I was too young to drive a motor car. What the hon. member is referring to, I am in trouble to understand, and I would hate to go further into the gutter to tell him when he bought his first car. Mr. Speaker, in spite of your bereavement you will probably have to give us some latitude and longitude too because it looks to me that today would be a good field day and I am in form for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: This sound to me more to be a point of property than a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I would not like to remind the hon. member of the purchase of his first car.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I suppose I would be told that I borrowed the money from him to buy the first car.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Premier confine himself to the matter which is before us.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Barbados Labour Party Newspaper has accused me of being a dictator for not telling anybody anything, and yet they say that I colluded with the Minister of Communications and the hon. senior member for the City so that I would let them know that a tax was being put on motor cars and we could get new cars beforehand. I have not bought a new car for the last eight years. The car which I now have is not a new car and it is not a car, which if I have bought today, would be subject to taxation. The same thing applies to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. As to the hon. senior member for the City, when he was in London with me, he discussed with Lord Rootes the type of car which he would like to get. I think that Lord Rootes offered to carry him for a ride in the car in order to persuade him to buy that type of car. Would I therefore tell the hon. member not to buy a car even if I knew that there would be a tax on motor cars? That would be tantamount to disclosing to him that there was a reason for not buying a car; it was the

same thing as disclosing that there would be a tax on cars. I told the Minister of Trade, I think it was late in December, that I had ordered a new car. When I came back here about ten days before the Budget Speech was actually introduced, one night I started to look for the incidence of taxation on cars and I immediately cancelled the order for the car which I had ordered. A personal friend of the hon. junior member for St. George is the person who purchased that car which was free of that tax and which I, personally, could have got free of the tax. I said that I did not like the colour of the car — or that the body was too short. Some weeks before the Budget was introduced the Hon. Minister informed me that he would like the same model car and there was one available which was a second-hand car. I did not tell him yea or nay but that I was satisfied with mine because it was a second-hand car. I am not like the ex-Premier who has imbued his Party and they have nothing constructive to tell the people of Barbados; they can only indulge in excursions into the unknown where they get lost completely in this world. This is not a personal explanation because it was not given much publicity in the Press. People got the impression that we exploited something in the Budget debate, and day after day and week after week they say that I am a dictator, that I would not disclose to any member of the Cabinet anything until 20 minutes before we came into this Chamber. We were still discussing on the day of the Budget Speech the details of the Budget Speech, but nothing has emerged from the other side except this doleful lament on the increase in the price of rum. The lament is that the price is now about 25% or less than the price that our brothers in the United Kingdom or Barbadians who migrated to the United Kingdom have to pay, that the price of rum is too high and the poor man's rum has been taxed.

3.40 p.m.

During the interval which has ensued between the introduction of the Budget Speech and today's Session, there have been many letters to the press about the imposition of a consumption tax on beer. This Government has been accused of breaking faith with the investors. We had the very sorry spectacle — I say "sorry spectacle" because it is an indication of the low standard of industrial development and understanding in this community in Barbados, something which will make Barbados the laughing-stock of the rest of the civilised world — of people dressing up in their Sunday suits and going to a shareholders' meeting of a Public Liability Company. In no other part of the world do you get this naive attempt, this ingenuousness of shareholders attending a meeting — a political meeting, I call it — an extraordinary meeting of shareholders, and I am now in the process of preparing a full tabulation and chronological recital of all the matters leading up to the establishment of this brewery right down to the date of that meeting, and it is not going to make good reading. It is going to be released to the Press at the end of this week.

When I introduced this consumption tax, I made no reference to any brewery at all. It was a consumption tax on beer which was imposed on all beer equally, whether it was imported beer or locally produced beer. This was strictly in accordance with the terms of an agreement made between Banks Breweries Limited and the previous Barbados Government, that the Government of Barbados reserved the right to impose a consumption tax on beer. Now we hear a lot of nonsense being spoken. In addition to that, the brewery was informed that as a result of the Orion Report they could look forward to a reduction in the differential between imported beer and the locally manufactured beer of a considerable amount, probably a reduction of some 50%; so that would have placed the Barbados Brewery in a more unfavourable position. That reduction has not yet taken place on the import duty on beer, although it had been stated to them that the import duty would be lowered to 60 cents. I do not want to give any advance notice of the paper which I have been working on for the last eight days, and I am checking and double checking on my facts; and if the newspapers do not print it, I am going to pay for it to be printed in the newspapers *verbatim*, because I do not want one single word to be left out. The position is, and I reiterate, that there are certain figures now which I have agreed not to disclose, but I challenge the proprietors or the gentleman from British Guiana, who incidentally has

sued the Currency Commissioners to transfer money to London long before this Government even took office. He brought a case against the Currency Commissioners, and the British Guiana Government, and threatened to bring criminal proceedings against the Currency Board including our Financial Secretary, Mr. Spence in Trinidad and all the members of the Currency Board, because Mr. D'Aguiar was transferring money out of British Guiana to London before this Government took office, and that is one of the reasons why Dr. Jagan had to impose restrictions on the export of currency.

Mr. Speaker, we have now suggested to the Currency Board a way to get around this matter. We have told them to pay, to honour all the matters in the Currency Act and run the risk of criminal prosecution, because it is time that some of these things came out. Let us examine the position. The hon. senior member for the City who moved the Resolution might wonder why I took so long to get to my feet. You never know; I may go outside now and be knocked down; *Antoni gladios potuit contemnere si sic omnia dixisset*; I would have been able to despise the swords of Antony if I had said all these things at the time when I should have said them; so it is better to say them now even though I said them in a skeleton kind of form, because in this life you never know what will happen; so I want the record straight for the benefit of posterity.

The position, Sir, is that I am not concerned, as I have had to tell the Minister of Trade several times, with any businessman coming to me with a rush of blood to the head and saying he wants to establish something and to give him this or that, give him pioneer status, give him exemptions from customs duty and that kind of thing, because the pioneer industry legislation itself says that the Executive Committee must consider the effect on employment, on revenue and several other considerations — international agreements and everything else — before you decide to give pioneer status. I will say right now that I did not know any of the facts about the relations between Banks Breweries, whether political, financial or otherwise, and the last Government before I came into office, but I know a lot about it now. A lot of us have been suspicious because of the way things were going about. I am going to say this now and I have said it before in public, but for some peculiar reason the Press did not elect to publish what I said on more than one occasion. Here was a firm which came in. A Solicitor of a certain firm — I do not like to drag people into this — who is not a politician, was the only person who had the courage to sit down and write at the time when the prospectus was coming before the public, that the public was being misled that this would be a business owned and managed by the small men in Barbados, because when you examine the overall position, the direction, the control and the power resided with Banks Breweries, British Guiana. Anybody who doubts that can study the actual formation of the brewery and see that. If it is entirely a matter of freedom of contract, free enterprise, free everything, free importation of raw materials and no income tax, already that position exists; therefore, the Barbadian is free to make a jackass of himself if he wants to.

I was not concerned, Mr. Speaker, about Banks Breweries when I introduced my Budget Proposals; I was concerned about the revenue of this Island, and I am saying that the economic consequences of the concession given to Banks Breweries was to the tune of \$1½ million a year, and as I pointed out before, they have employed 70 persons including Directorships and so on, and some of these persons are shareholders, and the higher echelons. Let us take the overall picture of 70 persons. If we had paid each one of these persons a toll, a remittance or whatever you feel like calling it of \$20 a week, it would have amounted per person to just over \$1,000 a year. Multiplied by seventy, it would have been \$70,000 a year; so when you study the effect of the employment created by Banks Breweries with all these concessions, I am saying that if we paid them \$40 a week, it would be \$140,000 a year; if we paid them \$80 a week, it would have been \$280,000 a year; and we could have paid each employee of Banks Breweries \$150 a week to stay home. That is what it has cost the Barbados taxpayer.

3.50 p.m.

he is quite right. It was non-alcoholic malt, and there is a drink called Crown Malt which at dances you pay 50 cents for, and you can get it for between 35 cents and 40 cents in shops. They wanted to produce a similar beverage to sell at 15 cents a bottle; whether the bottle was the same size is immaterial; the package was 15 cents. We asked them what they wanted pioneer status for because if they had all the equipment, did not have to employ more people and could still produce the malt economically at 15 cents a bottle, why should we give them exemption from income tax to sell something at 15 cents which would damage the sweet drink trade, and which they could sell at 15 cents anyhow without dispensations by way of income tax, and further discriminating against revenue which we get from imported malt? We get package tax and every kind of duty from these things; so the price alone should be sufficient if they had to raise it to 20 cents which would be 50% below the other beverage, though whether it was of the same composition or quality as that on the shelves time would show.

Mr. Speaker, you have what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would describe as a poor-great type of people who would say "Give me one for forty-two cents"; but the average West Indian that is watching his budget would buy a commodity for twenty cents. Now the same Banks Breweries, if my recollection is correct — and the ex-Minister, the hon. junior member for St. George can tell me — made the same application at the time or shortly after opening their factory to the previous Government, and the Government pushed that aside as being to them unpalatable. I do not know if they had an understanding that on a certain day after election they were to bring back up this application, but they brought back up the application and we said "No". This would have further enriched the coffers of the British Guiana shareholders of Barbados Banks Breweries; so we have turned it down and that is really what is annoying Mr. D'Aguiar.

There is a third matter which I do not choose to mention right here now, because he would like to know what we are doing about it, but it is none of his business, because they made a terrible mistake, despite all their slick promotion and everything else which they could not explain to the shareholders.
4.20 p.m.

I will be coming to the House with that and telling the House exactly what it is; but I do not elect to do anything about that now. It would be to let the cat out of the bag.

There is the third reason why Mr. D'Aguiar elected to act in the way he did because they made a terrible mistake — and I do not mean the miscalculation either which would substantially affect the shareholders and has nothing to do with the Government at all. If he thinks that he would be successful in resuscitating the Barbados Labour Party to be an instrument of his policy — although you can only resuscitate something which is at low ebb but not something which is gone out of being altogether — by spending money on the Barbados Labour Party and believe that he can run this country as he runs British Guiana, he is making a mistake. In this short life of ours, we never know what will happen; but I want to get it on the record while I am still here that I am issuing a release on this whole transaction at the end of the week because I do not like the dishonesty of people who get outside and say that this Government is making a lot of political football with this company and then prostrate themselves at the feet of the Barbadian shareholders, but retire from the company with 56% on their money and say they do so because they do not want to do anything to hurt the Barbadian shareholders.

I think I understood the hon. junior member for St. George correctly. He suggested that it was incorrect for me to say that they introduced legislation to discriminate against imported beer long before Banks Breweries was established. I will look for the relevant file and read from it.

Mr. Speaker, you will also remember that around the same time when this brewery was going to be established the Caribbean Development Company Limited, which was

a manufacturer of beer within the Federation in the neighbouring Island of Trinidad, had made previous application to the Government of Barbados for the establishment of a brewery here in this Island. On 20th March, 1959 a notice appeared in the Barbados Advocate stating that the Caribbean Development Company Limited, the manufacturers of Carib Beer, intended to put down a brewery here known as "The Barbados Brewery", or another suitable name of brewery, to manufacture lager beer or stout for consumption in the neighbouring colonies and this colony, and that application was made to the Government to grant the company pioneer status under the Pioneer Industries Act, 1959. Well, there was a lot of confusion about that because here were two beer companies, one a West Indian Company, one within the Federation, and here was Mr. D'Aguiar coming from outside, on the rails as it were, and with a miraculous spurt he managed to pass out the Caribbean Development Company Limited. Well, perhaps, the stakes may have been higher. That is all I can say.

I only mention that in passing because I think this is the time when one should bring all the facts before the public that an unjustified attack is made on the Government on the grounds that the Government was breaking faith with somebody. It is the directors of Banks Breweries who were breaking faith with the shareholders. Obviously, if you have to pay out 6 1/2% on \$1 million, not to mention if it is 7% or 8%, it is going to affect substantially the dividends which you are going to pay out to the shareholders. It may mean a 40% difference in the kind of dividends which you want to pay out. That had absolutely nothing to do with the consumption tax on beer. All these statistics which they published in which they say that Barbados beer is more heavily taxed than other beer is so much nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member starts to develop that point, let me remind him that the time for Private Members' Business has been expired. We will now start with Government Business.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the Service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1962-63, No. 15

GOVERNMENT PRINTERY — OVERTIME

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of \$1,800 because there has been an increase in the rates of overtime payable to the Printing Office staff with effect from 1st April, 1962.
4.30 p.m.

The amount of \$3,000 which has been provided in the Estimates under Head 28 — Government Printing, Item 21 — "Overtime" is therefore inadequate to meet the overtime payments of the Printing Office staff to the end of the current financial year. An additional amount of \$1,800 is required and supplementary provision of this amount is now requested.

Mr. Chairman, prior to this increase, the over-time paid to the printing staff of the Government Printery has been relatively small and this amount in the lowest bracket has been increased by overtime rates equivalent to time-and-a-half per hour. That is the reason why this amount is now required. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the same criticism of this Resolution as I made when the last Government was in power, and I am going to be more serious and insistent on this occasion. The Government is running a Printing Office and we are passing a Resolution now to continue the running of this office. I do not care who is the expert that advised the Government; I am saying that, in the present context of the Barbados economy and from the speech which I read by the Premier, there is absolutely no justification to ask me to pay more for rum or to increase the taxation by over \$1 million, and then we take up our money and send it to the United Kingdom to pay printers when we have printers walking about the streets looking for jobs here. Somebody is going mad or is drunk somewhere. What is wrong with these books? (He points at the Law Books on the Table). We are living in 1962 and do not let us be ignorant and foolish. We have to eat and we cannot postpone putting what is going into our stomach. Are we sending money to the United Kingdom for the purpose of printing law books? I repeat; somebody is drunk or mad somewhere.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, anybody who comes in here and hears the high level of invective made by the hon. member, would be under the impression that the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing was asking for money to send to England. That is not the case. This Resolution is asking for the sum of \$1,800 to pay over-time rates to Barbadian Printers inside of Barbados. Not one penny of this money is for anybody in the United Kingdom. The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows the full position about this matter because it has already been explained to him. We, on this side of the House, said that we would prefer to have the laws of Barbados printed in Barbados. I have asked the hon. member questions on that. We have invited — as a matter of fact, I wrote a minute to the Attorney General suggesting that we break the contract which has already been entered into with Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode who are the printers in the United Kingdom, and this Government was prepared to recommend that we pay compensation to that firm of printers for breach of contract. In other words, we would write to them and say: "We know that the Government has made a contract with you and we want to break the contract".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member cannot break the Rules of the House like that. His point of order would be that I have made a statement which is incorrect, but not for him to explain. The statement which I have made is not an incorrect statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. In so far as this Resolution is concerned, Mr. Chairman, it is incorrect to say that we are sending money to England because this is asking for money to pay members of the Barbados Workers' Union, for all I know. There is no point in attacking one's morals. (ASIDES). I see that the Sancho Panza, who is a member of our Party, has gone outside. There is no point in carrying on something which has already been investigated. I know that the hon. member can nominate groups of printers to do the laws of Barbados. I would be very glad to have the laws printed here, but do not let the hon. member fulminate against something which has not arisen.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you will have to let the Premier reserve that type of nonsense for a Party meeting. He cannot come here with that sort of thing. I have been in here for 17 years and there is no question of saying that what I am saying is irrelevant because this Resolution is to provide money for the Printing Department. To whom does the hon. member think he is talking? On anything which comes within the Department or in respect of any money for which the hon. member comes here for any department like this, I can make these remarks. A token vote has been passed for the printing of the Laws of Barbados and the idea is that the laws should be printed in England. I repeat that the Premier should reserve that sort of talk for people who do not understand what he is talking about. I would

not stand for that type of tripe, that circus talk; he must reserve that for his melodramatic affairs. Do not let the hon. member come here with that sort of thing. If he has that sort of information, do not align me with that. I am talking about something which is the vital life-blood of this island. The hon. member says that he told the Attorney General something and he also told me something. I want to say that I do not have any private discussions on any thing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member was given that information on the floor of this House. He is always coming up to Government Headquarters and saying that the Union has not been informed of this or of that. The hon. member has been told by me on the floor of this House and outside that we could not get anybody to print the Laws within three years.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any private discussions with the Premier and I do not have to go up to Government Headquarters. We are not loafers; I do not go up there looking for any jobs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Premier is on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is on a point of order to say what? Nonsense?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what has irritated the hon. member. When I mentioned about his coming up to Government Headquarters I did not mean that they send up a messenger to us. They wrote to us in respect of the Development Board and we have put a member on that Board. Everything which affects the Barbados Workers' Union as an organization or what affects the Chamber of Commerce, we send out on both sides. 4.40 p.m.

That is all I meant when I said they are always sending to us. For him to pretend that he and I are not on speaking terms and he does not know what is going on in Government is not in accordance with the facts of the case, and I am trying my best to retain my equanimity; you know what I mean.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not lose my temper, but I am quick to stop any stupidity and any rashness of statement. I am too busy a man to be going up to Government Headquarters. I am not one of those characters who go up to Government Headquarters looking for work, because I am not unemployed; so there is no point in saying that we are sending up to Government Headquarters all the time. Now the Hon. Premier knows that with any Government in power, if there is anything to do with the Trade Union, our position is not a face-saving one. We pass Resolutions at our annual conferences against any Government in all parts of the world. We passed one against the British Government on the Immigration Bill; so we do not ask anybody for favours. We pass a Resolution against anything done against the interest of our Organisation, no matter who you are. It is therefore a question of the economic and employment policy of any country for which we have any interest, because we have to protect the interests of those people who live there.

From the time of the Development Board, we said that you could not have the employers' interest represented on it and not the interests of the workers. Do you think we are moonshine idiots? We have people of the T.U.C. on the Bank of England Board, and we have a Trade Unionist on the Education Board; so in Barbados it cannot be anything which would be unique. When you put workers' representatives on Boards, it is because they have interest in it. I am not one of those people looking for favours from Ministers, and since this Government has been in power, no Minister over there can tell you that I have asked him a personal favour. Nothing that is done for the Barbados Workers' Union is done for Frank Walcott; so when it comes to this question of saying that you told us, as though we had some discussion when we have had none, I will ask you to look at the debates of this Assembly and see whether I have asked any question about printing. I raise this ques-

tion whenever printing comes up, because no answer has been given yet by the Government that they are going to have the printing done here. No negative reply to me is an answer in the affirmative. Who answered that you are going to have the Laws printed here? On the question of the contract being signed, can you sign a contract without the House giving you the authority to send money overseas? We told you already about these contracts, and the same thing happened with the Deep Water Harbour. We asked the last Premier about this matter, and he dodged the question by saying that they were still investigating. We in the House asked who was going to vote the money to pay for the contract, because they had to tell us when they entered the contract. As soon as you enter a contract like that, it is subject to the approval of the Legislature. What do you think this is? A Crown Colony? Do you think you can sign a contract and then come to us? You would be embarrassed. No Government can sign a contract without seeking the approval of the Legislature. Can you sign a contract to bind us to something of which we know nothing or are not in agreement with?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, is the hon. member intimating that this Government has signed the contract to which he has referred?

Mr. WALCOTT: Your Government or any Government which signs a contract without the approval of the Legislature is acting *ultra vires*. No Government has any right to sign a contract which the Legislature has to approve; therefore it is subject to our approval. To sign a contract is a serious matter if it affects the economic policy of the country.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I do not think he is quite correct. You cannot lease or alienate land in Barbados which is vested in the Executive Committee in trust for the inhabitants of this country without a Resolution of the House; but when it comes to the question of contracts, what the House discusses is the question of the money involved. The actual contract is not paraded on the floor of this House for inspection by members, neither is the contract to be laid. Whether that is in accordance with what is desirable or not is not my concern at this moment, but I am saying that these are constitutional facts; and what the Minister of Trade was pointing out is that the contract for the printing of the laws of Barbados was entered into by the last Executive Committee of the previous Government and not by this Government, and shortly after coming into office, we created a breach of this contract and informed the hon. member and other members that we were prepared to come and ask for money to offset the people whose contract we broke. That is exactly what I said before, at the time of the discussion of the Estimates.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I again say that I am not one of those members who, when a lawyer gets up and says something, says that I am not a lawyer. I again repeat that no contract agreed upon by any Government at any time in any matter like this is binding on the Legislature. I am not asking you to parade any contract before me, but as soon as you have to vote for it to be sent from Barbados, you cannot do it unless you come here, and if it is a contract involving money, it must be subject to the approval of this Legislature passing the money. How else are you going to pay for the contract, for the books and for the work unless you come here? I am not concerned with what the Hon. Premier said he did say; that involves too much red tape. The hon. member on my immediate left said that he did say so, but I do not know what he said. I believe I have a memory like an elephant.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, are we discussing a zoo?

Mr. WALCOTT: If it was said and I was not in the Chamber, I am saying therefore that it was not said. I have not asked any question, and what I do say, and I am consistent today, is that I did not query this, but whenever a vote comes up for Government printing, I raise it. The hon. member did say that a contract was entered into by

the last Government and that they were discussing with the Attorney General a method of dealing with it. No statement has been made to the effect that the Laws are going to be printed in Barbados. I do not know if you are taking away that contract from one set of contractors to give it to another set of contractors in England.
4.50 p.m.

All that I am saying is that no statement has been made by this Government that they intend to have the Laws of Barbados printed in Barbados. If they said that they said so, well, show me the debate. If you say that you are going to have the Laws printed in Barbados, that is all I want. Why should I say anything if you had said that you are going to have them printed in Barbados?

On the last occasion, they said that it was not so easy and they are getting the Attorney General to tell them what to do as regards breaking the contract. Up to today I do not know what is the conclusion. All I am emphasising is that if one Government does something — and I happen to be one of the preservers of the fundamental rights of the Legislature — and they come down here with a vote for us to underwrite the contractors for something which we oppose, our attitude would be not to sign the contract and have nothing to say.

I want the Hon. Premier to know that this is not a question of the text of the contract coming before this Honourable House. We do not ask for the text of any contract to come here. We always assume that contracts are properly and legally drawn up.

I am taking this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to draw to the attention of the Government that this is not a question of my opposing this Resolution for payment of overtime. You have to pay the men at the Printing Office for overtime; it is something which they have worked for. But what I am saying is that in the context of our present financial position, with what the Hon. Premier has said and with what statements have already been made about the budgetary proposals and what discussions are going on in Barbados, I say that the Government is well advised to have the Laws of Barbados printed here because in this year of grace, 1962, Barbados cannot afford to lose one single job which can be done in Barbados; and if the printing of these laws in Barbados is going to be a means of circulating money in the country, then it is doing Barbados more good to have them printed here than to be spending that money in the United Kingdom which has full employment already for its people.

To say that what I am saying about that is irrelevant, I do not know whether they want to change the rules of this House. I will only point out to you that in any matter dealing with a Department for which you bring in a Resolution to deal with a matter under it, there is nothing wrong in your raising a point on any matter concerning that Department. There is nothing wrong and I see no justification for the remarks which were made by the Hon. Premier. As a matter of fact, I repudiate and reject those remarks being made to me; I do not make those remarks to him. The last man who made those unnecessary and ugly remarks is using the same kind of remarks on the hills in the country districts now that he is no longer a member of any Parliament. It is a Barbadian cult to make unwarranted, sarcastic remarks in high places. You will find that only in the Barbados Legislature you get members who are capable of expressing themselves in a better way using the most sarcastic language. I am one of the members who are not going to sit down under that kind of stupidity.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I agree with what the hon. member who has just sat down has just said. But as regards all the talk of printing the Laws of Barbados here, I remember the debate which took place in here and the speech made by the Premier. He said that it would be a question of our probably breaking the contract and that he was going to instruct the Attorney General to break the contract even if we had to pay for it.

I remember this thing very well. The *Advocate* was asked to submit a specimen copy of the printing of the laws and they told us that they could not get through printing these laws in less than three years. The *Advocate* was not in a position to produce them as was requested. You get all this ranting and unwarranted attacks on the last Government. The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows this. It is a question that some time you do have to get things from outside. You are authorised to bring in a steam roller. You instruct them to import it. That is a contract. I do not agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that you should come to the House of Assembly and demonstrate the contract. Two-thirds of the time of Parliament is spent on contracts. I do not see why you should come to the House and ask the House to demonstrate the contract. I repeat, no contract can be made unless it is made subject to the approval of the Legislature. I do not understand the hon. senior member for St. Peter. All I said was that you can have a token vote for \$1.00 so as to pay the printers in the United Kingdom and it is the same thing as if they authorise you to import a steam roller.

Mr. WALCOTT: The last Government lost the elections; so you can very well say that it was a vote of "no confidence" in what they were doing. What I was saying was that we did not agree to any contract. We agreed to a vote and that the Laws of Barbados should be printed. They said that it had been recommended to them to have some loose-leaf binder when it came to the printing of the laws and the last Premier talked around it for about half an hour before he got to that point. The House dissolved and the Government did not make any positive statement as to their getting the laws printed in Barbados.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member would agree that you would be able to read them better by having them done in a loose-leaf binder. All that you have said by way of criticism of the last Government, you must agree that we came to that conclusion, not only on the basis of the time in which we will get them done but also on the basis of what it would cost.

The question as to the payment of overtime is that it is a more or less settled and fixed rate of pay. The Hon. Minister said very little on this. Probably these rates were paid since April, 1962.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, relative to your dealing with a money Resolution, that you have the right to get up in Committee and get from out of the Government any situation or any condition concerning any matter under that Department.
5.00 p.m.

The hon. member is in perfect order, in my opinion, in dealing in this way with this Resolution for money to pay the printers at the Government Printing Office. I think that we should be told something on this matter once and for all. The question of voting \$1 as a token authorising the printing of the Laws does not mean that they were authorised to award the contract for printing. The hon. member has said that when the last Government was in power he opposed the idea of printing the Laws in England when they could be printed in Barbados, and the Hon. Premier has said that he has discussed the breaking of the contract for printing these Laws with the Attorney General. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter wants to get at is what I want to get at too. We are not printing the Laws until we have revised the laws; we must get somebody who is good and who is capable of revising the Laws. We had somebody who began the job of revising the Laws but the gentleman gave up the job because it was too much for him at his age.

The Hon. Premier has also said that nobody locally could give us these Laws printed within three years. I do not think we should put up any argument for waiting longer than three years for the printing of these Laws. It is a fact that if we have to wait too long for the printing of these Laws, by the time that job is done we will probably need another revision of the Laws. I am definitely in favour of the suggestion that wherever it is possible to do so, we

should give this work to local craftsmen. When I was in the Opposition to the last Government as I am in opposition to this Government, I supported the suggestion that the Laws of Barbados should be printed in Barbados. I think we did get out of the last Premier that there was something in getting these Laws printed here. We have not got the Laws revised yet, and I take it that a statement could be made to this Chamber informing us of the position as to the revising and the printing of the Laws. If this work can be done in Barbados, we will fight this Government that this work be done in Barbados. The voting of one dollar as a token for the printing of the Laws was not to give the right to award the contract to Russia or to Cuba. I think that it would settle this matter once and for all if the Minister in charge of this Resolution would tell us straight and plain what is the position.

This matter has been going on for two or three years, and therefore what is the position now? I do not know how the contract is made. I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that although we have made a token vote of a dollar, I do not think you meant that you should settle every part of the contract, but we should have some say as to the country to which you are awarding this contract. We have a right to say that the work should be done in Barbados if it can be done here. I might be wrong; I have never seen what has been drawn up by the Attorney General, but I am wondering if the contract still holds good since it has been made some time ago. I would say that even if it costs us a little more money to do this work locally than it would cost us to have it done outside, the work should be done locally. I have seen craftsmen, who have been turned out from the local printeries, trying to get support for themselves and their family.

I say that the Premier should tell us what the position is once and for all and let the matter be all over. I repeat that the Laws have not yet been revised and that work is going to take about a year or so, and then we have to think about the printing of these laws. You do not have to be a Trade Unionist to say what the hon. member has said; if you can do something locally, why should we send it to Trinidad or to any other country to have it done, never mind England? If the work cannot be done locally, then we have to face the facts. If it even costs more money to do it locally than it would cost to do it outside, I repeat that it should be done locally. If the work cannot be done locally, then it must be done abroad.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not take that apologetic view of this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why some hon. members suggest that I get up when I have an apologetic view. I may say that if my method at times seems to be apologetic to the hon. member, it may be that he is accustomed to me when I had to look across the Chamber at two hon. members in the last Government. They used to go out of the way to be nasty and stupid, and some of them thought they could say things as they like and they would always get me hot. Do not let the hon. member think that he can get on any worse than I can. This is not any apologetic view; let anybody play any nonsense with me and you will see. I take the view that we should be told what is the position with respect to the printing of the laws once and for all.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I say that I do not take that apologetic view because, as to the question raised by the hon. senior member for the City that if a job cannot be done in any territory it must be done outside, that question does not arise. We have built the Deep Water Harbour but we discussed the matter of the contract before because we were talking about spending \$24 million of the taxpayers' money. When I heard the speech of the hon. junior member for St. George, that only shows what kind of politicians we are. He is saying, in justification of what his Government has done, that the contract is going to take three years to be done locally, but this spite work does not work.
5.10 p.m.

Now it is over three years that they have been talking about revising the laws, and now you are talking about

printing the laws. You are now quibbling about taking three years to print after it has taken three years to revise; so you have not given them to the Printery yet. The premise we laid was that if the job could be done in Barbados, why send it out of the Island? These laws were printed in Barbados for the last 300 years, and at the same time you did not have a Printing Department in Barbados. I can put it to the hon. member that he did not know Barbados when the laws were not printed here. The *Barbados Advocate* printed laws for Dominica and some of the other places.

Mr. Chairman, I read from the Premier's Budget Speech that there is shortage of capital and shortage of everything, and the thing you are sending out of the Island is money. You are short of money, but you are going to release money into a labour market outside the country. Would that make sense? This is not Trade Union talk; this is plain elementary fact, because no country exports money to perform services that can be done there; only idiots do that. If it cannot be done in the Island, the question does not arise. The hon. member's speech was apologetic. If you followed the argument of the hon. junior member for St. George, you would not have pioneer industries, because you can get milk from Holland cheaper than you can produce it here, and you can get cloth from Hong Kong cheaper; but close down these places and buy cheap shirts and see where you would be.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I want to say that I was not supporting anybody; I was bringing to realisation the cold facts. The Opposition at that time talked for hours on the same argument as to whether or not the laws should be printed overseas, but the Premier came here and promised and on the platform outside said that they would collapse the contract.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not a point of order; that is a reply.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, you must decide whether or not I am entitled to speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: A point of order would be to something I have said wrong.

Mr. MILLER: I ask the hon. member to be reasonable enough and agree with it. I was supporting no one or agreeing with no one, but was merely showing the wisdom of Government and showing that it would cost more to manufacture something in Barbados than to have a substitute for it from outside. Now the hon. member has a steel cabinet in his office which could be substituted by one made of wood, and in this Assembly there are chairs which were imported that could be made by people in Barbados. Why should you want a metal desk or a metal filing cabinet? As a protection against fire?

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member got up and talked a lot of nonsense about a metal desk.

Mr. MILLER: Who talks more nonsense than the hon. senior member for St. Peter? That is what he thrives on.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the hon. member got up on a point of order and said that I have a metal desk, he is only a blistering idiot, because I do not have one.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I do not want to make any criticism, but if I rise on a point of order, the hon. member for St. Peter must sit down. I am on a point of order, and the Rules of this Chamber say that you must hear me. Let the hon. member tell you that we understand the Rules, and if you do not, you can read them now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I will not be sitting down.

Mr. MILLER: You can call the Speaker or the Pope when I fail to observe the Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying.....

Mr. MILLER: But, Mr. Chairman, I was on a point of order and you must rule now.

Mr. WALCOTT: This sort of service-of-song....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. junior member for St. George on his point of order.

Mr. MILLER: This sort of service-of-song or village landship practice is all right, but I am simply saying that we want to operate by the Rules of this House, and I must ask you to spend a little more time on the Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. George tutoring the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: By no means, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still listening to the point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I am still on a point of order, but I cannot speak if you are speaking at the same time. As I was saying, it was the wisdom of the last Government to decide to have these laws printed in the United Kingdom. The Premier said in here that he would enquire from the Attorney General whether or not by breach of contract he could withdraw, abolish, abandon or what have you, the contract. That was the general attitude to things before the election, but today he realises that he has failed.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, how can you allow that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: Now you are allowing the hon. member to tell you this is not a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have listened to you and it is not a point of order. You are now making a speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, these service-of-song practices may be all right, but even today services-of-song seem to be a memory, therefore you do not bring the same practices in this House; you do not have points of order like that in Committee, because the hon. member can speak after I sit. It is not as if we were in the House, where, if I say anything that is wrong, he can rise on a point of order. After I have spoken, he can speak, but he is taking this opportunity to criticise the Premier or the Government, and as such he should not use me or anything in so doing.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, that is unfair because I would not have to use him. He knows I can get up and criticise anybody. There is nothing to criticise the Government on, but I am telling the Government that they have to follow the decision of the last Government and have these laws printed overseas. Now the Clerk of the House wants to run this House too, and that is why I say we are coming to a dictatorship.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when you hear this talk about a dictatorship, we killed a dictatorship on 4th December last year in this Island, and the hon. junior member for St. George was one of the little Nabobs; therefore he has to take his seat quietly now, because that is what is left of him.

Mr. MILLER: He is afraid of the revival.

Mr. WALCOTT: Saul had a revival too when he went down to Damascus, but you are not going to get to Damascus. If you cannot print the laws in Barbados, the question does not arise. I will tell the Hon. Premier that I will criticise his Government in the same way that I criticised the last Government in a matter like this, but when the hon. member gets up here and tries to use the argument about a

steel desk, he makes it appear as if I am propagating some idea with which I am not in consonance or as if I am talking something on a selfish basis.
5.20 p.m.

I do not want to be unparliamentary. Too much has been revealed in subsequent months coming from the Ministers of the last Government to show that the truth is not by any means any of the special virtues possessed by them.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. That is wicked and dishonest. You get all of these wicked and dishonest statements coming from platforms since the last elections and I have asked the Hon. Premier of the House and the hon. senior member for St. Peter ever since that time to put the last Government on the spot as having anything to do with corruption. Up to today you have not been able to say one thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: I never talked of corruption: I said the truth.

Mr. MILLER: (*sotto voce*) And if you lie, what is that?

Mr. WALCOTT: You will very well understand that to say a thing would take three years, that by just exaggerating the time, you are just a simple liar. Every liar is not a corrupt person in the context that he has done something corrupt; it is only that he has found it difficult to speak the truth when it is involved.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. You get these unkind and untrue insinuations by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. member knows that the last Government appointed somebody to revise the laws of Barbados and because of the strenuous undertaking his eyes perished. The hon. member knows that and the Hon. Leader of the House knows that too. The Government was forced to give the work to somebody else. For the hon. senior member for St. Peter to say that the time was exaggerated, he means to say that it was the intention of the Government to fool or mislead. That is not true.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will repeat what I said for the hon. member's benefit. Speaking the truth is a matter of habit and lying is a matter of habit too. If you are not in the habit of speaking the truth, it is very difficult for you to speak it though nothing is involved.

What I want to point out is this. The hon. member in making the statement confused the revision of the Laws with the printing of them. We are not now concerned with the revision. What I was saying was that there was no point in exaggerating the time taken for the printing of the Laws which we were discussing. The hon. member said that to have them printed in Barbados it would have taken three years. I said that an exaggeration like that was difficult for us to go by because we have no contract before us. Do not exaggerate the point to justify the reason why you did not give it to a printery in Barbados. Suppose the Government said that we cannot have the Laws printed in Barbados because it would take five years; then somebody said: "Oh no, we cannot give it to Barbados because by the time they got through with the printing the Laws would be out of date", you could very well understand; but there is no point in the hon. member saying that it would take three years as compared with how long it would take in England, because you never compare the time taken for jobs to be done in England with what it takes here because everybody knows, with the big huge machinery which you have in England, that they could turn out a job in less time. England is a place where you have large book-binding establishments; therefore, they can reel off books faster than they can be done in Barbados. We cannot compare Barbados with England in that line of productivity. If you are working on the simple basis of how long it would take in Barbados, you have to match that alongside Barbados. (*A voice was heard from the gallery*)

Mr. Chairman, I cannot be disturbed by the gallery. We have to make the people in the gallery understand the rules of this House. After all, this is Parliament; this is not a

public meeting where we can be subject to this kind of behaviour.

Sir, the analogy which I was drawing is this. If you were to carry what the hon. junior member for St. George said to its logical conclusion, you will find that with any enterprise which we have in Barbados we could get competition from outside because they would be able to do the thing more cheaply and more quickly. But we have to do certain things within our borders from the point of view of our own economy. You can get shirts cheaper by importing the goods from Hong Kong than you can get them manufactured in Barbados. They produce milk in Holland and sell it cheaper than you can buy it in Barbados. However, we must try to do something with our own economy so as to help our own people, and that is the reason why I drew attention to the printing of the Laws of Barbados in Barbados. We have men here who have skills and want work to do; therefore it is better to keep such skilled men employed and pay them and keep the money in Barbados. If you cannot do the job in Barbados then the question does not arise. How can anybody tell you that the Laws of Barbados cannot be printed in Barbados when we have volumes of the laws printed in Barbados? These will not be the first set of laws printed in Barbados. I repeat, in many things we are not as modern as other parts of the world. You cannot expect Barbados to be as modern as the U.S.A. with a population of 178 million people. You cannot compare little Barbados with a national income of \$25 million with that of the U.S.A.. We have lower standards here than those in Europe. We have people who have to sleep on floors. There are people here who do not have three square meals a day. If this is going to help our economy by having the laws printed here, what is wrong with it? It is sound, economic sense to have them printed here. Do you need Professor Arthur Lewis to tell you that? You have a little job which you can do in Barbados and you are making a big mountain over it as regards having it printed here and having it printed in the United Kingdom. Why not print the laws here and let the people get a little work to do? Every now and then you hear of a factory closing down and something going out of production, and you do not have any alternative to go by.

As I have said, Sir, far from only printing the laws in Barbados, the time has come when more printing that is done overseas should be done here. It should not only be a question that you can get it done cheaper outside. It should be a question of having them done here so as to help the people and have the money circulated around here. Why send money to the United Kingdom? You are sending it to people who have full employment. That is something which we have to understand. This is not a matter of the Trade Union; it is for the country as a whole that I am speaking. I am talking about the general economy of this country and you have to preserve it at every stage. The people of the U.S.A. will not let any one of our workers come there unless they have a survey and find out that they do not have an American there to do the work. They are not going to permit a Barbadian to come there and work in a printing factory when they have printers there. I repeat, we have to preserve our economy. If we have work which can be done in Barbados, it should be done here. The question that you cannot do it as well should not arise.

5.30 p.m.

I am extremely surprised to find that nowadays you will find the slightest bit of opposition to something which should be fundamentally within Barbados' own context. This matter should be a *sine qua non* in so far as our economic position is concerned. There should not be any question of ranting; this is something of a global basis in so far as the economy of Barbados is concerned.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I came into this Chamber after the debate had begun and I do not know what has been going on. (ASIDES) This Resolution seeks.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is your latitude or longitude. This Resolution is for the

sum of \$1,800 for the purpose of making over-time pay to the staff of the Government Printing Office. Each and every member of this Committee approves of this Resolution, and if hon. members knew the value of time they would try to save some of this precious time. There is too much time being wasted in debate on this Resolution which is merely for the purpose of making over-time pay to the staff of the Government Printing Office. It does not need our going all around the world like the Russian spaceship or parading through the earth. We could have done quite a lot more work in this Chamber today other than dealing with this Resolution. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will stick to your guns and operate them in full and give volume to the shot. You are there to rule and to keep every one of us in subjection. If you allow this kind of debate to go on, later on the world will think that there are all mad people in this House. Each hon. member can express his point of view in a quiet manner, but each one has spoken as from a volcano and I am very glad that none of the lava has come down on me. As I have already said, Mr. Chairman, every one of us agrees with this Resolution. The Staff of the Government Printing Office has been doing over-time work and this Resolution is for the purpose of paying them.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION re REPORT OF THE EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on a Resolution relative to the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference 1962.

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 3 standing in my name relative to the lease by the Executive Committee of a parcel of land situated in the City of Bridgetown together with the Bulk Sugar Store and other ancillary buildings erected thereon to the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association be the next Order of the Day. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order along with Order No. 5 were posted yesterday, the 13th August, 1962.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, from what you have said it does not mean that all hon. members received their copies yesterday (Mr. MOTTLEY: I received mine yesterday.) I have not received any mail from the Post Office, and there I did not receive any mail from the House. 5.40 p.m.

I wanted to inform you, Sir, that I have not received those papers. If they are simple matters, I have no objection to dealing with them, but there is a Bill to provide for a Boundaries Commission, and I do not think it would be fair to an hon. member if he has not received those papers to proceed with a matter which he should read. For that reason I do not know what the Registration Bill is like, because I came prepared to deal with Order No. 2 as I did not receive the papers to Orders Nos. 3 and 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill to Order No. 4 was posted last week and received last week, but the papers to Orders Nos. 3 and 5 came in the same wrapper and were postmarked yesterday, and I received mine today.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think they have machines doing these things, and you cannot always vouch for these people. I had my papers for today's meeting, and nothing was included in them other than Post Office Advances Statements, but I had no papers whatsoever in connection with the Bills of which I am speaking.... Pardon me, Sir, I have just found them.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE REGISTRATION OFFICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration Office Act, 1961.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a very short one, the purpose of which is to increase the rate of fees payable under the Registration Office Act, 1961, to copyists at the Registration Office for recording or copying documents other than plots. The current rate paid to copyists is 13 cents per folio of 90 words, and the purpose of the Bill therefore is to increase the fee paid to copyists from 13 cents to 16 cents per folio of 90 words.

The Bill, as I said before, is rather short with only three short sections, and although hon. members may not have had two or three weeks' notice of the Bill, I am sure it is one which will not create any degree of controversy on the principle underlying the Bill.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the only question I would like to ask the Hon. Premier is when was the last time the fee was increased.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Not since 1958.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE re EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day, to resume debate on a Resolution relative to the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962. When the House adjourned on the previous occasion, the Hon. Minister of Education was addressing the Chair. He may now resume if he so wishes.
5.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what really then is the situation which these West Indian territories occupy? It is that they are a part among that numerous mass which makes up the underdeveloped countries; therefore, it seems to me if they are to climb out from the unfortunate situation in which they now find themselves, it can only be on one premise, and that is in unity with one another if the whole purpose of bringing these Islands out of the economic doldrums in which they find themselves is that they are able to make their place in the world and having made it, to keep it.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is the inescapable political conclusion which must be drawn from their situation. Since they are part among the underdeveloped territories, there are only three ways in which they can bring themselves out from there into a higher state. They have to get hold somehow or the other of the tools of modern production and make themselves up-to-date in the production of wealth. They have to strive after higher levels of education because it is the possession of skills which brings them from among the underdeveloped to the not-so-highly developed and finally to the well-developed. And thirdly, they must have more experience in modern methods of Government and administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you admit that these are the three prerequisites for nationhood today, if these are the three things without which no group of persons living in underdeveloped territories can hope to claim attention on the world's stage, then the Federation of these Islands is the only answer: because it is only in union with one another that they can get hold of the tools of modern production. It is only in union with one another that they can obtain those higher levels of education which impart to their citizenry the skills which are so badly needed, and it is only in union with one another that they are likely to gain that new experience in modern Government and administrative techniques.

It follows, therefore, that the reasons for the federating of these eight Islands are reasons which lie deeply in their present situation. They are among the most numerous portion of the world population, that part today which is living economically from hand to mouth. In that situation, they are no better off or worse off than Latin-America and almost all of Asia and Africa. They are among that numerous group which though numerous makes the least contribution to the world national income, to the overall wealth produced in the world. When you see all of that, you see the reasons for coming together are clear and distinct.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it would be well for us to examine the concept of Federation, both as it may apply to Barbados and to the other nationals of these territories, and as it would look to the outside world when we do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, some people talk as if our situation was so favourable that the people of Barbados had a real choice as to whether they should federate or not. What I have said before shows that that choice is narrowed down almost to vanishing point, once you accept certain things as given; but because it may appear as if there is no future for us outside of Federation, it does not mean, of course, that we have to go into a Federation in order to be worse off. When therefore some people talk as if when we get into a Federation it would be, of course, too late for us to correct any mistakes which have been made, they do not understand what a Federation is, and into what it would involve this Island; and the reason why I approve of the White Paper and support it in its entirety is because I think it is a valiant and quite intelligent attempt to settle these issues.

First of all, the Federation of these Islands involves a division of sovereignty. You must get that quite clear. What it means in effect is that the eight territories and the inhabitants thereof are coming to a decision that there are some things which each of them cannot do and which all of them cannot do separately, and that it would be better in offering these things of common concern to a central authority, and that conversely the things which by common agreement each can do by itself without detriment to its own future or to the progress of the whole, each will do. The division of sovereignty is the essence of Federation, and there is nothing in this White Paper which insists that the principle of the division of sovereignty will be in any way infringed.

Far from that. Although the White Paper itself is not a constitutional instrument, it pays great regard to this principle that the sovereignty is divided between the several units who can do things for themselves and the central authority which can do things on behalf of all. What the eight islands are entering, Mr. Speaker, is really a partnership among themselves and with one another to promote certain interests upon which they are jointly resolved.

If you look at it that way, it spoils the whole essence of a Federation if one unit, as seems to be the tendency here in Barbados, insists that it can make prior claims as to the conditions upon which it would enter that partnership to the exclusion of others, as if it makes claim to do things which would not be attempted by the others. Since the Federation is a partnership, and since all are equal, it is not wise to make the sort of reservation which says that in a possible grouping we are bound to be outnumbered; because if you examine federation structures, all that you know of, in each of them there is bound to be a single unit which is larger, more important and more wealthy than the others and which so far as representation is concerned is on paper outnumbered.

Now, while it may appear that it would be in the interest of a single unit to take whatever safeguards it likes or can have against being outnumbered or allowing the prepondering influence on the part of others to work at a disadvantage, while that may appear feasible, at the same time if pursued beyond a certain point it calls the existence of the partnership into question.
6.00 p.m.

Let me explain what I mean. If the Barbados House of Assembly were to go on record as saying that the only condition on which it would enter a Federation of the Eight would be that it must have one-half of the seats in the future House of Representatives, then the other seven territories would argue, quite rightly in my opinion, that the very claim that Barbados makes to have that sort of representation shows us clearly that they are not out for partnership but for domination. Can we then face them on the vast counter-claims of one sort or another, of each for the others? For instance, we are busily engaged in the economic progress of this island, industrialising to raise the standards and to produce more wealth so that more can be shared among our growing population. But that is not all that we have in the economic field. We are not making these efforts in order to satisfy ourselves alone; we hope that when our industries expand above and beyond what we want for our minimum needs, there will be a lot left over for us to sell outside the island, first of all to those who are in partnership with us and then to countries outside the confines of the partnership. If we say that we must have the preponderance of things in the Federation, you could not blame the people in the other territories if they said: "Well, take all the seats, take all the power, but who will buy your goods?" In other words, they can claim with a certain amount of justification, that since the basis of a partnership which a Federation has is a mutual advantage, the claim by one unit of an advantage which the others cannot lay claim to, calls into question the whole claim of the partnership and breaks it. That is why I think we have to be very careful in this island that we do not stake claims and particular conditions on entering a Federation which call forth a similar reaction of a more violent nature.

We have advantages which we can exploit to the full without arousing any jealousy on the part of the others;

but we cannot start off on the assumption that because our numbers in the Federal Parliament will be smaller, arithmetically speaking, we have got to guard ourselves against any condition or any sort of advantage which will be taken of us. If the idea of a partnership is to hold good, then we must see to it that we give no offence while yet legitimately championing the cause of Barbados. Make no mistake about it, this White Paper is the consequence of mutual agreement. It represents, if one may so put it, the high water mark of the possible. There must be some very tough intractable problems to be resolved among the Eight. I myself have had the most interesting experience that we need to support the declaration of aims among all of us from all the territories as to what it is we want and upon the foundations of which we are going to build this new nation. My experience is that we are not yet all talking the same language. There has got to be — and nobody can do it better than Barbadians — there has got to be a bringing together of conflicting points of view even before the Federation has started off.

I make bold to say that we are watched with the same suspicion with which we were watched before, because some people in the other territories, some of them, seem to think that it is the aim of Barbados to pull the wool over their eyes. When it goes out that we have to set a prior condition, that we must have a preponderating opinion in the Federal House because there are more territories than this one, and we must be logically outnumbered as numbers go if we let them see that our contribution to Federation is to dominate, we must bring the curtain down. What we see of federal importance is to state the position clearly, and it must be stated with great clarity and tact and with the greatest discretion, because too much is at stake. We are not likely to get this nation formed as it should be formed, unless we take our fellow citizens in the other territories into our confidence and let them remain there. They watch us to see what attitudes and postures we are striking.

It is just to discuss this White Paper in the light of these facts. The Federation is a division of sovereignty and it little matters whether you ask for a strong Federation or a weak one. It is the level of political awareness and attainment which exist in the entire nation which will dictate the strength or the weakness of the Federation. That is so, Mr. Speaker, because in a Federation the centre of gravity is always shifting. At one time the centre appears to be strong and the units weak, and at another time the units appear to be strong and the centre is weak; but the weakness or strength of the centre or the weakness or strength of the component units do not make the country as a whole weak or strong.

6.10 p.m.

Everybody knows that the Canadian Federation is a strong one and that the American Federation is a weak one. In the Canadian Federation more power resides in the centre than in the provinces. In the American Federation more power resides with the States than in Washington. Yet, they are both of them two enormous, influential and powerful countries. What makes a Federation — and I am speaking of the Central Authority — weak or strong and what will make it in our case will be the degree of agreement the people of our countries — and when I say "our countries" I mean the people who inhabit the eight territories — can reach on what are matters of common concern to all of them; and the more they discover that this or that matter had better be handled at the centre on behalf of all of them, the stronger the Federation will be from time to time. But the Federation will not be strong because it is centred in Barbados; it will be strong when the majority of the citizens of the incipient nation decide how much better certain things can be done at the centre than among the component units. That is the essence of partnership.

Let us take the cast of Higher Education, Mr. Speaker. When I said a moment ago that what we need more than anything else is a positive declaration of aims, I knew what I was talking about from my own experience, and I can say this without offence. At the beginning of the Common Services Conference in Trinidad last month, the de-

gree of unanimity which was reached among the Eight on matters of Higher Education did not then exist. At the end of the Conference, the eight territories saw eye to eye on Higher Education, and we were able to play our part in the preservation of the University of the West Indies as a national institution. Why didn't they see eye to eye at the beginning of the conference, but saw eye to eye at the end? The reason is simple. During the course of the Conference, there was opportunity for the Barbadian point of view to be put to the Governments of the other seven territories, so that in the light of our experience in educational matters, they could see and be convinced that the Barbadian attitude was the one best calculated to serve the interests of the whole region. We reached unanimity on that point because we were able to meet together and declare our aims, and we found that our aims were quite in accordance with one another.

Now I made that diversion to say this: the White Paper could not be and was not meant to be a draft Constitution. It represented the maximum agreement which could be reached by the eight territories with the British Government, having regard to the peculiar circumstances of each and the difficulties with which all are confronted. Acceptance therefore of the White Paper as it stands does not prevent a detailed study of constitutional safeguards when it is time to draft a constitution. Acceptance of the White Paper and approval given to it do not mean that if there is an authentic Barbadian point of view or authentic St. Kitts point of view, it could not be put and incorporated, if acceptable to the others, in the draft constitution. But I just want to say this to my fellow countrymen in Barbados. We have been called upon to play a very difficult role in this matter, and we have none of the advantages at our disposal which the previous Government had, because they had less excuse for failing in this matter than there could be for anybody else, because they did not have the double pressures of organising a nation at the same time that they were re-organising the economy of one of its units.

Mr. Speaker, a double job has been put on this country and on this Government, and it is a job which has to be taken on simultaneously. You cannot neglect one for the other. You cannot organise a nation on any proper basis unless the Barbadian economy is viable and strong, and you cannot make the Barbadian economy viable and strong unless it is set within the context of a national community; so it falls to this Government to do both things at the same time, and I would have all Barbadians remember this. It is not therefore that we are entering into a Federation to neglect Barbados. It is that we have to take Barbados into a Federation because if she stays outside of it there is no future for her people; it is as simple as that. We have no choice of going in or coming out, or coming out with the proviso that if you remain out, you could still maintain your level of development and even widening and expanding it. It will not be like that.

We live in a world, Mr. Speaker, of rapid and catastrophic changes, and all the changes going around and on in the world today force these Islands together, not force them apart. There are things to which we shall have to give the deepest possible study. The economic arrangement which seems now to be imminent in Western Europe — the Common Market — deserves a study of its own, but it would be fatal to say that we could not come together until we know what is going to happen that side, because our coming together may be the one means we have at our disposal of influencing events which are the consequence of these same economic arrangements in Western Europe.

Again, Sir, if these eight territories are to raise the standard of living among their peoples, to industrialise and to sell their surplus products abroad, not only must they be able to speak with one voice; they must be able to use that voice almost immediately. Speaking now as a person and not as a Minister of the Crown, I only say this: the one possible thing I would have against all these present Federal arrangements is that it seems to me that we are missing the boat if we do not ask for independence with the establishment of the Federation, that there should be no time lapse or time limit whatever between the establish-

ment of the Federation and the grant or assumption of independence. Things are proceeding too rapidly in this world even for that time limit to do us any good, for our situation will be no different if we federate next year and become independent the year after, because by the time we become independent, all the pressures of world affairs will still be on us, and it will be better for us and the people in these territories — and I say this solemnly because I believe it to be true — to assume the mantle of responsibility immediately and request independence as soon as the nation is formed.

6.20 p.m.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if countries which are poor and under-developed want to make their way in the world and are not to be pushed around, they must have first of all, and this is a prerequisite which you cannot gainsay, control and effective control of their own foreign policy; and although we are not yet independent, although we are not yet even federated, decisions are forced upon the Governments of each of these territories which bring them into the international arena and it is forcing them to take choices even before they are in a position to take a choice.

If you look around at the turmoil and upset which is going on in Latin America, the revolutionary situation which has been created by the overthrow of the Batista regime, the long torment which the Guianese people seem to be undergoing, the long economic crisis, the weakening of their financial position which seems to be besetting in all these territories, the apparent instability in the American and Canadian economies — all these are forcing choices on the people of these territories daily, weekly and monthly although they are not yet independent.

The possible advantage of being independent is this. While you cannot stop these crises from occurring, at least you will be able to take decisions on your own account which might affect to a greater or lesser extent the way in which these things come upon you. That is how I feel about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to come to grips with the idea of Federation realistically and by looking at it as a question of partnership; and while partnership is not the same thing as federalism, there cannot be federalism unless there is partnership. That is the inescapable conclusion which I draw: and those who want Barbados to play the leading role can have their desires satisfied, they can have all the safeguards they seek, provided Barbados was prepared to give the leadership which the other people would admire and follow. We cannot afford to be arrogant in our dealings with them nor in our manner of speaking with them. We have got to let them see in us a genuine desire for the common concern.

I have under consideration in my Ministry proposals to make to my opposite numbers in the other seven territories on educational matters — matters which I know would redound to the benefit of us all; but I have to be careful how we put those proposals to them. I would like to make Erdiston available to the entire nation as a centre of Teacher Training; I would like, when we establish the Liberal Arts College here in a few months, to see it freely used by our fellow citizens in the other territories; but I cannot put it to them like that because if I put it to them like that they will ask: "Do you want us to contribute money for the upkeep of Erdiston, to expand it in one territory at the expense of others?" And they would be justified in asking it if I put it to them like that. What I propose to do is some time later this year with the Cabinet's approval to summon a conference of the Ministers of Education of the entire eight territories, of British Guiana, and Trinidad and Jamaica, if those two independent territories are willing to co-operate to that extent, to consider the problems arising out of co-operation in education. We shall ask them to supply us with all the statistical information they can find about their own educational plans and educational development. We shall supply ours; and on the basis of a dispassionate, objective, factual survey of the situation, I am sure they will reach a conclusion that it is in Barbados that their own interests would be best served if the institutions of Higher Education are situated there. I have to do it in that

roundabout way because, having been let down with the break up of one Federation and having themselves much to regret and to disapprove of in the handling of that Federation under a Barbadian Prime Minister, they may well feel that anything which comes from any Barbadian Government must be viewed with suspicion: and that is why I would ask all Barbadians who are debating and discussing this matter to exercise diplomacy, caution, restraint and tact in whatever they say which might affect adversely the desire of our fellow countrymen to come together with us.

To work a federal constitution, Mr. Speaker, requires a considerable degree of tolerance, of good humour and of sound political commonsense, particularly of the last mentioned quantity. For those reasons, since it is of the essence of the federal principle that it involves a division of sovereignty, it follows that citizens of all federations have got to evaluate their politics at two distinct levels — or rather in two distinct spheres, because if I say two distinct levels I may give the impression that the federal level is necessarily higher than the unit level. That is not so. They are not different levels; they are different spheres — this division of sovereignty. The citizens of a Federation have got to be more politically aware than the citizens of a Unitary State because in a Unitary State there is one sphere of politics. It is true that in some Unitary States, there are local government authorities, but that does not matter for the point which I am trying to make. In Great Britain, for instance, a citizen of the United Kingdom knows that Parliament is supreme over all causes and there is nothing above the supremacy of Parliament. In the U.S.A., no American citizen argues that the Congress of the United States is supreme. He does not even argue that the Parliament or the Legislature of his own state is supreme. What he says is that the Constitution is supreme. It is the Constitution against which no final appeal can be held. The Constitution itself is the final appeal.

In the constitution which is laid down, the sphere of sovereignty which belongs to the federal body is different from the sovereignty which belongs to the different states of the U.S.A.; therefore, in Australia, Switzerland, Canada and all federations, the citizens have got to get themselves accustomed to two spheres of politics and they have got to exercise judgment with respect to both spheres.

6.30 p.m.

It may well be that when the citizen is called upon to vote for representatives to the Federal House, he may be using not a higher, but a different yardstick, because he knows the spheres of activity which belong to the Federal Government. He knows great things which are of national concern; therefore, when he is choosing representatives for the Federal Parliament, he uses a sense of values which he would not have to call into account when he is choosing representatives for his local Parliament. It does not mean that the people in the Federal Parliament are more sensible or more politically aware than anybody else; it means that the ordinary citizen has to exercise a greater concern in Federal matters than in local matters. That is one of the things meant by the division of sovereignty. What follows from that is this; to make this proposed Federation work, it is not enough even to approve the White Paper because that only sets out the maximum agreement to be reached in the circumstances. We have to get it across to the citizens of Montserrat, St. Vincent and the other territories that henceforth they have to fulfil two functions at the same time, as they happen to be citizens of unit territories and at the same time citizens of a nation. All their beliefs and judgments have got to run, so to speak, in double harness all the time. They have to reconcile them with one another because it is the only way in which they can make their national structure work. There is a division of sovereignty. That is why I cannot understand the force of the amendment which has been moved by the hon. senior member for the City, the argument being, I believe, that the Barbadian situation may well be so precarious or that in some other territories the people who are now in power may so desire to remain in power in their own island if not in presence, but still, at the same time, to occupy positions of authority in the Federal sphere.

Let me say here and now that whatever criticism may be made of dual membership, this criticism is the most unassailable; that once you accept the principle of dual membership in a Federation, you do not have a Federation; you have a unitary state or you are getting near to one. A Federation involves a division of sovereignty. Logically, if sovereignty is divided in respective spheres in local matters and in Federal Government affairs, it is not responsible in its own sphere for matters of a common centre. The component Governments remain individually responsible in their respective spheres for matters of local concern. You will not get the Federation thriving as it should thrive, if you attempt the position of dual membership. Nothing is more designed to kill the Federation than that. The last Federal Government did not die because Sir Grantley Adams was not a member of this House and also a member of the Federation; the last Federation did not die because Mr. Manley was not at one and the same time a member of the Jamaica Parliament and a member of the House of Representatives. The Federation did not die because there was so great a dearth of talent in the ten units that the worst people went to the House of Representatives and the best people stayed at home; the Federation died because those who knew how to run it did not run it and permitted the one person who did not know how to run it to do so with the consequences which we now have. Mr. Manley has only got himself to thank for this situation. I heard him say at a meeting that they should hurry up with the Federation because he wanted to see it with his own eyes and play his part in it. When the time came, however, he called a meeting and said that he renounced the glittering prize of being the first Prime Minister because he wanted to deal with the local position. So did Dr. Williams, with the consequences which we now see, that the people who felt that they could make a contribution did not make one, but allowed every poltroon and every mountebank to take over with the consequences which we now complain about. It is worse than that. Mr. Manley himself said that the Federal Government did not grumble about Mr. Adams' leadership of the Federation; Mr. Manley said that if the horse would not pull, you do not break up the cart, but you take him from between the shafts. But they did not take him from between the shafts; they let him remain between the shafts until he broke up the cart. Last year they said that the only condition on which the Federation could remain in existence was that if Jamaica and Trinidad could get all the possible guarantees that they could have. They went to London and they all but killed the Federation after Jamaica got everything she wanted. If Mr. Manley had cared then about the existence of the West Indian nation as much as he appears to do now, the thing for him to have done when they came back from London and even after Jamaica got all she wanted, the thing for him to have done was to call off the Referendum and say: "You have no fear of entering into Federation because we have half-killed the Federation so that Jamaica could survive". But he had the Referendum with the consequences we now know. The thing snowballed and the Jamaica Government, feeling that there could not be a change of Government in Barbados and feeling that the Federation would have to continue under Sir Grantley Adams, took themselves out of it with the consequences which we now know. It therefore falls to Barbados to keep alive the idea of nationhood.

6.40 p.m.

We cannot keep it alive with the same mistakes that Jamaica and Trinidad made, or if we allow our feelings of arrogance or of assumed superiority to allow us to handle our colleagues and our fellow citizens in other parts of the national territory as if we had some prescriptive right to be superior to them. We have got to make the people of Barbados understand that our situation in this Island is perilous in the extreme and that they cannot have the prosperous life to which they are entitled unless they have it in partnership with other people, for the whole world shows now that the idea of partnership and large power groupings is the order of the day. There is the proposed European Common Market. The Communist countries in Eastern Europe have an economic organisation of their own called Cominform. President Nkrumah and President Toure of Guinea are still busily constructing the United States of Africa and certainly the African Common Market.

The Eastern countries are doing the same thing. In North America and Latin America there is the Alliance for Progress.

Now all these groupings point inescapably to one conclusion: that eight little islands in the Western Atlantic have no choice but to come together, and that no one of them is so far superior to the others that it can really dictate the terms upon which it can enter. That is a sobering fact. I know that we Barbadians like to feel that there are no other gods but ourselves, and sometimes this feeling is justified when you think of the achievements which people from this Island have made in other parts of the world; but in this matter we stand no differently from the others. In this matter we have literally nothing of which we can boast, because if we boast that we have had a more stable form of Government, their answer is and should be that it is our very stability which enables or should enable us to take the lead without arrogance. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, to accept this White Paper is to tell the people of Barbados that the Government of Barbados and this House understand quite clearly what they are doing, that they do not propose to pull wool over the other people's eyes, or over the eyes of the people in Barbados.

I was amused myself the other night when I listened to the hon. senior member for the City trying, as it were, apparently to make it appear to the people of St. Lucy that in order to get into a Federation without the safeguards which he says are necessary, there is a possibility of the School Meals programme and other things being discontinued. There are two comments I would like to make on that. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in this Island public opinion had not yet become sufficiently aware of all these issues.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, did I hear the Hon. Minister right when he said that he listened to my speech and I tried to impress his constituents in St. Lucy that in order to go into Federation the School Meals programme would have to be discontinued? Did I hear him right in mentioning that? If so, I take great exception.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order to enquire from the Hon. Minister what the hon. member heard.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I asked if I heard him right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the Hon. Minister would not know what the hon. member heard.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know he would not, but I asked whether I heard right. I must take objection, because I never said any such thing. I am sure the hon. member is not likely to misquote me purposely, but if he quotes from Hansard which he would have in his possession, or if he would like me to repeat what I said, he would understand what I did say. Is he actually saying that that is what I said, or is he just quoting from memory without referring to what I said?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I said that the implication of the remarks made by the hon. member in the amendment which he moved last week, was that somehow or other the people of St. Lucy and elsewhere would run the risk of not having the School Meals service if we did not go into Federation with the safeguards he was recommending. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I did say, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of elucidation, if Your Honour so desires it should be, what I did say was that we must have these safeguards rather than go into Federation and take the chance of spending money which obviously we would have to look for at the expense of the programme which the present Government in power has put up in their manifesto and the promises they have made. If the hon.

member was not in the House, I am sure his colleagues can tell him that in no way did I suggest that they are going into Federation at the expense of their programme. I suggested having these safeguards, because no Barbadian at all could think of going into a Federation under any circumstances which would obstruct, hinder or prevent our programme of development. Although at times we expressed the view that we did not see eye to eye with their suggestions, I would never attempt to stay in the way, but would hope that they can get them through. We hope that going into Federation would not take the place of those social services which they are offering, and I still feel so now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now beginning to make a second speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should never attempt to follow the example set by other hon. members which is sometimes allowed by the Chairman, but not by Your Honour at all; but what I did say, Sir, is that as far as our Party is concerned, we are not anti-Federation, neither are we pro-Federation at any cost, but commonsense must direct you.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, unless it had been an attempt to make the people of St. Lucy believe that somehow or other they would be faced with the choice of a School Meals service or Federation, there would have been no point in mentioning St. Lucy and school meals at all.
6.50 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am sorry that the hon. member should take such objection, and if he would look in my speech, he will see that I did not only mention St. Lucy, I also mentioned St. Peter. The hon. member knows that there is such a thing as a pilot scheme. I mentioned Christ Church. I do not think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would take objection to my mentioning Christ Church.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Education heard, when I mentioned St. Lucy, that I mentioned other parishes and other things.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The point is that everybody knows that long before the elections were held, this Party which now has the Government made it clear that it was not in favour of Federation at any price and was not prepared to sacrifice its policies on immediate and expanded social reforms in Barbados in order to continue the old Federation or any new grouping. That was our policy and it is still our policy. Therefore, you do not argue for the safeguards which you want to see in the new federation by saying if we have a Federation on the terms of the White Paper, something may happen to the social programmes in this country. We regard that as basic; and nothing which we have done so far on the federal front has ever come near the position where I would have to abandon the position which we have said. Therefore I do not want the people of Barbados to ever feel that for this country to enter into a political Federation, we have to give up our word. That is not the problem. In any case, all the things which come under the heading of social reform would be the things which tend to unite Government in any case; and further, if ever more justification was needed for the steps which this Government has taken to bring the finances of the country up to a proper level, it is that by the time we enter Federation, we hope this country will be able to pull its weight without necessarily imposing greater burdens on the people of this country. Therefore, if ever the argument is that we enter the Federation blindly, that argument has got to be rejected because everything this Government has done on the financial front, on the political front, on all fronts, is to make sure that when we enter the Federation, we enter on the best possible terms for Barbados, and if you want a guarantee or a security for Barbados, you do not get it by putting up impossible conditions for Barbados; you get it by strengthening the economy of Barbados, and that is what we are trying to do. In other words, the best contribution to Barbados as to the safety of Barbados is that Barbados enter the Federation and therefore

submit to the progress of the entire Federation. Therefore, Sir, I do not argue on the premise that you have to give up this or take away that in order to join a political grouping. That is false. Of course, that is stagnation. In order to join on the best possible terms, you lift the levels of the units as high as possible in each unit. You revise and expand the economy so that it pulls its own weight and that becomes the best contribution it can make to the well-being of the whole; and, so long as Barbados continues on the path which this Government has set for it and so long as the ideas and minds of the people are not confused by the wicked and spiteful propaganda going on on the domestic front, there should be no fear when the time comes for the fateful decision to be made that we would be in a position to make it by strengthening ourselves. That is why I say the White Paper ought to be approved because it is the surest and most secure basis upon which the security and safeguards of the Islands can be solved.
(Cheers.)

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for the Day. It is two minutes to seven and we propose to take the adjournment now until 12.00 o'clock on Tuesday next because as I have indicated last week, we intend to take the adjournment on the 28th for the summer recess.

There are over 61 items of Private Members' Business on the Order Paper which have not been dealt with due to the hour at which we commence our sittings and we therefore propose meeting next Tuesday 21st August at 12 o'clock noon.

I should like to assure hon. members who have tabled questions that we are making a very serious effort to have those questions answered before the House rises for its summer recess on 28th August.

As far as the Order Paper is concerned, I propose that Items under Government Business stand in the same order as they do.

I think I ought to mention that the hon. senior member for the City has a Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to deal with and I think enough time has elapsed by which we can dispose of this. There are two or three Select Committees appointed to deal with Bills and doubt very much whether they have met at all. There are also several Minutes of Meetings which we have been notified have not yet been prepared. We hope that all of these things would be put in order by the next sitting of the House on Tuesday.

The Bill for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission I understand was only circulated within the last 24 hours. I propose to go on with that on Tuesday next: so I enjoin hon. members to make a careful study of the provisions of the Boundaries Commission and to do all the necessary background relevant to the debate. That is why we are meeting at 12 (noon).

To all those hon. members who are members of the Local District Councils, I am very pleased to report that the necessary amending legislation to enable them to lay the rates for the financial year 1962-63 will be ready on Tuesday.
7.00 p.m.

There are one or two amendments to the 1958 Local Government Act which, I am sure, will come as a pleasant surprise to hon. members who are engaged in Local Government politics. The Estimates will have been approved by that time, I hope, by the Executive Committee; therefore the machinery of the Local Government tax collection can start moving in high gear. I also intend to introduce legislation next week which will have to be dealt with within seven days, for mortgage insurance, rental housing and all of the ancillary legislation which will be necessary for us to establish these schemes in the island. Therefore,

there is quite a lot of work to be done between now and the end of the month. Having sat and listened to some very illuminating statements made by hon. members both on the White Paper and on other matters, I think we should take the adjournment at this stage.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In connection with what the Hon. Premier has said, the matters which stand in my name are not ready. I am always ready to go on with my matters. It is not my fault that my matters are not dealt with; it is entirely a matter for the Clerk to have these matters ready so that I can go on with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto, I have been advised by the Clerk that he was not able to arrange a convenient date with the hon. member for a meeting of the Select Committee which has been appointed to consider and report on that Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must take exception to that. I say categorically that that is not so. The Clerk has just come around to me and asked me what date would suit me for a meeting of this Committee and this is the first time that the Clerk has said anything like that to me. I am not standing for anything like that. I told the Clerk that he could make it any date. I must say that somebody is misunderstanding somebody else. The Clerk drew to my attention that this Bill has had to be advertised for two weeks; the Clerk is sure I am right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk has said that some time last week he "would" and not that he "had".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I was not suggesting that the delay was due to anybody's fault. Last week when I raised this question about Bills being held up I was informed that the question of printing and circulating and the necessary period of time elapsing — all of those formalities were not observed. When these formalities are observed, there can be no delay with these matters. There are one or two other Bills which were in Select Committee for some time and I doubt very much whether the Committee has met. There is a Committee on the Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957, there is one on the Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, and there is one on the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939. We have made recommendations about a comprehensive revision of the Trade Union Act, 1939, which even goes beyond what the hon. senior member for St. Peter was asking for in the first instance, and then the last Bill in Committee is the one of which the hon. senior member for the City is in charge, that is, the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto. I was merely reminding hon. members that these Committees should be able to sit and make their Reports.

On the Government side, there is a long list of questions. We have disposed of some of the matters under Private Members' Business but I doubt very much whether we will be able to deal with the Resolutions. However, we will try to dispose of the outstanding matters. We would like to have the House up to date on these matters.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, before the motion for the adjournment is put, I am asking leave that Order No. 26, standing in my name under Private Members' Business, be made Order No. 2 for the next meeting of the House.

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

ORDER WITHDRAWN

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw Order No. 18 which stands in my name. That is a Bill to amend the Registration of Deaths Act, 1924. Since this Bill was placed on the Order Paper, the Government is bringing down a more comprehensive Bill which will render this Bill unnecessary.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would not advise the hon. member to withdraw his Bill until he saw something which is a bit more concrete and tangible before the House; but the Government has already passed legislation which embraces the provision which the hon. member wants to bring about. There was some doubt as to whether the amendment really embraces the provisions of registration. I was absent when the amending Bill was brought forward and, as far as I understand, that provision has been covered.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there a motion for the adjournment of this House until this day week? Otherwise, we will formally have to adjourn until 7.45 p.m. of the clock.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the Clerk that that Bill to which I was referring just now is ready, but we could not present it until the hon. member has withdrawn his Bill.
7.10 p.m.

I saw the comprehensive amendment and I thought it was concluded during my absence. That was the Registration of Births; this is now Registration of Deaths and it is a comprehensive amendment. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 noon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just say that I have duly noted that the hon. senior member for St. Michael rose to speak on the Federation debate and the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, but only gave way to the hon. and learned Premier who rose to make the motion for the adjournment. I will therefore be looking in the direction of the hon. senior member for St. Michael next Tuesday when we resume the debate on that Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. If he is not here, I will observe his absence.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st August, at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.11 p.m.